THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
LIBRARY

620038

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_june-21-july-29-1864_176

HANSARD'S
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

THIRD SERIES

COMMENCING WITH THE ACCESSION OF

WILLIAM IV.

27° & 28° VICTORIÆ, 1864.

VOL. CLXXVI.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM

THE TWENTY-FIRST DAY OF JUNE 1864,

TO

THE TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF JULY 1864.

Fourth and Last Volume of the Session.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY CORNELIUS BUCK,
AT THE OFFICE FOR HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,
23, PATERNOSTER ROW [E.C.]
1864

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK, PRINTER, 23, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CLXXVI.

THIRD SERIES.

BEING ALSO AN ABSTRACT OF THE LORDS' "MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS," AND THE COMMONS' "VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS," IN RELATION TO THE PUBLIC BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

[*The* * *indicates that there was no Debate at that Stage of the Bill.*]

LORDS, TUESDAY, JUNE 21.

Page

MINUTES.] — *Took the Oath* — The Bishop of Ely.

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—County Constabulary Superannuation * (No. 140); Government Annuities, &c.* (No. 145); Servants Hiring (Scotland) * (No. 146); Valuation of Rateable Property (Ireland)* (No. 147).

Second Reading — Attorneys and Solicitors Remuneration, &c. [H.L.] (No. 120), and referred to a Select Committee; Vacating of Seats (House of Commons)* (No. 105); Banking Co-partnerships * (No. 113).

Committee—Summary Procedure (Scotland)* (No. 89).

Third Reading—Admiralty Lands and Works* (No. 129); Penal Servitude Acts Amendment* (No. 136); Union Assessment Committee Act Amendment * (No. 137); Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland) [H.L.] * (No. 138); Improvement of Land Act (1864) [H.L.]* (No. 122); Naval Prize Acts Repeal * (No. 78); Chain Cables and Anchors * (No. 101), and *passed*.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—

Moved, That the Lord Portman do take the Chair in the Committees of the Whole House this day, in the absence of The Lord Redesdale.

Motion *agreed to**.

UNITED STATES—OUTRAGE ON A BRITISH SUBJECT BY THE FEDERAL AUTHORITIES—CASE OF MR. LEVY—Question, The Earl of Derby; Answer, Earl Russell 2

Attorneys and Solicitors Remuneration, &c. Bill (No. 120)—

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2^a.—(*The Lord Chancellor*) .. 5

After Debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *referred* to a Select Committee, but nothing further was done therein.

MOUNT ST. BERNARD'S REFORMATORY — Question, Lord Berners; Answer, Earl Granville 18

House adjourned at a quarter before Eight o'clock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JUNE 21.

Page

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* [Bill 164].
Committee—Court of Chancery (Ireland) [Bill 78] [No Report]; Accidents Compensation Act Amendment* [Bill 143]; Countess of Elgin and Kincardine's Annuity* [Bill 156].
Report—Accidents Compensation Act Amendment* [Bill 143]; Countess of Elgin and Kincardine's Annuity* [Bill 156].
Considered as amended—Pilotage Order Confirmation* [Bill 131]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation* [Bill 149].
Third Reading — Coventry Free Grammar School* [Bill 124]; Sale of Gas (Scotand)* [Bill 125.]

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

Court of Chancery (Ireland) Bill [Bill 78]—

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 11 *agreed to.*
Clause 12 (Appointment of Chief Clerks 15 & 16 *Vict.* c. 80, s. 16) 23
Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "one chief clerk" and insert the words "two clerks."—(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen.*)
Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."
Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Whiteside.*)
After Debate, Question put, "That the Chairman do leave the Chair:"—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 42, Noes 41; Majority 1.
[No Report.]

Court of Chancery (Ireland) Bill—The Division—
The House having resumed at Six o'clock—
Explanation of Sir Colman O'Loghlen 30

The Income Tax Commissioners at Blything—Question, Sir FitzRoy Kelly; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 32

Navy—Court Martial at Jamaica—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 33

The Ashantee War—Question, Sir James Elphinstone; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 33

Affairs of the Ionian Islands—Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Layard 35

Reform in the Royal Court of Jersey—Question, Mr. Paull; Answer, Sir George Grey 35

Pay and Allowances in the Royal Navy—Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 35

Australian Postage—Question, Lord Alfred Churchill; Answer, Mr. Peel .. 36

The Ballot—Resolution—
Motion made, and Question proposed,
"That, as a General Election is impending, and it is notorious that our Electoral system is defective and corrupt in practice, and as we have no Law which can put down the intimidation of Voters, nor prevent bribery, it is therefore expedient that a fair trial should be given to the Vote by Ballot."—(*Mr. H. Berkeley*) 36
After Debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 123, Noes 212; Majority 89.

Agricultural Population (Ireland)—Resolution—
Motion made, and Question proposed,
"That this House observes with regret that the Agricultural Population of Ireland are rapidly leaving the Country."—(*Mr. Hennessy*) 47
After long Debate, *Previous Question* put, "That that Question be now put:"—(*Sir George Grey:*)—The House *divided;* Ayes 52, Noes 80; Majority 28.
Motion made, and Question proposed,
"That this House trusts that Her Majesty's Government will devise some means by which the Irish Agricultural Population may be induced to devote their capital and labour to reproductive employment at home."—(*Mr. Hennessy*) 92
Whereupon *Previous Question* proposed, "That that Question be now put." (*Sir George Grey.*)
After short Debate, Original Motion and *Previous Question,* by leave, *withdrawn.*

ARMY—REGIMENTAL QUARTERMASTERS—

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to direct an inquiry to be made into the condition as to provision, pay, and allowances of the Regimental Quartermasters of Her Majesty's Service."—(*Sir Frederic Smith*) 92

After short Debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland) Bill—

Bill to authorize the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury to make provision in regard to the Salaries of certain Sheriffs Substitute in Scotland; *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 164.]

House adjourned at One o'clock.

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report*—Standing Orders (Parliamentary Deposits) *brought up* [No. 423].
PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered*—India Office *
First Reading—India Office * [Bill 166].
Committee—Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers) [Bill 62] [No Report]; Weights and Measures (Metric System) [Bill 24]; Jersey Court [Bill 48], Debate *adjourned.*
Report — Weights and Measures (Metric System) [Bill 24].
Considered as amended—Accidents Compensation Act Amendment * [Bill 143].
Third Reading — Superannuation (Union Officers)* [Bill 133]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation * [Bill 149]; Countess of Elgin and Kincardine's Annuity * [Bill 156], and *passed.*
Withdrawn—Bank of England Notes (Scotland) [Bill 115].

COURT OF CHANCERY (IRELAND) BILL—

Moved, "This House will, on Thursday next, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House to consider further of the progress of the Court of Chancery (Ireland) Bill."—(*Mr. O'Hagan*) 95

After Debate, Motion *agreed to.*

Committee to consider further of the Bill *To-morrow.*

Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers) Bill [Bill 62]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair." 101

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Edward Craufurd,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After short Debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Manner of Voting).

After a desultory discussion, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do leave the Chair:" —(*Mr. Peacocke*:)—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 76, Noes 49; Majority 27.

[No Report.]

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill [Bill 24]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 104

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Short Title).

After short Debate, Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (The Use of Metric Weights and Measures allowed) 104

Moved, That Clause 2 be omitted.—(*Mr. W. Ewart.*)

After short Debate, Motion *agreed to.* Clause *struck out.*

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL—*continued.*

New Clause, "Notwithstanding anything contained in any Act of Parliament to the contrary, no contract or dealing shall be deemed to be invalid or open to objection on the ground that the weights or measures expressed or referred to in such contract or dealing are weights or measures of the metric system."—(*Mr. W. Ewart*) ... 107

After short Debate, Clause *agreed to.*

New Clause, "3. The table in the schedule hereto annexed, shall be deemed to set forth, in terms of the legal weights and measures in force in this country, the equivalents of the weights and measures therein expressed in terms of the metric system, and such table may be lawfully used for computing, determining, and expressing, in legal weights and measures, weights and measures of the metric system."—Clause *agreed to* ... 108

Schedule of Tables of Equivalents.

After short Debate, Schedule *agreed to.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered on *Monday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 165.]

Bank of England Notes (Scotland) Bill [Bill 115]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir John Hay*) 109

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Finlay.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

After Debate, Amendment, and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

Jersey Court Bill [Bill 48]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Locke*). 126

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

India Office Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Cowper*, Bill to vest the Site of the India Office in Her Majesty, for the service of the Government of India, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Cowper and Mr. Peel:—Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 166.]

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock.

LORDS, THURSDAY, JUNE 23.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Countess of Elgin and Kincardine's Annuity* (No. 149); Superannuation (Union Officers)* (No. 154); Bribery* (No. 155) [H.L.]; Cathedral Minor Corporations* (No. 157) [H.L.]

Second Reading—Facilities for Divine Service in Collegiate Schools (No. 117) [H.L.] Beer Houses (Ireland)* (No. 134) County Constabulary Superannuation* (No. 140).

Committee—Vacating of Seats (House of Commons)* (No. 105); Banking Co-partnerships* (No. 113).

Report—Vacating of Seats (House of Commons)* (No. 105); Banking Co-partnerships* (No. 113).

Royal Assents—Under Secretaries Indemnity [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 21]; Registration of County Voters (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 22]; Local Government Supplemental [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 26]; Naval Agency and Distribution [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 24]; Naval Prize [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 25]; Naval Prize Acts Repeal [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 23]; Chain Cables and Anchors [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 27]; Common Law Procedure (Ireland) Act (1853) Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 28]; Insane Prisoners Act Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 29]; Court of Justiciary (Scotland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 30].

DENMARK AND GERMANY—THE CONFERENCE—Observations, Earl Russell .. 140

Bribery Bill—

A Bill for the more effectual Prevention of Bribery and Corruption in the Election of Members to serve in Parliament—Was *presented* by The Lord Brougham and Vaux; read 1ª,* and to be *printed.* (No. 155.)

MOUNT ST. BERNARD'S REFORMATORY—Explanation, Earl Granville .. 143

Facilities for Divine Worship in Collegiate Schools Bill [H.L.] (No. 117)—

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2^a.—(*The Bishop of Oxford*) .. 143

Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday*, the *5th of July next.*

Cathedral Minor Corporations Bill [H.L.]

A Bill to substitute fixed instead of fluctuating Incomes for the Members of certain Minor Corporations in certain of the Cathedral Churches in England — Was *presented* by The Lord Archbishop of York; and read 1^a.* (No. 157.)

House adjourned at a quarter past Six o'clock.

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JUNE 23.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolutions in Committee*—Harwich Harbour Act*.
Ordered—Inclosure (No. 2); Harwich Harbour Act.
First Reading—Public Schools* [Bill 168] (*Lords*); Mortgage Debentures* [Bill 169] (*Lords*); Inclosure (No. 2)* [Bill 170]; Harwich Harbour Act Amendment* [Bill 171].
Second Reading—Weighing of Grain (Port of London) [Bill 119]; Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties)* [Bill 159].
Committee—Local Government Supplemental (No. 2)* [Bill 147]; Settled Estates Act Amendment* [Bill 142] (*Lords*).
Report — Local Government Supplemental (No. 2)* [Bill 147]; Settled Estates Act Amendment* [Bill 142] (*Lords*).
Considered as amended—Railways Construction Facilities* [Bill 111].
Third Reading — Accidents Compensation Act Amendment* [Bill 143], and *passed.*

ARMY — ENGINEER OFFICERS AT SOUTH KENSINGTON — Question, Lord John Manners; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 150

ARMY — RIFLE PRACTICE NEAR THE NEW CROYDON RAILWAY — Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington .. 151

ARMY — MARCHWOOD POWDER MAGAZINE — Question, Mr. Alderman Rose; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 151

ARMY—FIELD ALLOWANCE TO TROOPS ON THE GOLD COAST—Question, General Peel; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 152

ARMY—REQUISITION FROM THE WAR OFFICE TO THE ADMIRALTY — Question, General Peel; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 153

INDIA—BANDA AND KIRWEE BOOTY—Question, General Peel; Answer, Viscount Palmerston 154

THE ROYAL FORESTS—Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, Mr. Peel 154

UNCLAIMED WRECK—Question, Mr. Rogers; Answer, Mr. Hunt .. 155

ANNUAL REPORT ON OUR COLONIAL POSSESSIONS—Question, Mr. Rogers; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 155

NAVY—THE "RESEARCH"—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 155

NAVY—THE TRANSPORT "GLADIATOR"—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 157

ARMY—TRIAL OF HEAVY RIFLED GUNS—Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 157

DOCKS AT MALTA—Question, Captain Talbot; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget .. 158

UNITED STATES—CASE OF MR. JAMES M'HUGH—Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Mr. Layard 159

ASHANTEE WAR—OFFICERS AT CAPE COAST CASTLE—Question, Mr. Longfield; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 159

STAMP DUTIES — ORDERS ON BANKERS — Question, Mr. Alderman Salomons; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer.. 160

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL—Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, Sir George Grey 160

NAVY—THE "GLADIATOR"—Question, Lord Stanley; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 161

DENMARK AND GERMANY—THE CONFERENCE—Question, Mr. Disraeli; Answer, Viscount Palmerston 162

Weighing of Grain (Port of London) [Bill 119]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Crawford*) 163

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "inasmuch as the Bill seeks to enlarge and alter the powers of the Corporation of the City of London to levy a Rate or Duty, and to alter existing Rates and Duties, on Grain and Seeds imported into the Port of London for the use and benefit of the Corporation, this House is of opinion that the Bill ought not to be proceeded with until the Standing Orders relating to Private Bills be duly complied with,"—(*Mr. Ayrton,*)—instead thereof 166

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After Debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—Resolution—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [14th June],

"That, in the opinion of this House, the Rules sanctioned by the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland on the 21st day of November, 1863, are, so far as regards their operation on the aid afforded to Convent and Monastic Schools, at variance with the principles of the system of National Education."—(*Sir Hugh Cairns*) .. 176

Question again proposed.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out the words "so far as regards their operation on the aid afforded to Convent and Monastic Schools."—(*Mr. Hennessy*) 184

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After long Debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 112, Noes 8; Majority 104.

Main Question put:—The House *divided.*

[Notice being taken that Sir George Bowyer, the Member for Dundalk, having given his voice with the Ayes, had voted with the Noes, Sir George Bowyer was called to the Table by Mr. Speaker, and stated that he had given his voice with the Noes, but had called out "The Ayes have it," in order to force a Division; whereupon Mr. Speaker directed his Vote to be recorded with the Ayes.]

Ayes 59, Noes 91; Majority 32.

Inclosure (No. 2) **Bill**—

On Motion of *Mr. Baring*, Bill to authorize the Inclosure of certain lands in pursuance of a Special Report of the Inclosure Commissioners, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Baring and Sir George Grey:—Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 170.]

Harwich Harbour Act Bill—

Bill *considered* in Committee.*

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, That leave be given to bring in a Bill for amending the Harwich Harbour Act, 1863.

Resolution *reported.*

Bill *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Milner Gibson and Mr. Hutt:—Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 171.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LORDS, FRIDAY, JUNE 24.

Page

MINUTES.]—*Sat First in Parliament*—The Marquess Townshend, after the Death of his Father.

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Accidents Compensation Act Amendment* (No. 158.)

Second Reading—Army Prize (Shares of Deceased)* (No. 106); Countess of Elgin and Kincardine's Annuity* (No. 149).

Committee—Beer Houses (Ireland)* (No. 134.)

Report—Beer Houses (Ireland)* (No. 134).

Third Reading—Vacating of Seats (House of Commons)* (No. 105); Banking Co-partnerships* (No. 113), and *passed.*

The St. Bernard's Reformatory—Observations, Lord Berners .. 235

The Royal Academy—Question, Earl Stanhope; Reply, Lord St. Leonards .. 236

Alkali Works Regulation Bill—Question, Lord Ravensworth; Answer, Lord Stanley of Alderley 253

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock.

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JUNE 24.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee**—Committee R.P.

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland)* [Bill 174].

Second Reading—Cranbourne Street* [Bill 154]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) [Bill 100].

Referred to Select Committee—Weighing of Grain (Port of London)* [Bill 119] (*List of Committee.*)

Committee—Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties) [Bill 159]; Chimney Sweepers Regulation* [Bill 148] (*Lords*); Weighing of Grain (Port of London)* [Bill 119]; Court of Chancery (Ireland) [Bill 78], *Debate adjourned;* Railways (Ireland) Act Amendment* [Bill 99].

Report—Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties) [Bill 159]; Chimney Sweepers Regulation* [Bill 148] (*Lords*); Weighing of Grain (Port of London)* [Bill 119], and *re-committed* to a Select Committee; Railways (Ireland) Act Amendment* [Bill 99].

Police in the Parks—Question, Mr. J. Hardy; Answer, Sir George Grey .. 255

United States—The "Kearsarge"—Question, Mr. Corry; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 256

Navy—The Course of the "Gladiator"—Question, Mr. Dalglish; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 256

The Highways District Act—Question, Mr. Dodson; Answer, Sir George Grey 257

Ensign for the Naval Reserve—Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 257

Army—Sanitary Regulations for Field Service—Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 258

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

The Duty on Malt—Resolution—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "In case of any modification of the Indirect Taxation of this Country, the Excise on Malt requires consideration,"—(*Mr. Morritt,*)—instead thereof ... 262

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question.

After long Debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 166, Noes 118; Majority 48.

Law of Jersey—Observations, Mr. Digby Seymour; Reply, Sir George Grey 277

Court of Admiralty (Ireland)—Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. O'Hagan (The Attorney General for Ireland) 279

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Supply *considered* in Committee*—

Committee report Progress; to sit again on *Monday* next.

Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties) Bill [Bill 159]—

Bill *considered* in Committee:— 281

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 8, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 9 (Sections 54 to 65 of the 7 & 8 *Vict.* c. 52, and so much of Section 13 of the 3 & 4 *Will.* IV. c. 68, as relates to Brewers in Ireland, repealed) 282

After short Debate, Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 10 (Extension to Ireland of certain provisions relating to Brewers in England) 282

After short Debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress,"—(*Mr. Hennessy,*)—put and *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to*:—Clauses 11 to 15 *agreed to*:—Clause 16 *postponed.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered on *Monday* next.

Court of Chancery (Ireland) Bill [Bill 78]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" 285

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the Bill be committed to a Select Committee,"—(*Mr. Longfield,*)—instead thereof 291

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After short Debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Whiteside,*)—instead thereof 297

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 51, Noes 49; Majority 2.

Original Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 51, Noes 56; Majority 5.

Original Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Collins.*)

Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 53, Noes 56; Majority 3.

Original Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Vance.*)

After short Debate, Debate *adjourned* till *Monday* next.

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Bill [Bill 100]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Frederick Peel*)

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. George*) 301

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

After short Debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read 2°, and committed for *Monday* next.

House adjourned at One o'clock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LORDS, MONDAY, JUNE 27.

Page

MINUTES.]—*Sat First in Parliament*—The Duke of Cleveland (after the Death of his Brother).

Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Superannuation (Union Officers)* (No. 154); Civil Bill Courts (Ireland) (No. 67); Servants Hiring (Scotland)* (No. 146); Coventry Free Grammar School* (No. 153).

Committee—Army Prize (Shares of Decased)* (No. 106); Countess of Elgin and Kincardine's Annuity* (No. 149).

Report—Army Prize (Shares of Deceased)* (No. 106); Countess of Elgin and Kincardine's Annuity* (No. 149).

Third Reading—Beer Houses (Ireland)* (No. 134), and *passed*.

Denmark and Germany — The Conference — Ministerial Statement—Observations, Earl Russell 302

Civil Bill Courts (Ireland) Bill (No. 67)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor*) .. 332

After short Debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

House adjourned at a quarter before Eight o'clock.

COMMONS, MONDAY, JUNE 27.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—On Expiring Laws, *appointed* and *nominated* (*List of Committee.*)

Supply—*considered in Committee*—Miscellaneous Estimates.

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* [Bill 176].

Second Reading—Contagious Diseases* [Bill 163]; Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* [Bill 152]; Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* [Bill 164]; Inclosure (No. 2)* [Bill 170]; Mortgage Debentures* [Bill 169] (*Lords*).

Referred to Select Committee—Contagious Diseases* [Bill 163]; Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* [Bill 152].

Report of Select Committee—Cattle Diseases Prevention, and Cattle, &c. Importation* [Bills 27 & 28], Report* (No. 431).

Committee—Greek Loan [Bill 144]; Factory Acts Extension* [Bill 55]; Naval and Victualling Stores* [Bill 178] (*Lords*); Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers)* [Bill 62]—R.P.

Report—Cattle Diseases Prevention* [Bill 27] (*re-committed*); Highways Act Amendment* [Bill 177] (*re-committed*); Greek Loan [Bill 144]; Factory Acts Extension* [Bill 55]; Naval and Victualling Stores* [Bill 178] (*Lords*) (*re-committed*).

Considered as amended—Settled Estates Act Amendment* [Bill 142] (*Lords*); Weights and Measures (Metric System)* [Bill 165].

Third Reading—Chimney Sweepers Regulation* [Bill 148] (*Lords*); Railway Construction Facilities* [Bill 111], and *passed*.

Withdrawn—Cattle, &c. Importation* [Bill 28].

Poor Law Relief—Question, Mr. Warner; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers .. 334

State of Park Lane—Question, Sir John Shelley; Answer, Mr. Tite .. 334

Egham Railway Accident—Question, Sir Richard Bulkeley; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson 335

Church Livings (Ireland)—Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir Robert Peel 336

Guns for the Navy—Question, Mr. Corry; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget .. 336

Expiring Laws Bill—Select Committee *appointed*,* (*List of Members*,)

"To inquire what temporary Laws of a public and general nature are now in force, and what Laws of the like nature have expired since the last Report on the subject; and also what Laws of the like nature are about to expire at particular periods, or in consequence of any contingent public events, and to report the same, with their Observations thereupon, to the House:"—Mr. Peel, Mr. Massey, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Adderley, Mr. Cowper, Sir William Jolliffe, Colonel French, Mr. Baring, Mr. Brand, Mr. Williams, and Lord John Manners:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Three to be the quorum.—(*Mr. Peel.*)

Denmark and Germany—The Conference—

Copy *presented*, of Protocols of Conferences held in London relative to the Affairs of Denmark [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 337

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

SUPPLY—*continued.*

ANNUITY TO THE KING OF GREECE—Resolution—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the Grant to the King of Greece of an Annuity of £4,000 out of monies belonging to the Consolidated Fund, by Treaty not made subject to the sanction of Parliament, is a violation of the Privileges of the House of Commons,"—(*Mr. Ayrton,*)—instead thereof ... 356

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After Debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

THE LAW COURTS—Observations, Mr. Montague Smith; Reply, The Attorney General 363

BRITISH TROOPS IN CANADA—Resolution—

"That in the opinion of this House it is inexpedient that detachments of British troops should be stationed upon exposed posts on the Canadian frontier unless adequately supported by Canadian Forces."—(*Mr. Adderley*) 373

UNITED STATES—CLEARANCE OF BRITISH SHIPS AT NEW YORK—Observations, Mr. Cave; Reply, Mr. Layard 385

RECRUITING FOR THE ARMY—Observations, Colonel Dunne; Reply, The Marquess of Hartington 387

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY *considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES 392

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £94,222, to complete the sum for Establishments in China, Japan, and Siam.

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £27,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for the Extraordinary Disbursements of Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad 392

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £17,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for the Extraordinary Disbursements of Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad."—(*Mr. Dodson*) 393

After short Debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 37, Noes 113; Majority 76.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(3.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £20,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for Special Missions, Diplomatic Outfits, and Conveyance and Entertainment of Colonial Officers and others" 396

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Item of £52 4*s.* 4*d.*, for Seamen's Clothing supplied to Commodore Wilmot from the *Rattlesnake* in January, 1863, for presentation to the Chiefs, &c., at the Court of the King of Dahomey, be omitted from the proposed Vote."—(*Mr. Butt*) ... 397

After short Debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(4.) £3,649, to complete the sum for Third Secretaries to Embassies, &c.
(5.) £123,280, to complete the sum for Superannuation and Retired Allowances.
(6.) £728, Toulonese and Corsican Emigrants, &c., and American Loyalists.
(7.) £325, Refuge for the Destitute.
(8.) £1,959, to complete the sum for Polish Refugees and Distressed Spaniards.
(9.) £50,700, to complete the sum for Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions.
(10.) £25,400, to complete the sum for Relief of Distressed British Seamen.
(11.) £2,607, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Charges, formerly on Civil List.
(12.) £1,272, to complete the sum for Public Infirmaries, Ireland.

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—*continued.*

(13.) £1,600, to complete the sum for Westmoreland Lock Hospital.
(14.) £700, Rotunda Lying-in Hospital.
(15.) £200, Coombe Lying-in Hospital.
(16.) £5,600, to complete the sum for House of Industry Hospitals.
(17.) £1,500, to complete the sum for Cork Street Fever Hospital.
(18.) £600, Meath Hospital.
(19.) £100, St. Mark's Ophthalmic Hospital.
(20.) £300, to complete the sum for Dr. Steven's Hospital.
(21.) £245, for Board of Superintendence of Dublin Hospitals.
(22.) £5,693, to complete the sum for Concordatum Fund, and other Charities and Allowances, Ireland.

(23.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £29,670, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for Non-conforming, Seceding, and Protestant Dissenting Ministers in Ireland" 399

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £670, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for Non-conforming, Seceding, and Protestant Dissenting Ministers in Ireland."—(*Mr. Hadfield*) 399

After short Debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 21, Noes 127; Majority 106.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow:*—Committee to sit again on *Wednesday.*

Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties) Bill [Bill 159]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be taken into Consideration this day." 400

After short Debate, Amendment proposed, at the end of the Question, to add the word "week."—(*Mr. Hennessy*) 401

Question proposed, "That the word 'week' be there added."

After further Debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Ordered, That the Bill be taken into Consideration *To-morrow.*

Greek Loan Bill [Bill 144]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 403

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Power for Treasury to relinquish £4,000 a year).

Amendment proposed, to add the following Proviso, to secure the payment of certain pensions due to British subjects:—"That the sum should not be remitted until the salaries were paid."—(*Colonel Dunne.*)

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Lord Robert Cecil*) 406

The Committee *divided;* Ayes 48, Noes 58; Majority 10.

After Debate, Amendment *withdrawn,* and the following substituted:—

"Provided always that certain sums for pensions and compensations, payable to British subjects and others who were employed in the service of the Ionian Republic when under British protection, and guaranteed by the said treaty, shall be regularly paid."—(*Colonel Dunne.*)

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read 3° on *Thursday.*

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

LORDS, TUESDAY, JUNE 28.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS — *First Reading* — Railways Construction Facilities* (No. 160).

Second Reading — Valuation of Rateable Property (Ireland)* (No. 147); Cathedral Minor Corporations* (No. 157) [H.L.]; Pilotage Order Confirmation* (No. 150); Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation* (No. 151); Brokers Bonds and Rents Bill.

Committee — County Constabulary Superannuation* (No. 140); Coventry Free Grammar School* (No. 153).

Report—Coventry Free Grammar School* (No. 153.)

Third Reading — Army Prize (Shares of Deceased)* (No. 106); Countess of Elgin and Kincardine's Annuity* (No. 149), and *passed.*

Brokers Bonds and Rents Bill—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*Lord Taunton*) 408

Amendment *moved,* to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Six Months.") —(*Lord Kingsdown*) 409

After Debate, on Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion? *Resolved* in the *Negative;* and Bill to be read 2^a on *this Day Six Months.*

Brazilian Slave Trade—Observations, Lord Brougham; Reply, Earl Russell 411

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock.

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JUNE 28.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Ordered*—Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension;* Election Petitions Act (1848) Amendment.*

Select Committee—Weighing of Grain (Port of London)* [Bill 172] *nominated.*

Committee—Lunacy (Scotland) [Bill 146]; Administration of Trusts (Scotland) [Bill 95]; Elections Petitions [Bill 17] (*count out*); Thames Conservancy (*re-committed*) [Bill 135].

Report—Lunacy (Scotland) [Bill 146]; Administration of Trusts (Scotland) [Bill 95]; Thames Conservancy Bill (*re-committed*) [Bill 135].

Thames Conservancy (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 135]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 415

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 69 *agreed to* with verbal Amendments.

Clause 70 (Power to take Tolls for Moorings and for Lighters and Steam Tugs).

Amendment proposed, "To omit the words 'lighters and steam tugs' used on the river Thames."—(*Mr. Alderman Salomons.*)

After short Debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to*:—Clauses 71 to 74 *agreed to.*

Clause 75 (Prohibitions of deepening or altering Sewers or Drains discharging into the River).

Amendment proposed, In page 25, line 4, after the word "condition," to insert the words "Provided always, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to apply to any legally authorized sewers, drains, or works, now in course of construction by the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses of the borough of Kingston-upon-Thames, and the connection of the houses in such borough with the said sewers, drains, and works."—(*Mr. Alcock*) ... 415

After short Debate, Question put, "That those words be there added:"—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 9, Noes 45; Majority 36.

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

Lunacy (Scotland) Bill [Bill 146]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 422

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Continuance of Deputy Commissioners).

Amendment moved to omit the words, "until Parliament shall otherwise determine," and to insert the words, "until the 1st August, 1866."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Treasury to regulate Salaries of Secretary, Clerk, and Deputy Commissioners.)

After short Debate, Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

Administration of Trusts (Scotland) Bill [Bill 95]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 423

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 7 *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Trustees desirous of purchasing the Trust Estate may apply to Court for permission).

After short Debate, Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 9 (Court may authorize Trustee to enter into Transactions with the Estate) ... 425

After short Debate, Clause *withdrawn.*

Clause 10 (Extension of the Powers of Trustees in relation to Investments).

After short Debate, Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

Then, on Motion of the Lord Advocate, New Clauses added.

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered on *Monday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 179.]

COLONIAL GOVERNORS—PAPERS MOVED FOR—

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of any Correspondence which has passed between any Departments of the Government, with respect to the granting of Pensions to Colonial Governors."—(*Mr. Baillie Cochrane*) ... 426

After Debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

OPEN SPACES (METROPOLIS)—RESOLUTION—*Moved,*

"That it is the duty of Her Majesty's Government to provide for the preservation of open spaces in and around the Metropolis, within the limits assigned by the 14th section of the Inclosure Act of 1845."—(*Mr. Doulton*) 431

After short Debate, Question put — The House *divided ;* Ayes 79, Noes 40; Majority 39.

QUEEN'S PLATES—RESOLUTION—

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, as the annual grant of sums of money voted by this House for Queen's Plates no longer encourages the Breed of good horses, the object for which it was originally given, it should, for the future, be discontinued."—(*Mr. Percy Wyndham*) 437

After Debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Election Petitions Bill [Bill 17]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [1st June], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" .. 448

And which Amendment was,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words, "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the expediency of amending the Election Petitions Act (1848) and the Act for the better discovery and prevention of Bribery and Treating at Elections,"—(*Mr. Ayrton,*)—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

House counted out 449

Election Petitions Act (1848) Amendment Bill—

On Motion of *Sir Colman O'Loghlen,* Bill to amend "The Election Petitions Act, 1848," in certain particulars, *ordered** to be brought in by Sir Colman O'Loghlen and Mr. Adair.

House adjourned at half after Eight o'clock.

LORDS, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 29.

Their Lordships met; and having gone through the business on the paper, without Debate,

House adjourned at Four o'clock.

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 29.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*Resolutions* [June 27] *reported*.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension* [Bill 181]; Election Petitions Act (1848) Amendment* [Bill 182].

Second Reading — Poor Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment [Bill 51] *negatived.*

Committee—Tests Abolition (Oxford) [Bill 18]: Street Music (Metropolis) [Bill 90]—R.P.; Gaols* [Bill 93].

Report —Tests Abolition (Oxford) [Bill 18]; Gaols* [Bill 93] (*re-committed*).

Considered as amended — Thames Conservancy* [Bill 135]; Lunacy (Scotland)* [Bill 146].

Third Reading — Weights and Measures (Metric System)* [Bill 165]; Settled Estates Act Amendment* [Bill 142] (*Lords*), and *passed.*

Poor Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill [Bill 51]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Hennessy*) 449

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Lord Naas*) 454

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

After Debate, Question put:—The House *divided ;* Ayes 24, Noes 201; Majority 177:—Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *put off* for three months.

Tests Abolition (Oxford) Bill [Bill 18]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 467

After short Debate, Bill *reported,* without Amendment ; to be read 3° on *Friday.*

Street Music (Metropolis) Bill [Bill 90]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 467

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Repeal of recited Provision and Substitution of amended Provision).

Moved, That after the words " such householder " to insert the words " On account of the illness, or on account of the interruption of the ordinary occupations or pursuits of any inmate of such house, or for other reasonable or sufficient cause."—(*Mr. Cavendish Bentinck.*)

After short Debate, Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 3, to leave out the word " near," and insert the words "in front of."—(*Mr. Ayrton*) 468

Question put, " That the word ' near ' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided ;* Ayes 201, Noes 87 ; Majority 114.

Amendment proposed, in line 5, after the word " shillings," to insert the words " or, in the discretion of the magistrate before whom he shall be convicted, may be imprisoned for any time not more than three days."—(*Mr. Cavendish Bentinck*) 473

After short Debate, Question put, " That those words be there inserted."

The Committee *divided ;* Ayes 121, Noes 111 ; Majority 10.

Amendment proposed, in line 5, to leave out the words " and it shall be lawful for any constable."—(*Mr. Ayrton*) 474

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

After short Debate, Whereupon Motion made, and Question put, " That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Butt*) 477

The Committee *divided;* Ayes 54, Noes 175 ; Majority 121.

Amendment again proposed.

After short Debate, Question put, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided;* Ayes 151, Noes 68 ; Majority 83.

Amendment proposed, at the end of the Clause, to add the words " within view of such constable."—(*Sir George Grey*) 478

After short Debate, Question put, " That those words be there added."

The Committee *divided;* Ayes 83, Noes 118 ; Majority 35.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again *To-morrow.*

Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension Bill—

Bill to place the employment of Women, Young Persons, and Children in the occupations of Finishers, Hookers, Lappers, and Makers-up and Packers in Warehouses under the Regulations of the Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension ; *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 181.]

Election Petitions Act (1848) Amendment Bill—

Bill to amend " The Election Petitions Act, 1848," in certain particulars ; *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 182.]

And it being Six of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House till To-morrow, without putting the Question.

LORDS, THURSDAY, JUNE 30.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading* —Weights and Measures (Metric System)* (No. 164) ; Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment * (No. 167).

Second Reading—Government Annuities, &c.* (No. 145) ; Clerks of the Peace Removal * (No. 126) [H.L.]

Committee—Valuation of Rateable Property (Ireland)* (No. 147) ; Cathedral Minor Corporations * (No. 157) [H.L.]

Report — Summary Procedure (Scotland)* (No. 148) ; Valuation of Rateable Property (Ireland)* (No. 147).

Third Reading — Coventry Free Grammar School * (No. 153).

Withdrawn — Oyster Fishery (England and Wales) (No. 108) [H.L.]; Servants Hiring (Scotland)* (No. 146).

Royal Assent—Countess of Elgin and Kincardine's Annuity [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 31]; Fish Teinds (Scotland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 33]; Vacating of Seats (House of Commons) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 34] ; Banking Co-partnerships [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 32]; Beerhouses (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 35] ; Chimney Sweepers Regulation [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 37] ; Chief Rents (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 38] ; Army Prize (Shares of Deceased) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 36].

ABOLITION OF METROPOLITAN TURNPIKES—Observations, Lord Ravensworth .. 479

London City Tithes Bill—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" 480
After short discussion, Debate *adjourned* to *Monday* next.
Second Reading, *put off* to *Monday* next.

Oyster Fishery (England and Wales) (No. 108)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) .. 480
Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn;* and Bill (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

Agrarian Outrages (Ireland)—*Moved—*

"That, considering the Extent to which Agrarian Outrages prevail in certain Counties in Ireland, and the Difficulty which exists in obtaining Convictions for Offences of this Description, this House is of Opinion that the Power of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to remit the whole or a Portion of the Sentences of Persons convicted of such Crimes should be exercised with greater Care and Circumspection; and this House observes with Regret that the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland ordered the Release of Michael Duigan, Patrick Duigan, and Patrick Egan, Prisoners under Sentence for an Agrarian Offence, confined in the County Gaol of Westmeath, upon Grounds which appear to be insufficient."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore*) 482

Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

Theresa Keenan—Alleged Misconduct of the Police in Leitrim—*Moved—*

"Copy of the Informations of Theresa Keenan, taken before J. Tyrell Byrne, Esquire, J. P., at Drumsna, in the County of Leitrim, on the 2nd day of April, 1864, relative to some Windows being broken at Eskeragh alias Esker South, in the Parish of Mohill, Barony of Mohill, and County of Leitrim, between the 24th and 30th days of March, 1864."—(*The Earl of Leitrim*) 492

After short debate, *agreed to.*

Prison Returns (Ireland)—*Moved—*

"Return of the Names of Prisoners under Sentence and discharged from the several Gaols or Convict Prisons in Ireland before the Expiration of their Sentences, or whose Sentences have been commuted by the Order of the Government in Ireland, during the Years 1859, 1860, 1861, 1862, 1863, and 1864; showing the Nature of the Crime for which each was convicted, the Sentence of the Court, and the Grounds upon which the Release or Commutation has taken place."—(*The Earl of Leitrim*) ... 493

After short debate, *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock.

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JUNE 30.

MINUTES.]—New Member Sworn—Sir Hedworth Williamson, Bart., *for* Durham County (Northern Division).

Supply—*considered in Committee*—Civil Service Estimates.

Public Bills—*Resolutions in Committee*—Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)*; Isle of Man Harbours Act*.

Ordered—Isle of Man Harbours Act*; Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)*; India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment*.

First Reading—India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment* [Bill 183]; Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)* [Bill 184]; Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* [Bill 185].

Second Reading—Local Government Act (1858) Amendment* [Bill 155]; India Office* [Bill 166]; Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland)* [Bill 174] (*Lords*); Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* [Bill 176].

Select Committee—Contagious Diseases* (*List of Committee*).

Committee—Inclosure (No. 2)* [Bill 170]; Cranbourne Street* [Bill 154]—r.p.; Mortgage Debentures (Stamps)* [Bill 169]—r.p.

Report—Inclosure (No. 2)* [Bill 170].

Considered as amended—Factory Acts Extension* [Bill 55]; Railways (Ireland) Acts Amendment* [Bill 173].

Third Reading—Greek Loan [Bill 144]; Thames Conservancy* [Bill 135]; Lunacy (Scotland)* [Bill 146]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 2)* [Bill 147].

Canada—Defences of Quebec—Question, Mr. Adderley; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 494

Army—Barrack Masters—Question, Mr. C. P. Berkeley; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 494

Traffic on Westminster Bridge—Question, Sir John Shelley; Answer, Mr. Cowper 494

The Ladies' Gallery—Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answer, Mr. Cowper .. 496

[*June* 30.] Page

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

GRANTS TO ENDOWED SCHOOLS—Notice of Motion, Sir John Pakington, *withdrawn* 497

SCHOOL OF NAVAL ARCHITECTURE—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the New School of Naval Architecture ought to be established in immediate connection with one of the chief Naval Arsenals, where the students may have, together with scientific lectures of a high order, the benefit of regular, progressive, and continuous instruction in every branch of practical shipbuilding, as well as constant opportunities of inspecting and studying steam and other machinery, the varied armaments, and numerous operations carried out in the docking, fitting out, and working of every species of vessel embraced by the Royal Navy; and further, that the South Kensington Establishments and Museums are altogether wanting in the educational staff and means of practical application indispensable for such School,"—(*Mr. Augustus Smith,*)—instead thereof 498

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Amendment *negatived.*

TRADE OF COVENTRY—Observations, Mr. Treherne and other hon. Members, 505; Reply, Mr. Milner Gibson 509

INCOME TAX DEDUCTIONS—Question, Mr. Hubbard; Answer, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer 514

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY *considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £525,404, to complete the sum for Public Education, Great Britain .. 516

After long debate, Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £97,582, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for the General Management of the Department of Science and Art, of the Schools throughout the Kingdom in connection with the Department, and of the Geological Surveys of Great Britain and Ireland, &c. ... 557

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £82,582, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for the General Management of the Department of Science and Art, of the Schools throughout the Kingdom in connection with the Department, and of the Geological Surveys of Great Britain and Ireland, &c."—(*Mr. Augustus Smith*) 560

After short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 73, Noes 131; Majority 58:—Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow*:—Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

Penal Servitude Acts Amendment Bill [Bill 167]—

Lords Amendments *considered,* and, with Amendments to one of them, *agreed to,* as far as the second Amendment, in page 2, line 36.

The second Amendment, in page 2, line 36, to leave out the words, "once in each month," and insert the words, "if required to do so by the conditions of his licence," read 2°.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with The Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Hunt*) 566

After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 129, Noes 84; Majority 45.

Subsequent Amendments *agreed to.*

Penal Servitude Acts Amendment Bill—*continued.*

Committee *appointed,*

"To draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to the Amendment to which this House hath disagreed:"—Mr. Hunt, Sir John Pakington, Sir Hugh Cairns, Mr. Adderley, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Marsh, and Mr. Beach:—To withdraw immediately:—Three to be the quorum.

Greek Loan Bill [Bill 144]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time" 567

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the words "That the" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "said Order be discharged,"—(*Mr. Hennessy,*)—instead thereof ... 569

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read 3 , and *passed.*

Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill—

Bill *considered* in Committee.*

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, That leave be given to bring in a Bill for confirming a Provisional Order, made by the Board of Trade, under "The Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act, 1862," relating to the Pilotage of the River Tyne.

Resolution *reported.*

Bill *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Milner Gibson and Mr. Hutt:—Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 184.]

Isle of Man Harbours Act Bill—

Bill *considered* in Committee.*

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, That leave be given to bring in a Bill for amending the Isle of Man Harbours Act, 1863.

Resolution *reported.*

Bill *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Milner Gibson and Mr. Hutt:—Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 185.]

India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment Bill—

On Motion of *Sir Charles Wood,* Bill to amend an Act of the twenty-fifth year of the reign of Her present Majesty to provide for the registration and transfer of Indian Stocks at the Bank of Ireland, and for the mutual transfer of such Stocks from and to the Banks of England and Ireland respectively, *ordered** to be brought in by Sir Charles Wood and Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer:—Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 183.]

Contagious Diseases Bill—

Select Committee *appointed** on the Contagious Diseases Bill to consist of Nineteen Members:—Lord Clarence Paget, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Walpole, Mr. Hennessy, Mr. Hunt, Lord Hotham, Sir James Fergusson, General Peel, Mr. Liddell, Sir Harry Verney, Mr. Ayrton, Sir Morton Peto, Sir John Trelawny, Mr. Kinnaird, Mr. Locke, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir George Grey, Captain Jervis, and Mr. Longfield:—Five to be the quorum.

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

LORDS, FRIDAY, JULY 1.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Lunacy (Scotland)* (No. 172); Thames Conservancy* (No. 173); Local Government Supplemental* (No. 174).

Second Reading — Public and Refreshment Houses (Metropolis, &c.)* (No. 135).

Report — Cathedral Minor Corporations* (No. 166).

Japan—Resolutions of Earl Grey

After long debate, On Question, Whether to agree? Their Lordships *divided;* Contents 11, Not-Contents 30; Majority 19

Resolved in the *Negative.*

List of Contents and Not-Contents 612

House adjourned at a quarter before Nine o'clock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JULY 1.

Page

MINUTES.]—Supply—*Resolutions* [June 30] *reported**.

Supply—*considered in Committee*—Civil Service Estimates.

Public Bills — *Resolutions in Committee* — Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans); Registration of Deeds (Ireland) [Stamps]*.

Ordered—Courts of Justice Money*; Courts of Justice Site*; Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension*; Militia Ballot Suspension*.

First Reading — Improvement of Land Act (1864)* [Bill 187] (*Lords*); Courts of Justice Money* [Bill 188]; Courts of Justice Site* [Bill 189]; Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension* [Bill 190]; Militia Pay and Clothing*; Militia Ballot Suspension*.

Second Reading—Indemnity [Bill 97].

Committee—Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans) [Bill 191]; Cranbourne Street* [Bill 154]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland)* [Bill 100]; Divorce and Matrimonial Causes (Amendment)* [Bill 162] (*Lords*); Street Music (Metropolis) [Bill 90].

Report — Cranbourne Street* [Bill 154]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland)* [Bill 100]; Divorce and Matrimonial Causes (Amendment)* [Bill 162] (*Lords*); Street Music (Metropolis) [Bill 90].

Third Reading — Factory Acts Extension* [Bill 55]; Inclosure (No. 2)* [Bill 170;] Railways (Ireland) Act Amendment* [Bill 173]; Tests Abolition (Oxford) [Bill 18], and *passed*.

West Riding Assizes—Question, Colonel Smyth; Answer, Sir George Grey .. 613

India—Officers of the Indian Army—Question, Captain Jervis; Answer, Colonel Sykes 613

Navy—The Course of the "Gladiator"—Question, Sir James Elphinstone; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 615

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

Hudson's Bay Territory—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copies of all Correspondence which has taken place between the Imperial and Canadian Governments respecting the Western Boundaries of Canada, and of any Memorials forwarded to the Colonial Office from the inhabitants of the Red River Settlement,"—(*Mr. Arthur Mills,*)—instead thereof 616

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Lunatic Asylums in Ireland—Observations, Mr. Blake, 628; Reply, Sir Robert Peel 636

Inns of Court—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of any Correspondence that may have passed between the Government and the Inns of Court, with regard to the Report of the Commission on the Inns of Court,"—(*Mr. Grant Duff,*)—instead thereof 639

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After short debate, Amendment *negatived.*

Royal Forests in Essex—Observations, Mr. Cox, and other hon. Members; Reply, Mr. Peel 647

Denmark and Germany—Earl Russell and the Conference—Question, Lord Burghley; Answer, Viscount Palmerston 655

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Supply *considered* in Committee—Civil Service Estimates—

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £3,750, Ecclesiastical Commissioners 656
After short debate, Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) £11,224, to complete the sum for Temporary Commissions .. 657
After short debate, Vote *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—*continued.*

(3.) £22,689, to complete the sum for Patent Law Expenses.

(4.) £11,152, to complete the sum for Fishery Board, Scotland.

(5.) £2,000, Trustees of Manufactures, Scotland.

(6.) £37,948, to complete the sum for Dues under Treaties of Reciprocity.

(7.) £2,220, to complete the sum for Inspectors of Corn Returns.

(8.) £500, Boundary Survey, Ireland.

(9.) £680, Malta and Alexandria Telegraph, &c. 657
After short debate, Vote *agreed to.*

(10.) £12,457, to complete the sum for Civil Contingencies 658
After short debate, Vote *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported on *Monday* next:—Committee to sit again on *Monday* next.

THAMES EMBANKMENT AND METROPOLIS IMPROVEMENT (LOANS)—

Resolutions *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved,

"That it is expedient to authorize the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to guarantee the repayment of any money that may be borrowed under the Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement Acts, together with the interest thereon; and to cause advances to be made out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland of such sums as may be necessary for the repayment of such principal and interest, in aid of any other moneys applicable for that purpose under the said Act.

"That the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt be authorized to advance the money which, by the Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement Acts, the Metropolitan Board of Works is authorized to raise."—(*The Chancellor of the Exchequer*) 660

Resolutions *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported on *Monday* next

Indemnity Bill [Bill 97]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "considering the long period during which yearly Indemnity Bills have passed, on account of the non-compliance with the requirements of Acts of Parliament made and passed in times of political excitement and trouble (some of them two hundred years ago), imposing oaths and declarations as stated in the Indemnity Bill, a Select Committee be appointed to consider and report first of all whether a complete and effectual Indemnity can be given by Parliament for all omissions to the present time; and, in the next place, whether the time has not arrived to repeal so many of the said requirements as are useless and no longer required for the present times,"—(*Mr. Hadfield,*) —instead thereof 663

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*
Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *Monday* next.

Tests Abolition (Oxford) Bill [Bill 18]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Sir William Heathcote*) 666

Tests Abolition (Oxford) Bill—*continued.*

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided;* Ayes 150, Noes 140; Majority 10.

List of the Ayes and Noes 668

Main Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."

After short debate, Main Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 170, Noes 170.

List of the Ayes and Noes 675

Whereupon, the numbers being equal, Mr. Speaker stated that after the votes that had been taken this evening, the House would not be surprised if he desired to afford them another opportunity of deciding the Question themselves; this they would be able to do on the Question, "That this Bill do pass;" on the present stage he declared himself with the Ayes.

Qustion put, "That this Bill do pass:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 171, Noes 173; Majority 2.

List of the Ayes and Noes 678

Street Music (Metropolis) Bill [Bill 90]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 680

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Repeal of recited Provisions, and Substitution of amended Provision) ... 680

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again:"—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 52, Noes 138; Majority 86.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Clause, to add the words "provided he shall have been informed by the person making such charge of the circumstances under which he is required to depart."—(*Mr. Ayrton*) 681

After short debate, Question put, "That those words be there added:"—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 67, Noes 98; Majority 31.

After short debate, Amendment *agreed to.*

Moved at the end of the Clause to add,

"Provided that the person making a charge for an offence against this Act, shall accompany the constable who shall take into custody any person offending as aforesaid, to the nearest police station-house, and there sign the charge-sheet kept for such purposes."—(*Sir George Grey.*)

Amendment *agreed to:*—Clause *agreed to.*

Moved to insert New Clause,

"Whenever any person charged with an offence under this Act, shall be brought to any station-house during the time when the police court shall be shut, it shall be lawful for the constable in charge of the station-house to require the person making the charge to enter into a recognizance conditional as is provided by the Act passed in the 2 & 3 *Vict.* c. 47, s. 72; and, upon the refusal of such person to do so, it shall be lawful for such constable to discharge from custody the person so charged."—(*Sir George Grey.*)

Clause *added* to the Bill.

Moved to add, at end of the Clause,

"And upon such recognizance being entered into, it shall be lawful for the said constable to discharge from custody the person so charged, on his entering into a recognizance to appear to answer the same."—(*Mr. Ayrton.*)

Amendment *withdrawn.*

New Clause moved—

"Any person who shall sound or play any musical instrument, or shall sing in any thoroughfare near any premises licensed for the sale of beer, wine, or spirits, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding 40*s.*, and it shall be lawful for any constable belonging to the metropolitan police force, to apprehend any such person if he shall continue so playing or singing, after being warned to desist therefrom, in view of such constable."—(*Mr. Ayrton*) 682

After short debate, Clause *negatived.*

Proviso—

"That nothing in this Act contained shall extend or apply to a dramatic representation usually performed in the streets of the metropolis, and generally known as the show of Punch and Judy, nor to any person representing any of the characters in such show, nor to any music performed or played in connection with such show, in the same manner as has been usual before the passing of this Act; but such dramatic representation, show, and music may continue to be played as heretofore, before the passing of this Act."—(*Mr. Thomson Hankey*) 683

STREET MUSIC (METROPOLIS) BILL—*continued.*

After short debate, Clause (This Act not to extend to Punch and Judy)—(*Mr. Hankey,*) —*brought up,* and read 1°. 684

Question put, "That the Clause be now read a second time:"—The Committee *divided,* Ayes 34, Noes 65; Majority 31.

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered on *Tuesday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 186.]

Courts of Justice Money Bill

On Motion of *Mr. Attorney General,* Bill to supply means towards defraying the expenses of providing Courts of Justice, and of the various Offices belonging thereto; and for other purposes, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, and Mr. Peel:—Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 188.]

Courts of Justice Site Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Attorney General,* Bill to enable the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Works and Public Buildings to acquire a Site for the erection of Courts of Justice, and of the various Offices belonging thereto, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Attorney General and Mr. Peel:—Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 189.]

Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension Bill—

On Motion of *Sir Edward Dering,* Bill to extend the provisions of "The Criminal Justice Act, 1855," to the Liberties of the Cinque Ports and to other places not comprised within any Petty Sessional Division, *ordered** to be brought in by Sir Edward Dering and Sir Brooke Bridges:—Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 190.]

Militia Ballot Suspension Bill

On Motion of *The Marquess of Hartington,* Bill to suspend the making of Lists and the Ballots for the Militia of the United Kingdom, *ordered** to be brought in by The Marquess of Hartington and Mr. Baring:—Bill *presented,* and read 1°.*

Militia Pay and Clothing Bill

Bill to defray the Charge of the Pay, Clothing, and contingent and other Expenses of the Disembodied Militia in Great Britain and Ireland; to grant Allowances in certain cases to Subaltern Officers, Adjutants, Paymasters, Quartermasters, Surgeons, Assistant Surgeons, and Surgeons Mates of the Militia; and to authorize the Employment of the Non-commissioned Officers, *presented,* and read 1°.*

House adjourned at half after Two o'clock.

LORDS, MONDAY, JULY 4.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Factory Acts Extension* (No. 176); Inclosure (No. 2)* (No. 177); Railways (Ireland) Acts Amendment* (No. 178).
Second Reading — London (City) Tithes; Greek Loan* (No. 171).
Committee — Government Annuities, &c.* (No. 145); Clerks of the Peace Removal* (No. 126); Superannuation (Union Officers)* (No. 154); Pilotage Order Confirmation* (No. 150).
Report—Government Annuities, &c.* (No. 145); Superannuation (Union Officers)* (No. 154).
Third Reading—Valuation of Rateable Property (Ireland)* (No. 147); Cathedral Minor Corporations* (No. 166), and *passed.*

ALLEGED REVIVAL OF THE HOLY ALLIANCE — Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Reply, Earl Russell 684

NAVY—ARMOUR-PLATED VESSELS—THE "KEARSARGE" AND THE "ALABAMA"—Observations, The Earl of Hardwicke; Reply, The Duke of Somerset .. 685

London (City) Tithes Bill—

Debate on Motion for Second Reading *resumed.*

After further short debate,

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed.*

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—Observations, The Earl of Clancarty, 686; Reply, Earl Granville 703

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock.

COMMONS, MONDAY, JULY 4.

Page

MINUTES.] — NEW WRIT ISSUED — For Gloucester County (Eastern Division) *in the room of* Sir Christopher William Codrington, baronet, deceased.

SELECT COMMITTEE — *Report* — Expiring Laws No. 459).

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee — Resolutions* [July 1] *reported* *.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolutions in Committee* — Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans) *; Turnpike Acts Continuance *.

Second Reading — Public Schools [Bill 23] (*Lords*); Transfer Act Amendment * [Bill 183].

Select Committee — On Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands) * [Bill 152].

Committee — Cranbourne Street * [Bill 154], *re-committed*—R.P.; India Office* [Bill 166]; Indemnity * [Bill 97]; Judgments, &c., Law Amendment *re-committed* * [Bill 160]; Local Government Act (1858) Amendment* [Bill 155].

Report — India Office * [Bill 166]; Indemnity * [Bill 97]; Judgments, &c., Law Amendment *re-committed* * [Bill 160]; Local Government Act (1853) Amendment * [Bill 155].

Considered as amended—Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties) [Bill 159]; Administration of Trusts (Scotland)* [Bill 179]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) * [Bill 100].

INDIA—LUCKNOW BOOTY—Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Sir Charles Wood 705

INDIA—DELHI PRIZE MONEY—Question, Captain Clive; Answer, Sir Charles Wood 705

RELATIONS WITH BRAZIL—Question, Sir Minto Farquhar; Answer, Mr. Layard 706

INDIA—THE GAOL OF CALCUTTA—Question, Mr. Leslie; Answer, Sir Charles Wood 706

DENMARK AND GERMANY—THE CONFERENCE—Question, Sir Lawrence Palk; Answer, Sir George Grey 707

THAMES EMBANKMENT AND METROPOLIS IMPROVEMENT (LOANS)—Resolutions [July 1] *reported.* 708

Resolutions *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* * to be brought in by Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer and Mr. Peel

THE ALLEGED HOLY ALLIANCE—

Moved, "That the Orders of the Day be postponed till after the notice of Motion relative to Denmark and Germany."—(*Viscount Palmerston*) .. 708

Motion *agreed to.*

DENMARK AND GERMANY—VOTE OF CENSURE—RESOLUTION (MR. DISRAELI)—

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to thank Her Majesty for directing the Correspondence on Denmark and Germany, and the Protocols of the Conference recently held in London, to be laid before Parliament:

"To assure Her Majesty, that we have heard with deep concern, that the sittings of that Conference have been brought to a close without accomplishing the important purposes for which it was convened:

"To express to Her Majesty our great regret that, while the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government has failed to maintain their avowed policy of upholding the integrity and independence of Denmark, it has lowered the just influence of this Country in the councils of Europe, and thereby diminished the securities of peace."—(*Mr. Disraeli*) 709

After long debate, Amendment proposed,

To leave out the second paragraph of the proposed Question, in order to insert the words "To submit to Her Majesty the opinion of this House, that the independence of Denmark and the possessions of that Kingdom, on the terms proposed by the Representatives of the Neutral Powers in the recent Conference, ought to be guaranteed,"—(*Mr. Newdegate,*) —instead thereof 777

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After further debate, Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties) Bill [Bill 159]—

Bill, as amended, *considered* 817

After short debate, to be read 3° on *Monday* next.

Public Schools Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 23]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir George Grey*) .. 818

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *To-morrow*.

Turnpike Acts Continuance.

On Motion of *Mr. Baring*, Bill to continue certain Turnpike Acts in Great Britain, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Baring and Sir George Grey.

House adjourned at half after One o'clock.

LORDS, TUESDAY, JULY 5.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading* — Salmon Fishing (Scotland) Acts Amendment (No. 2) * (No. 167); Local Government Supplemental * (No. 174).
Committee — Facilities for Divine Service in Collegiate Schools (No. 183); Public and Refreshment Houses (Metropolis, &c.) (No. 184); Greek Loan * (No. 171).
Report—Clerks of the Peace Removal * (No. 179); Greek Loan * (No. 171); Pilotage Order Confirmation * (No. 180).
Third Reading—Government Annuities, &c.* (No. 145); Superannuation (Union Officers)* (No. 154).
Withdrawn—Bribery * (No. 155).

ALLEGED REVIVAL OF "THE HOLY ALLIANCE"—Question and Notice of Motion.—(*Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe*) 819

DENMARK AND GERMANY—ALLEGED PRUSSIAN ATROCITIES—Question, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Answer, Earl Russell 820

BRIBERY BILL—Question, Lord Cranworth; Answer, Lord Brougham .. 821

Facilities for Divine Service in Collegiate Schools Bill (No. 183)—

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

New Clause, securing to the parish the advantage of all contributions to the offertory, whether held in the parish church or in the school chapels.—(*The Earl of Shaftesbury*) 821

After short discussion, Clause *negatived*.

Amendment made: the Report thereof to be received on *Thursday* next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 183.)

Public and Refreshment Houses (Metropolis) Bill (No. 184)—

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 2, *Moved*, "The omission of the words which give power to Town Councils to adopt the provisions of the Bill if they think fit."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

Moved, to omit from ("and") to the end of the Clause.

After short debate, Question put, Whether the words proposed to be omitted shall stand part of the Clause?—Their Lordships *divided*; Contents 31, Not-Contents 24; Majority 7.

Amendments made; the Report thereof to be received on *Monday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 184.)

List of Contents and Not-Contents 822

Local Government Supplemental (No. 2) Bill (No. 174.)—

Moved, as regards the Local Government Supplemental (No. 2) Bill, That the Resolution of the House of the 21st April last, "That no Bill confirming any Provisional Order of the Board of Health, or authorizing any Inclosure of Lands under special Report of the Inclosure Commissioners for England and Wales, or for confirming any Scheme of the Charity Commissioners for England and Wales, shall be read a Second Time after Tuesday, the 30th Day of June next," be suspended, and that, on the Ground of special Reasons, the said Local Government Supplementa (No. 2) Bill be read a Second Time; *agreed to*.—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

Bill read 2ª * (according to Order), and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

House adjourned at a quarter before Seven o'clock.

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JULY 5.

Page

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered* — Poisoned Grain, &c., Prohibition Act (1863) Amendment *; Expiring Laws Continuance *.

First Reading— Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans)* [Bill 191]; Poisoned Grain, &c., Prohibition Act (1863) Amendment* [Bill 192]; Expiring Laws Continuance* [Bill 193]; Turnpike Acts Continuance* [Bill 194].

Second Reading—Game (Ireland) [Bill 116]; Improvement of Land Act (1864)* [Bill 187] (*Lords*); Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* [Bill 185]; Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)* [Bill 184].

Committee — India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment* [Bill 183]; Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers)* [Bill 62].

Report—India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment* [Bill 183]; Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers)* [Bill 62].

Considered as amended—Street Music Metropolis* [Bill 186]; Indemnity* [Bill 97].

Third Reading—India Office* [Bill 166]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland)* [Bill 100]; Divorce and Matrimonial Causes (Amendment)* [Bill 162] (*Lords*); Local Government Act (1858) Amendment* [Bill 155], and *passed*.

IRELAND—THE REGIUM DONUM—Question, Sir Hervey Bruce; Answer, Mr. Peel 824

THE POLICE FORCE AND MR. ARNOLD—Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Sir George Grey 824

ARMAMENT OF THE NAVY—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 825

THE ALLEGED MASSACRE OF SWEDES — Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. Layard 826

ORDERS OF THE DAY—

Ordered, "That the first seven Orders of the Day be postponed till after the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate relative to Denmark and Germany."

DENMARK AND GERMANY—VOTE OF CENSURE—RESOLUTION (MR. DISRAELI)—*Adjourned Debate.* [*Second Night.*]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [4th July] 826

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After long debate, Debate *further adjourned* till *Thursday* next.

Poisoned Grain, &c., Prohibition Act (1863) Amendment Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Berkeley*, Bill to alter and amend the "Poisoned Grain, &c., Prohibition Act, 1863," *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Berkeley, Mr. Wykeham Martin, and Lord Fermoy:—Bill *presented*, and read 1°*. [Bill 192.]

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Baring*, Bill for continuing various Expiring Acts, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Baring and Mr. Peel:—Bill *presented*, and read 1°*. [Bill 193.

House adjourned at One o'clock.

LORDS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 6.

Their Lordships met; and having gone through the business on the paper, without Debate,

House adjourned at half past Two o'clock.

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 6.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Committee*—Trespass (Ireland) [Bill 13]; Punishment of Rape [Bill 157], *negatived;* Insolvent Debtors [Bill 20]—R.P.

Report—Trespass (Ireland) [Bill 13].

Considered as amended — Judgments Law Amendment* [Bill 160].

Withdrawn — Municipal Corporations (Ireland)* [Bill 139]; Fisheries (Freshwater)* [Bill 130].

Trespass (Ireland) Bill [Bill 13]—[Progress 27th April.]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Question again proposed.

Clause 1 (Repeal of 10th Section of 27 *Geo.* III.) 931

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Bagwell*) 932

After short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 29, Noes 73; Majority 44.

Amendment proposed, in page 1, line 11, after the words "sixty-four," to insert the words "whenever any proceeding shall be instituted against any person to recover the penalty imposed by."—(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*) 936

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

After short debate, Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Roebuck.*)

The Committee *divided;* Ayes 43, Noes 60; Majority 17.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Penalty for trespassing in pursuit of Game, or of Woodcocks, Snipes, &c.) *struck out* 937

Clause 3 (Interpretation of the word "Game").

Amendment proposed, in line 23, to leave out the word "rabbits."—(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*) 937

Question, "That the word 'rabbits' stand part of the Clause," put, and *negatived.*

Motion made, and Question put, "That the word 'woodcocks' be added."—(*Mr. William Ormsby Gore.*)

After short debate, the Committee *divided;* Ayes 81, Noes 28; Majority 53.

Amendment proposed, at the end of the Clause, to add the words "wild ducks."—(*Mr. William Ormsby Gore*) 938

After short debate, Question put, "That those words be there added:"—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 64, Noes 53; Majority 11.

Amendment proposed to insert the word "deer."—(*Mr. William Ormsby Gore*) ... 939

After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Act to extend to Ireland only) also *agreed to* 939

Moved the following Clause in lieu of Clause 2:—

"Where the landlord or lessor of any land has reserved to himself the right to the game on such land, or where the occupier of any land shall hold the same as tenant from year to year, without a right to the game having been duly given to him by some writing, then such landlord or lessor for the purpose of prosecuting all persons for trespassing in pursuit of game on such land without his consent, shall be deemed the legal occupier of the said land; and any person who shall enter or be upon said land in search of or in pursuit of game without the consent of such landlord or lessor, shall be deemed a trespasser, and shall on conviction thereof before one or more justices of the peace, sitting in petty sessions, forfeit and pay such sum not exceeding 40*s.*, together with the costs, as the said justice or justices shall think fit; and such penalty and costs shall be recovered and levied in the same mode, and with the same power of appeal, as are provided for the recovering and levying of any penalties under the Petty Sessions Act of the 14 & 15 *Vict.* c. 93, and the Petty Sessions Act of the 21 & 22 *Vict.* c. 100, and as if the provisions in said acts relating to the recovery of penalties were herein expressly repeated."—(*Mr. William Ormsby Gore*) 939

Clause (Definitions of "legal occupier" and "trespasser.")—Penalties for such "trespass,"—(*Mr. William Ormsby Gore,*)—*brought up,* and read 1°; 2°.

After short debate, Motion made, and Question put, "That the Clause be added to the Bill:"—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 103, Noes 27; Majority 76.

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered on *Friday.* [Bill 195]

Punishment of Rape Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 157]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair."—(*Sir Stafford Northcote*) 941

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen,*)—instead thereof.

After further debate, Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 78, Noes 84; Majority 6:—Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *put off* for three months.

[*July* 6.] Page

Insolvent Debtors Bill [Bill 20]—
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Paull*) 948
After short debate, Bill *considered* in Committee:—Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow*.

House adjourned at a quarter before Six o'clock.

LORDS, THURSDAY, JULY 7.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland)* (No. 189); Local Government Act (1858) Amendment* (No. 190); India Office* (No. 191).

Second Reading—Life Annuities and Life Assurances* (No. 116); Factory Acts Extension* (No. 176); Railway Construction Facilities (No. 160), and Railway Companies Powers* (No. 121), and *referred* to same Select Committee; Lunacy (Scotland)* (No. 172); Burials Registration* (No. 144).

Committee—Civil Bill Courts (Ireland)* (No. 67); Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment* (No. 167).

Report—Facilities for Divine Service in Collegiate Schools* (No. 183).

Select Committee—Local Government Supplemental (No. 2)* (No. 174), *referred.*

Third Reading — Clerks of the Peace Removal* (No. 179); Greek Loan* (No. 171); Pilotage Order Confirmation* (No. 180).

Railway Construction Facilities Bill (No. 160)—
"*Moved*, That the Bill be now read 2ª" 949
Amendment *moved*, to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Six Months.")—(*The Duke of Buckingham*) 949
After short debate, Amendment (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn*:—Then the original Motion was *agreed to*.
Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *referred* to a Select Committee.
And on *Friday* the 8th inst., Committee *nominated* as follows:—
D. Devonshire, D. Buckingham and Chandos, E. Devon, E. Romney, E. Grey, E. Stradbroke, V. Hutchinson, L. Camoys, L. Wodehouse, L. Redesdale, L. Stanley of Alderley, L. Belper, L. Lyveden, L. Taunton.

Railway Companies Powers Bill (No. 121)—
Bill read 2ª (according to Order); and referred to the same Select Committee.

House adjourned at a quarter past Eight o'clock.

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JULY 7.

MINUTES] — Public Bills — *Ordered* — Turnpike Trusts Arrangements*; Ionian Islands Commissions Act Repeal, &c.*

First Reading—Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* [Bill 196]; Ionian Islands Commissions Act Repeal, &c.* [Bill 197].

Second Reading — Courts of Justice Site* [Bill 189], and *committed* to a Select Committee; Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* [Bill 194]; Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c.* [Bill 192].

Committee—Cranbourne Street* [Bill 154]; Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)* [Bill 184], Order *discharged*, Bill *committed* to a Select Committee (*List of Committee*); Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment (Deficiency of Dues)* [Bill 185]; Public Schools* [Bill 168] (*Lords*); Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland)* [Bill 174] (*Lords*).

Report — Cranbourne Street* [Bill 154]; Public Schools* [Bill 168] (*Lords*); Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland)* [Bill 174] (*Lords*).

Considered as amended — Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers)* [Bill 62].

Third Reading — Indemnity* [Bill 97]; India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment* [Bill 183]; Judgments, &c. Law Amendment* [Bill 160]; Street Music (Metropolis) [Bill 186], and *passed*.

Turnpike Gates—Question, Mr. Sutton Western; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring 951
The Royal Horticultural Society—Question, Sir William Gallwey; Answer Mr. Cowper 952
Denmark and Germany—Vote of Censure—Resolution (Mr. Disraeli) .. 952
Adjourned Debate. [*Third Night.*]
Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [4th July].
Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question.
After long debate, Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow*.

Street Music Bill [Bill 186]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time" 1073

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Sir William Jolliffe*) 1074

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

After short debate, the House *divided;* Ayes 49, Noes 18; Majority 31.

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read 3° and *passed.*

Courts of Justice Site Bill [Bill 189]—

Order for Second Reading read:—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Lygon.*)

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Bill read 2°,* and *committed* to a Select Committee.

Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Bill 184]—

Order for Committee read, and *discharged.**

Bill *committed* to a Select Committee of Five Members, to be nominated by the Committee of Selection.

Ordered,

That the Petition of the Trinity House of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, which was presented upon Tuesday last, against the Bill, be referred to the Committee; and that the Petitioners be heard by their Counsel or Agents upon their Petition, if they think fit, and counsel heard in favour of the Bill, against the said Petition.—(*Mr. Milner Gibson.*)

Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers) [Bill 62]—

Bill, as amended, *considered.**

New Clause—Motion,

"Unless at a general meeting of the Company it shall be otherwise resolved, the directors of such Company shall cause a list of the shareholders who are entitled to vote, with their registered addresses, to be printed annually or half-yearly as the directors may determine, distinguishing shareholders holding shares or stock to the amount of a director's qualification by an asterisk, and such list shall be sold to any shareholder on application to the Company at a reasonable cost price, not exceeding five shillings."—(*Mr. Vance.*)

Clause *brought up*, and read 1°; 2°.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Clause be added to the Bill:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 32, Noes 53; Majority 21:—Bill to be read 3° *this day*, and to be *printed.* [Bill 195.]

Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment (Deficiency of Dues) Bill [Bill 185]—

Bill *considered* in Committee.*

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient that any deficiency in the Dues of the Harbour of Port Erin in the Isle of Man, applicable to meet the Claims of the Public Works Loan Commissioners, should be charged on the Surplus Customs Revenue of that Island.

Resolutions to be reported *this day.*

Turnpike Trusts Arrangements Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Baring*, Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made under an Act of the fifteenth year of Her present Majesty, to facilitate arrangements for the relief of Turnpike Trusts, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Baring and Sir George Grey:—Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 196.]

Ionian Islands Commissioners Act Repeal Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Chichester Fortescue*, Bill to repeal an Act to enable the subjects of the Ionian States to hold Military and Naval Commissions under the Crown; to amend the Ionian Marriages Act; and for other purposes, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Chichester Fortescue and Mr. Secretary Cardwell:—Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 197.]

House adjourned at Two o'clock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LORDS, FRIDAY, JULY 8.

Page

MINUTES.]—*Sat First in Parliament*—The Marquess of Hastings (after the Death of his Father).
PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Defence Act Amendment [H.L.]* (No. 193); Judgments, &c. Law Amendment* (No. 194); India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment* (No. 195); Street Music (Metropolis)* (No. 196); Indemnity* (No. 197).
Second Reading—Accidents Compensation Act Amendment* (No. 158).
Select Committee—On Railways Construction Facilities* (No. 160); Railway Companies Powers* (No. 121).
Consideration—Settled Estates Act Amendment* (No. 163) (Commons' Amendments).
Third Reading—Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment* (No. 167), and *passed.*

DENMARK AND GERMANY—THE ALLEGED CRUELTY OF PRUSSIAN SOLDIERS—Observations, Earl Russell 1076

DENMARK AND GERMANY—VOTE OF CENSURE—RESOLUTION (THE EARL OF MALMESBURY)—

Moved,

"That this House has heard with deep concern that the sittings of the Conference recently held in London have been brought to a close without accomplishing the important purposes for which it was convened."

"That it is the opinion of this House, that while the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government has failed to maintain their avowed policy of upholding the integrity and independence of Denmark, it has lowered the just influence of this country in the councils of Europe, and thereby diminished the securities for peace."—(*The Earl of Malmesbury*) 1076

After long debate, Amendment *moved,*

To omit all the Words after the Word ("convened") for the Purpose of inserting the following Words: ("That this House regrets that Denmark was allowed to expect from the English Government material Aid in support of the Objects of the Treaty of May, 1852.")—(*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) 1112

After further debate, on Question, That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Motion? their Lordships *divided;* Contents (Present) 119, (Proxies) 58; Total 177.
Not-Contents (Present) 123, (Proxies) 45; Total 168: Majority 9.
Resolved in the *Affirmative.*
Then the said original Motion *agreed to.*

List of the Contents and Not-Contents 1190

Protest against The Earl of Malmesbury's Resolutions relating to Denmark .. 1193

House adjourned at a quarter past Two o'clock, A.M.

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JULY 8.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report*—On Schools of Art (No. 466).
SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—Committee R.P.
PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolutions in Committee*—Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment [Deficiency of Dues], *reported.**
Second Reading—Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans)* [Bill 191].
Considered as amended—Public Schools* [Bill 168] (*Lords*).

BRITISH MUSEUM—Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis; Answer, Mr. Walpole .. 1194

THE NEW ZEALAND WAR—Question, Sir Frederic Smith; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1195

CHINA—MAJOR GORDON'S RETIREMENT—Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Mr. Layard 1195

DENMARK AND GERMANY—SWEDES AND DANES—Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. Layard 1196

VOTE OF CENSURE—THE DEBATE OF MONDAY EVENING—LANGUAGE IN DEBATE—Explanations of The Chancellor of the Exchequer, General Peel, and Mr. Layard 1196

DENMARK AND GERMANY—VOTE OF CENSURE—RESOLUTION (Mr. DISRAELI).

Adjourned Debate. [*Fourth Night.*]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [4th July] 1198

And which Amendment was, to leave out the second paragraph of the proposed Question." —(*Mr. Newdegate.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After long debate, Amendment *withdrawn.*

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Whereupon Amendment proposed,

To leave out the last paragraph of the proposed Question, in order to add the words "To express the satisfaction with which we have learnt that, at this conjuncture, Her Majesty has been advised to abstain from armed interference in the War now going on between Denmark and the German Powers,"—(*Mr. Kinglake,*)—instead thereof ... 1300

Question put, That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:—The House *divided;* Ayes 295, Noes 313; Majority 18:—Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Resolved,

That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, to thank Her Majesty for directing the Correspondence on Denmark and Germany, and the Protocols of the Conference recently held in London, to be laid before Parliament:

To assure Her Majesty, that we have heard with deep concern, that the sittings of that Conference have been brought to a close without accomplishing the important purposes for which it was convened:

To express the satisfaction with which we have learnt that, at this conjuncture, Her Majesty has been advised to abstain from armed interference in the War now going on between Denmark and the German Powers.

To be presented by Privy Councillors.

List of Contents and Not-Contents 1301

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

LORDS, MONDAY, JULY 11.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE — On Library of the House (*List of the Committee*).

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—India Office* (No. 191); Thames Conservancy* (No. 173).

Committee—Life Annuities and Life Assurances* (No. 116); Lunacy (Scotland)* (No. 172).

Report — Public and Refreshment Houses (No. 184); Life Annuities and Life Assurances* (No. 116); Lunacy (Scotland)* (No. 172).

Third Reading—Summary Procedure (Scotland)* (No. 165), and *passed.*

LIBRARY OF THE HOUSE—

Select Committee to consider of certain Matters relative to the Library of this House and to the Papers and Documents delivered for their Lordships House, *appointed:* The Lords following were named of the Committee; the Committee to meet on *Friday* next, at Three o'clock:—

Committee *nominated*—

L. Abp. Canterbury, Ld. Chancellor, Ld. President, Ld. Privy Seal, D. Richmond, M. Lansdowne, M. Bath, E. Stanhope, E. Malmesbury, E. Russell, V. Eversley, L. Willoughby de Eresby, L. Colville of Culross, L. Ponsonby, L. Redesdale, L. Colchester, L. Somerhill, L. Brougham and Vaux, L. Monteagle of Brandon, L. Cranworth, L. St. Leonards, L. Wensleydale, L. Chelmsford, L. Kingsdown.

BURIAL SERVICE—*Moved,*

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying for the Appointment of a Commission to consider what steps should be taken to obviate the evils complained of as arising from the present compulsory and indiscriminate Use of the Burial Service of the Church of England."—(*Lord Ebury*) 1306

After short debate, Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

Public and Refreshment Houses Bill (No. 184)—

Formerly entitled

Public and Refreshment Houses (Metropolis, &c.) Bill

Amendments *reported* (according to Order) 1312

Moved to omit the words ("and Districts of Improvement Commissioners.")—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

After short debate, Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill?"—Their Lordships *divided;* Contents 34, Not-Contents 26; Majority 8.

List of Contents and Not-Contents 1313

Clause 9 (Adoption of Act by Corporate Boroughs).

After short debate, Question, That Clause be omitted?—their Lordships *divided;* Contents 31, Not-Contents 31.

The numbers being equal, it was (according to ancient rule) *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

List of Contents and Not-Contents 1315

After short debate, Bill to be read 3ª on *Thursday* next.

House adjourned at a quarter past Seven o'clock.

COMMONS, MONDAY, JULY 11.

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Resolutions in Committee*—Sheriff in Chancery (Scotland)* [Salary].

Second Reading—Ionian Islands States Acts of Parliament Repeal, &c.* [Bill 197]; Militia Pay*; Expiring Laws Continuance* [Bill 193]; Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension [Bill 181]; Militia Ballots Suspension*; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* [Bill 196]; Election Petitions Act (1848) Amendment* [Bill 182]; Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension* [Bill 190].

Committee—Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* [Bill 185]; Naval and Victualling Stores (*re-committed*)* [Bill 178] (*Lords*); Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* [Bill 164]—R.P.; Thames Embankment and Improvement (Loans)* [Bill 191]; Improvement of Land Act (1864)* [Bill 187] (*Lords*)—R.P.; Mortgage Debentures* [Bill 169] (*Lords*), *Debate adjourned;* Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c.* [Bill 192].

Report—Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* [Bill 185]; Naval and Victualling Stores (*re-committed*)* [Bill 178]; Thames Embankment and Improvement (Loans)* [Bill 191]; Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. (*re-committed*)* [Bill 192].

Considered as amended—Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland)* [Bill 174] (*Lords*); Trespass (Ireland)* [Bill 195].

Third Reading — Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties)* [Bill 159]; Public Schools* [Bill 168] (*Lords*); Administration of Trusts (Scotland)* [Bill 179], and *passed;* Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers) [Bill 198] (*count out*).

Withdrawn — Court of Chancery (Ireland)* [Bill 78]; Juries in Criminal Cases* [Bill 120].

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read:—Exchequer Bonds, Account [presented 5th July] *referred:*—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

THE BRADFORD RESERVOIRS—Motion for Papers (*Mr. Ferrand*) .. 1318

DENMARK AND GERMANY—HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS—

Lord Proby [The Comptroller of the Household] *reported* Her Majesty's Answer to Address [8th July] as follows:—

I have received your Address thanking Me for directing the Correspondence on Denmark and Germany, and the Protocols of the Conference recently held in London, to be laid before Parliament:

I share your deep concern that the sittings of that Conference have been brought to a close without accomplishing the important purposes for which it was convened:

I am happy to be assured of your satisfaction with the course which I have felt it My Duty to take in abstaining at this conjuncture from armed interference in the War now going on between Denmark and the German Powers.

GAME LAW PROSECUTIONS—Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir George Grey 1324

SUPPLY—*continued.*

DENMARK AND GERMANY—THE WAR IN DENMARK—Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Speaker 1328

ARMY—FORAGE MONEY OF CAVALRY OFFICERS—Observations, Mr. Whiteside; Reply, The Marquess of Hartington 1329

THE SERVICES OF SIR FRANCIS BOND HEAD— Resolution, Sir William Jolliffe 1331

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE (IRELAND) — Observations, Captain Archdall; Reply, Sir Robert Peel 1340

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY *considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £236,770, to complete the sum for Public Education, Ireland .. 1340
After long debate, Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) £805, Commissioners of Education, Ireland (Office Expenses).

(3.) £3,206, to complete the sum for the University of London .. 1352
After short debate, Vote *agreed to.*

(4.) £13,704, to complete the sum for Universities, &c., in Scotland.

(5.) £2,462, for Queen's University in Ireland.

(6.) £3,400, to complete the sum for the Queen's Colleges in Ireland .. 1353
After short debate, Vote *agreed to.*

(7.) £500, Royal Irish Academy.

(8.) £600, National Gallery of Ireland 1355
After short debate, Vote *agreed to.*

(9.) £1,500, to complete the sum for the Belfast Theological Professors, &c.

(10.) £69,127, to complete the sum for the British Museum.. .. 1356
After short debate, Vote *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow:* — Committee to sit again on *Wednesday.*

Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension Bill [Bill 181]—

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. H. A. Bruce*) 1362

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. William Edward Forster*) 1363

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."
After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 65, Noes 22; Majority 43.

Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *Thursday.*

Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers) Bill [Bill 198]—

Order for Second Reading read.
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months." —(*Mr. Thompson.*)*

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at Two o'clock.

LORDS, TUESDAY, JULY 12.

Page

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties)* (No. 198); Administration of Trusts (Scotland)* (No. 199).
Second Reading—Indemnity* (No. 197); Street Music (Metropolis) (No. 196); India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment* (No. 195); Defence Act Amendment [H.L.]* (No. 193).
Committee—India Office* (No. 191).
Report—Civil Bill Courts (Ireland)* (No. 200); India Office* (No. 191).
Third Reading—Facilities for Divine Service in Collegiate Schools [H.L.] (No. 183); Life Annuities and Life Assurances* (No. 116); Lunacy (Scotland)* (No. 172).

Metropolitan Railway Schemes—The Sessional Order of the 21st of April last *dispensed with:* Then Standing Order No. 179, Sec. 4, *considered* (according to Order), and *dispensed with* in respect to any Metropolitan Railway Bill which has been or may be brought from the House of Commons during the present Session.—(*The Chairman of Committees.*)*

Massacre of Swedes at Duppel — Question, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Answer, Earl Russell 1366

Street Music (Metropolis) Bill (No. 196)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Malmesbury*) .. 1367
After short debate, Bill read 2ª, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Friday* next.

Facilities for Divine Service in Collegiate Schools Bill (No. 183)—
Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*The Bishop of Oxford*) .. 1368
After short debate, Question *Resolved* in the *Affirmative:*—Bill read 3ª accordingly, and *passed,* and sent to the Commons.

Memorial of Sir Francis Bond Head—Observations, The Earl of Hardwicke, and other noble Lords; Reply, Earl Granville 1370

House adjourned at half past Six o'clock.

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JULY 12.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—*Report*—Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (House of Commons) (Second Report) (No. 480).
Public Bills—*Committee*—Highways Act Amendment (*re-committed*) [Bill 177].
Report—Highways Act Amendment (*re-committed*) [Bill 177]; Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* [Bill 152], and *re-committed.*

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

Highways Act Amendment Bill [Bill 177]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 1372

(In the Committee.)

Motion, "That the Preamble be postponed."
Clauses 1 to 23 were *agreed to,* with numerous verbal Amendments.
Clause 24 (Penalty as to Cattle found straying on Highways) 1373
Amendment proposed, in page 8, line 34, to leave out the words "without a keeper."—(*Mr. Henry Fenwick.*)
After short debate, Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause:"—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 38, Noes 42: Majority 4.
Proviso *agreed to:*—Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*
Clauses 25 to 31 *agreed to,* with Amendments.
Clause 32 (Mode of defraying Expenses of the Highway Board) 1374
After short debate, Clause *agreed to.*
Clauses 33 to 35 *agreed to.*
Clause 36 (Appeal against Rate) 1375
After short debate, Clause *agreed to.*
Clauses 37 to 44 *agreed to.*

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL—*continued.*

Clause 45 (Power of Highway Board to make Improvements and Borrow Money).
Amendment proposed,
In page 17, line 5, after the word "improvements," to insert the words "Provided always, That the consent of at least two-thirds in value of the ratepayers in vestry assembled of the highway parishes to be benefited by such improvements shall be given."—(*Mr. Liddell*) 1375
After short debate, Question put, "That those words be there inserted:"—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 17, Noes 88; Majority 71.
Amendment *agreed to.*
Amendment to omit the Clause.—(*Sir W. Jolliffe.*)
Amendment *negatived*:—Clause *agreed to.*
Remaining Clauses and Schedules were also *agreed to.*
After short debate, Clause *withdrawn*, on an understanding that it should be considered on the Report.

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

BRAZIL—SLAVE TRADE—Question, Mr. Hardcastle.
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Bright*) 1382
After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

COMMUNICATION WITH RAILWAY GUARDS—Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson 1388

NAVY—FLAG SHIP FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 1389

DESPATCHES FROM ST. PETERSBURG—Question, Mr. A. Seymour; Answer, Mr. Layard 1389

THE MURDER ON THE NORTH LONDON RAILWAY—Question, Mr. C. S. Butler; Answer, Sir George Grey 1389

NAVY—THE SQUADRON ON THE WEST COAST OF AFRICA—Question, Sir James Elphinstone; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 1390

OFFICE OF POSTMASTER GENERAL—*Moved,**
"That the practice of appointing a Peer and Privy Councillor exclusively to the office of Postmaster General is one which is not directed or required by law, and does not particularly conduce to the convenience of the distribution of Ministerial appointments, or to the efficiency of the Public Service."—(*Mr. Darby Griffith.*)

House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at a quarter after Seven o'clock.

LORDS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 13.

Their Lordships met; and having gone through the business on the paper, without debate,

House adjourned at half past Three o'clock.

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 13.

MINUTES.]—*Resolution in Committee*—Fortifications and Works—R.P.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered*—Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues*; Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex)*; Westminster Bridge Traffic*; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland)*; Supplemental Bank Notes, &c., Signatures*; Public Works (Manufacturing Districts).*

First Reading—Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues* [Bill 202]; Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex)* [Bill 203]; Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* [Bill 204]; Westminster Bridge Traffic* [Bill 205]; Bank Notes, &c., Signatures* [Bill 206]; Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland) Supplemental* [Bill 207].

Second Reading—Uniformity Act Amendment [Bill 134], *negatived;* Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal [Bill 161] (*Lords*).

Committee—Insolvent Debtors [Bill 20] (No Report); Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. (*re-committed*) [Bill 199]—R.P.; Expiring Laws Continuance* [Bill 193]; Militia Ballots Suspension*; Criminal Justice (1855) Extension* [Bill 190].

Report—Expiring Laws Continuance* [Bill 193]; Militia Ballots Suspension*; Criminal Justice (1855) Extension* [Bill 190], and *re-committed.*

Considered as amended—Highways Act Amendment* [Bill 177]; Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* [Bill 185].

MINUTES.]—*continued.*

Third Reading — Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland)* [Bill 174] (*Lords*); Trespass (Ireland)* [Bill 195], and *passed.*
Withdrawn — Superior Courts of Common Law (Ireland)* [Bill 86]; Court of Queen's Bench (Ireland)* [Bill 123]; Married Women's Acknowledgments* [Bill 122]; Poor Law Guardians Election* [Bill 153]; Petty Offences Law Amendment [Bill 121]; County Voters Registration* [Bill 112]; Jersey Court [Bill 48]; Election Petitions Act (1848) Amendment* [Bill 182].

Uniformity Act Amendment Bill [Bill 134]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. E. P. Bouverie*) 1391
Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Walpole*) 1399
Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."
After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 101, Noes 157; Majority 56:—Words *added.*
Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *put off* for three months.

Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal Bill (*Lords*) (No. 161)—

Order for Second Reading read.
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir William Heathcote*) 1408
Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire how far any privileges which may be conferred upon the Clergy of the Episcopal Church in Scotland would interfere with the Treaty of Union between England and Scotland, and into the expediency of removing at the same time from the Ministers of the Established Church of Scotland the disabilities imposed on them by the Act 13 & 14 *Charles* II. c. 4,"—(*Mr. Kinnaird,*) instead thereof 1418

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."
After debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*
Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read 2° and *committed* for *Friday.*

Insolvent Debtors Bill [Bill 20]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 1431

(In the Committee.)

After short debate,—[No Report.]

Petty Offences Law Amendment Bill [Bill 121]—

Order for Second Reading read.
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Whalley*) 1433
Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Solicitor General.*)
Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."
After short debate, Amendment, and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn:*—Bill *withdrawn.*

Jersey Court Bill [Bill 48]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [22nd June], "That Mr Speaker do now leave the Chair."
Question again proposed.
After short Debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn:*—Bill *withdrawn.*

Poisoned Flesh Prohibition Bill, &c. (*re-committed*) [Bill 199]—

Order for Committee read.
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair"

POISONED FLESH PROHIBITION BILL, &c.—*continued.*

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Lord Edwin Hill-Trevor,*)—instead thereof 1435

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 60, Noes 38; Majority 22.

Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *considered* in Committee.

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

FORTIFICATIONS AND WORKS—*Considered* in Committee 1437

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, towards providing a further sum for defraying the expenses of the construction of works for the defence of the Royal Dockyards and Arsenals, and of the Ports of Dover and Portland, and for the creation of a Central Arsenal, a sum not exceeding £650,000 be charged upon the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, and that the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorized and empowered to raise the said sum by Annuities, for a term not exceeding thirty years; and that such Annuities shall be charged upon and be payable out of the said Consolidated Fund."

After short debate, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues Bill—

On Motion of *Sir Hugh Cairns,* Bill for adjustment of Charges on the Revenues of the Archbishopric of Armagh, *ordered** to be brought in by Sir Hugh Cairns and Mr. Whiteside:—Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 202.]

Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex) Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Dodson,* Bill to confirm certain proceedings of the Justices for the county of Sussex, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Dodson, Colonel Barttelot, and Mr. Cobbett:—Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 203.]

Westminster Bridge Traffic Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Cowper,* Bill for the better regulation of the Traffic on Westminster Bridge, and for the prevention of obstructions thereon, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Cowper and Mr. Baring:—Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [205.]

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Peel,* Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863," *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Peel and Sir Robert Peel:—Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 207.]

Bank Notes, &c. Signature Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Peel,* Bill for impressing by machinery Signatures of Names on Bank Notes and certain Bills on the Bank of Ireland, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Peel and Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer:—Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 206.]

Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Villiers,* Bill to extend the powers of the Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) Act, 1863, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Villiers and Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer:—Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 204.]

And it being Six of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House till To-morrow, without putting the Question.

LORDS, THURSDAY, JULY 14.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Trespass (Ireland)* (No. 202).

Second Reading — Railways (Ireland) Acts Amendment * (No. 178); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland)* (No. 189).

Committee — Factory Acts Extension (No. 176); Indemnity * (No. 197); India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment * (No. 195); Defence Act Amendment * (No. 193).

Report—Factory Acts Extension (No. 176); Indemnity* (No. 197); India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment* (No. 195); Defence Act Amendment* (No. 193).

Third Reading — Public and Refreshment Houses (No. 184); Civil Bill Courts (Ireland)* (No. 200); India Office * (No. 191).

Royal Assents — Union Assessment Committee Act Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 39]; Coventry Free Grammar School [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 41]; Superannuation (Union Officers) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 42]; Government Annuities, &c. [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 43]; Divorce and Matrimonial Causes (Amendment) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 44]; Greek Loan [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 40]; Settled Estates Act Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 45]; Life Annuities and Life Assurances [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 46].

OFFENCES IN RAILWAY CARRIAGES—Question, Lord Brougham; Answer, Earl Granville 1439

Penal Servitude Acts Amendment Bill (No. 136)—

"Commons' Reasons for disagreeing to One of the Amendments made by the Lords, and Commons' Amendments to Lords' Amendment should be considered" (according to Order). 1440

Moved, "To insist on the Amendments to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*The Earl of Shaftesbury.*)

After short debate, on Question, Whether to insist? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 25, Not-Contents 62; Majority 37.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

Commons' Amendment to Lords' Amendments *agreed to.*

List of Contents and Not-Contents 1446

Public and Refreshment Houses Bill (No. 184)—

Bill read 3^a (according to Order) 1447

Clause 2 (Limits of Act.)

Moved, To leave out "such" and insert "within the limits of."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

On Question, That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 44, Not-Contents 33; Majority 11.

Resolved in the *Negative:*—Bill *passed,* and sent to the Commons.

List of Contents and Not-Contents 1447

Factory Acts Extension Bill (No. 176)—

Moved, "That the House be put into a Committee on the said Bill."—(*The Lord President*) 1448

After short debate, House in Committee:—Bill *reported,* without Amendment; and to be read 3^a *To-morrow.*

NEW GOVERNMENT OFFICES—Question, Lord Redesdale; Answer, Earl Granville 1450

House adjourned at a quarter past Seven o'clock.

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JULY 14.

MINUTES.]—NEW MEMBER SWORN—Sir Michael Edward Hicks Beach, Bart., *for* Gloucester County (Eastern Division).

SELECT COMMITTEE—Standing Orders Revision *appointed* (*List of the Committee*).

Report—Sewage (Metropolis) [No. 487].

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered in Committee.**

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolutions in Committee*—Improvement of Land Act (1864) [Stamps]*; —Fortifications and Works.

Ordered—Bank Post Bills (Ireland).*

First Reading—Facilities for Divine Service in Collegiate Schools* [Bill 208] (*Lords*); Clerks of the Peace Removal* [Bill 209] (*Lords*); Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment* [Bill 210] (*Lords*).

Second Reading—New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan) [Bill 150]; Bank Notes, &c., Signatures* [Bill 206]; Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex)* [Bill 203].

Committee—Bleaching and Dyeing Works Act Extension* [Bill 181]; Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* [Bill 194]; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* [Bill 196]; Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal* [Bill 197]; Militia Pay*; Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands) (*re-committed*)* [Bill 200]; Harwich Harbour Act Amendment* [Bill 171]; Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* [Bill 164]; Mortgage Debentures* [Bill 169] (*Lords*) (Debate *further adjourned*); Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* [Bill 176]; Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. (*re-committed*)* [Bill 199].

Report—Bleaching and Dyeing Works Act Extension* [Bill 181]; Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* [Bill 194]; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* [Bill 196]; Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal* [Bill 197]; Militia Pay*; Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* [Bill 200]; Harwich Harbour Act Amendment* [Bill 171]; Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* [Bill 164]; Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* [Bill 176]; Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. (*re-committed*)* [Bill 199].

Third Reading—Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans)* [Bill 191]; Highways Act Amendment* [Bill 177]; Expiring Laws Continuance* [Bill 193]; Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* [Bill 185]; Militia Ballots Suspension*; Naval and Victualling Stores* [Bill 178] (*Lords*).

Withdrawn—Courts of Justice Money* [Bill 188]; Gaols (*re-committed*)* [Bill 180].

[*July* 14.] Page

STANDING ORDERS REVISION—

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to revise the Standing Orders."—(*Colonel Wilson Patten*) 1453

After debate, Motion *agreed to.*

Select Committee *appointed*, "to revise the Standing Orders:"—Mr. Massey, Lord Stanley, Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie, and Mr. Milner Gibson, nominated Members of the said Committee

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Sotheron Estcourt be one other Member of the said Committee 1466

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Ingham, Mr. Edward Egerton, Mr. Scourfield, Mr. Hassard, Mr. Adair, Mr. Lowe, Colonel French, and Colonel Wilson Patten, nominated other Members of the said Committee:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Five to be the quorum.

Moved, That it be an Instruction to the Committee to consider whether—

"It is expedient that Refeces should be constituted under the authority of this House for the more speedy and economical decision of certain questions of fact commonly arising in the proceedings upon Private Bills."—(*Colonel Wilson Patten.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Ordered,

That it be an Instruction to the Committee to consider the expediency of constituting Referees under the authority of this House for the more speedy and economical decision of certain questions of fact commonly arising in the proceedings upon Private Bills.—(*Colonel Wilson Patten.*)

CASE OF CAPTAIN DE BURGH—Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington.. 1467

NAVY—CHAPLAIN GENERALSHIP OF THE NAVY—Question, Mr. Hanbury Tracey; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 1468

COMMUNICATION WITH RAILWAY GUARDS — Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson 1468

THE NEW ZEALAND WAR — Question, Sir Minto Farquhar; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 1469

New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan) Bill [Bill 150]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Cardwell*) 1471

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Arthur Mills.*)

Question, That the word "now" stand part of the Question.

After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 92, Noes 55; Majority 37.

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read 2°, and committed for *Monday* next.

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

DENMARK AND GERMANY — THE ARMISTICE—Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Viscount Palmerston 1522

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY *considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £8,876, to complete the sum for the National Gallery 1523
After debate, Vote *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—*continued.*

(2.) £1,500, Gallery of Portraits 1532
After short debate, Vote *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow* :—Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

FORTIFICATIONS AND WORKS—*Considered* in Committee 1532

(In the Committee.)

Question again proposed,

"That, towards providing a further sum for defraying the expenses of the construction of works for the defence of the Royal Dockyards and Arsenals, and of the Ports of Dover and Portland, and for the creation of a Central Arsenal, a sum not exceeding £650,000 be charged upon the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, and that the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorized and empowered to raise the said sum by Annuities, for a term not exceeding thirty years; and that such Annuities shall be charged upon and be payable out of the said Consolidated Fund."

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolution *agreed to.*

(2.) *Resolved,*

That the said Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorized to direct the payment, to the Governor and Company of the Bank of England, out of the said Consolidated Fund, of the sum of £600, for the management of the contributions to be received by the said Governor and Company in respect of the said Annuities 1534

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

Bank Post Bills (Ireland) Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*, Bill to permit, for a limited period, compositions for Stamp Duty on Bank Post Bills of Five Pounds and upwards in Ireland, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer and Mr. Peel.

House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at half after Two o'clock.

LORDS, FRIDAY, JULY 15.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report*—Railway Companies (Borrowing Powers) (No. 127).

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia) * (No. 204); Naval Discipline * (No. 205); Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans) * (No. 206); Highway Act Amendment * (No. 207); Expiring Laws Continuance * (No. 208); Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment * (No. 209); Militia Ballots Suspension.*

Second Reading — Judgments, &c., Law Amendment * (No. 194), and *referred* to Select Committee; College of Physicians * (No. 114); Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties)* (No. 198); Inclosure (No. 2)* (No. 177); Trespass (Ireland)* (No. 202).

Committee — Accidents Compensation Act Amendment * (No. 158); Street Music (Metropolis)* (No. 196); Railways (Ireland) Act Amendment * (No. 178); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland)* (No. 189).

Report — Street Music (Metropolis)* (No. 196); Railways (Ireland) Act Amendment * (No. 178); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland)* (No. 189).

Third Reading — Factory Acts Extension * (No. 176); Indemnity * (No. 197); India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment * (No. 195); Defence Act Amendment * (No. 193), and *passed.*

POWERS OF CONVOCATION TO PASS SYNODICAL JUDGMENT ON BOOKS—ESSAYS AND REVIEWS — Question, Lord Houghton; Answer, The Lord Chancellor:—long debate thereon 1535

Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia) Bill [H.L.]—

A Bill for giving Effect to a Convention between Her Majesty and The King of Prussia for the mutual Surrender of Criminals—Was *presented** by The Earl Russell; read 1ª;* to be *printed;* and to be read 2ª on *Monday* next. (No. 204.)

Naval Discipline Bill [H.L.]—

A Bill to make Provision for the Discipline of the Navy—Was *presented** by The Duke of Somerset; read 1ª;* to be *printed;* and to be read 2ª on *Tuesday* next. (No. 205.)

House adjourned at a quarter before Eight o'clock.

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JULY 15.

Page

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—On Standing Orders Revision — Sir Henry Willoughby, Mr. Ayrton, and Mr. Richard Hodgson *added.*

Report—On Scientific Institutions (Dublin) (No. 495); on Dockyards (Second Report) (No. 496).

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—MISCELLANEOUS ESTIMATES.

WAYS AND MEANS—*Resolutions* [July 14] *reported;* Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000), Bill *ordered.*

PUBLIC BILLS — *Resolutions in Committee—Reported*—Fortifications and Works*, Bill *ordered;* Corn Returns*, Bill *ordered.*

Ordered—Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000); Metropolis Management Act (1862) Amendment*; Hackney Carriages*; Indian Medical Services*; West Indian Incumbered Estates Act Amendment.*

First Reading—Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* [Bill 211]; Indian Medical Service* [Bill 213]; Corn Accounts and Returns* [Bill 214]; West Indian Incumbered Estates Act Amendment* [Bill 215]; Hackney Carriages (Metropolis)* [Bill 216]; Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000)* [Bill 217]; Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* [Bill 218]; Metropolis Management Act (1862) Amendment* [Bill 219].

Second Reading — Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* [Bill 204]; Westminster Bridge Traffic* [Bill 205]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental* [Bill 207]; Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment* [Bill 210].

Committee—Cattle Diseases Prevention [Bill 175] on *re-committal*—R.P.; Improvement of Land Act (1864)* [Bill 187] on *re-committal*—R.P.; Bank Notes, &c., Signature* [Bill 206]; Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal [Bill 161]; Justices Proceedings Confirmation* [Bill 203].

Report — Contagious Diseases* [Bill 163]; Bank Notes, &c., Signature* [Bill 206]; Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal [Bill 161]; Justices Proceedings Confirmation* [Bill 203].

Considered as amended—Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension* [Bill 181]; Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* [Bill 194]; Militia Pay*; Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* [Bill 164]; Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* [Bill 176]; Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. [Bill 199]

Third Reading—Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* [Bill 196]; Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal* [Bill 197]; Harwich Harbour Act Amendment* [Bill 171].

Withdrawn—Game (Ireland) (No. 2)* [Bill 140].

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

Cattle Diseases Prevention (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 175]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 1567

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 5 *agreed to.*
Clause 6 (Market for Cattle affected with certain Diseases).
Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Monsell.*)
The Committee *divided;* Ayes 24, Noes 39; Majority 15.

After short debate, Committee report Progress; to sit again this day month.

INDIA — THE INDIAN ARTILLERY—Question, Mr. O'Neill; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1570

TURNPIKE GATES REMOVED — Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Sir William Jolliffe 1570

INDIA—ARMY BREVET RANK—Question, Captain Jervis; Answer, Sir Charles Wood 1571

RELATIONS WITH BRAZIL—Question, Mr. Bernal Osborne; Answer, Viscount Palmerston 1572

AUSTRALIAN POSTAGE—Question, Lord Alfred Churchill; Answer, Mr. Peel .. 1573

UNITED STATES—SEIZURE OF BRITISH PROPERTY IN NEW YORK—Question, Mr. Laird; Answer, Mr. Layard 1574

PASSPORTS IN ROME—Question, Mr. Corbally; Answer, Mr. Layard .. 1574

SPAIN AND PERU—THE CHINCHA ISLANDS—Question, Mr. Caird; Answer, Mr. Layard 1575

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

IONIAN ISLANDS—ANNEXATION TO GREECE—Observations, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Reply, Mr. Layard 1575

UNION ASSESSMENT COMMITTEES—Observations, Mr. Hubbard; Reply, Mr. C. P. Villiers 1583

SUPPLY—*continued.*

BRITISH CLAIMS ON PORTUGAL—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copy of the Papers relating to the claims of British Subjects in respect of the Union Mercantile Company,"—(*Mr. Ayrton,*)—instead thereof 1593

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

FORFEITURE OF LANDS AND GOODS BILL—Question, Mr. Charles Forster; Answer, The Attorney General 1597

ASSIZES FOR THE WEST RIDING — Question, Colonel Smyth; Answer, Sir George Grey 1598

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY *considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £5,184, to complete the sum for Magnetic and Meteorological Observations, &c. 1598

After short debate, Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) £500, Royal Geographical Society.

(3.) £1,000, Royal Society.

(4.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £500, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for enabling the Directors of the Royal Academy of Music to provide accommodation for the Institution" 1600

After debate, The Committee *divided;* Ayes 52, Noes 42; Majority 10. Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) £771,473, Customs (Salaries and Expenses) 1608

After short debate, Vote *agreed to.*

(6.) £1,313,467, Inland Revenue (Salaries and Expenses).

(7.) £2,114,616, Post Office (Salaries and Expenses).

(8.) £492,536, Superannuations, &c., Customs, Inland Revenue, and Post Office 1609

After short debate, Vote *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported on *Monday* next; Committee to sit again on *Monday* next.

WAYS AND MEANS—Report—Resolutions [July 14] *reported.*

Question thereon, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1610

After short debate, Resolutions *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Massey, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Peel.

Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 161]—

Bill *considered* in Committee (In the Committee.) 1610

Clauses 1 to 3 *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Persons admitted into Holy Orders by Bishops in Scotland, not to be admitted to Benefices, &c., in England or Ireland, without consent of Bishop of the Diocese) ... 1610

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 10, to leave out the words "and any such Bishop shall be entitled to refuse such consent and approbation without assigning reason for such refusal, any law or practice to the contrary notwithstanding."—(*Mr. Kinnaird*) 1611

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The Committee *divided;* Ayes 48, Noes 5; Majority 43.

Clause *agreed to:*—Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

Bill *reported,* with an Amendment as amended, to be considered on *Monday* next.

Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c., Bill [Bill 199]—

Bill, as amended, *considered* 1611

Moved, "That the Clause excluding Ireland from the operation of the Bill be omitted."—(*Lord Naas.*)

After short debate, Clause *omitted* :—Bill to be read 3°, on *Monday* next.

Metropolis Management Act (1862) Amendment Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Baring*, Bill to amend "The Metropolis Management Amendment Act, 1862," *ordered* * to be brought in by Mr. Baring, Mr. Cowper, and Mr. Tite :—Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 219.]

Hackney Carriages (Metropolis) Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Locke*, Bill to amend the Laws relating to the Hackney Carriages of the Metropolis and the Proprietors and Drivers thereof, *ordered* * to be brought in by Mr. Locke, Sir Morton Peto, Mr. Alderman Salomons, and Mr. Ayrton :—Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 216.]

Indian Medical Service Bill—

On Motion of *Sir Charles Wood*, Bill to repeal certain parts of the Act of the sixteenth and seventeenth years of Her Majesty, chapter ninety-five, and to make provision for the Medical Service of Her Majesty's Indian Forces, *ordered* * to be brought in by Sir Charles Wood and The Marquess of Hartington : — Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 213.]

Corn Returns Bill

Acts *considered* in Committee.* (In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Law relating to Publication of Accounts of Corn Imported, and to Returns of Purchases and Sales of Corn.

Resolution *reported* :—Bill *ordered* * to be brought in by Mr. Milner Gibson and Mr. Hutt :—Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 214.]

West Indian Incumbered Estates Act Amendment Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Chichester Fortescue*, Bill to amend the West Indian Incumbered Estates Act, *ordered* * to be brought in by Mr. Chichester Fortescue and Mr. Peel :—Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 215.]

Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000) Bill—

Bill for raising a sum by Exchequer Bonds for the Service of the year one thousand eight hundred and sixty-four ; *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 217.]

Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) Bill—

Bill for providing a further sum towards defraying the expenses of constructing Fortifications for the protection of the Royal Arsenals and Dockyards, and the Ports of Dover and Portland, and of creating a Central Arsenal ; *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 218.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

LORDS, MONDAY, JULY 18.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—On Judgments, &c., Law Amendment Bill *nominated* * (*List of Committee.*) (No. 194).

Public Bills — *First Reading* — Harwich Harbour Act Amendment* (No. 210); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements * (No. 211); Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal * (No. 212).

Second Reading—Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia)* (No. 204); Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans)* (No. 206); Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment * (No. 209).

Committee—Burials Registration * (No. 144).

Third Reading—Street Music (Metropolis) * (No. 196); Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties)* (No. 198); Railways (Ireland) Acts Amendment* (No. 178); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) * (No. 189); Administration of Trusts (Scotland)* (No. 199).

Cuba Slave Trade—Petition, Lord Brougham 1613

After short debate, Petition to lie on the table.

Judgments, &c., Law Amendment Bill—

Select Committee *nominated*.* The Lords following were named of the Committee ; the Committee to meet on *Friday* next, at Eleven o'clock ; and to appoint their own Chairman :—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. Steward, E. Shaftesbury, E. Romney, L. Wodehouse, L. Cranworth, L. St. Leonards, L. Wensleydale, L. Chelmsford, L. Kingsdown, L. Lyveden.

House adjourned at half past Six o'clock.

COMMONS, MONDAY, JULY 18.

Page

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

Resolutions [July 14 & 15] *reported.*

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered in Committee*—Account No. 46 of the Finance Accounts [presented June 7] *referred.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered*—Private Bill Costs* ; Poor Removal.*

First Reading—Cathedral Minor Corporations* [Bill 220] (*Lords*); Private Bill Costs* [Bill 221]; Poor Removal* [Bill 222]; Defence Act Amendment* [Bill 223] (*Lords*).

Second Reading—Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* [Bill 218]; Indian Medical Service* [Bill 213]; Corn Accounts and Returns* [Bill 214]; West Indian Incumbered Estates Act Amendment* [Bill 215]; Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000)* [Bill 217]; Metropolis Management Act (1862) Amendment* [Bill 219]; Clerks of the Peace Removal* [Bill 209] (*Lords*); Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues* [Bill 202].

Committee—Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) [Advances] [Bill 204]; New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan) [Bill 150]; Navy and Army Expenditure (1862-3); Westminster Bridge Traffic [Bill 205]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental* [Bill 207]; Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment* [Bill 210] (*Lords*); Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. (*re-committed*)* [Bill 199].

Report—New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan) [Bill 150]; Westminster Bridge Traffic [Bill 205]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental* [Bill 207]; Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment* [Bill 210]; Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c.* [Bill 199] (*re-committed*).

Considered as amended—Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal [Bill 161] (*Lords*); Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c.* [Bill 199].

Third Reading—Metropolitan District Railways; Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension* [Bill 181]; Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* [Bill 194]; Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* [Bill 200]; Militia Pay*; Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* [Bill 164]; Bank Notes, &c., Signature* [Bill 206]; Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* [Bill 176]; Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c.* [Bill 199]; Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex)* [Bill 203], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Charitable Trusts Fees* [Bill 128].

Metropolitan District Railways Bill—(*Queen's Consent Signified*)—

Order for Third Reading read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time" 1617

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day month."—(*Mr. Crawford.*)
Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."
After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read 3°, and *passed.*

PUBLIC OFFICES—SATURDAY HALF HOLIDAY—Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Viscount Palmerston 1622

UNITED STATES—SEIZURE OF THE BARQUE "SCIENCE"—Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Layard 1622

TRAFFIC OF THE CITY OF LONDON—Question, Lord Ernest Bruce; Answer, Sir George Grey 1623

TREATY OF VIENNA AND PRUSSIA—Question, Mr. Ayrton; Answer, Viscount Palmerston 1623

ARMY—EXPERIMENTS WITH RIFLED ORDNANCE—Question, Mr. J. A. Smith; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1624

DENMARK AND GERMANY—THE TREATY OF LONDON (1852)—Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Viscount Palmerston 1625

MR. ARNOLD, POLICE MAGISTRATE—Explanation, Sir George Grey; Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Sir George Grey 1625

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

POLITICAL RELATIONS WITH BRAZIL—Observations, Mr. Bernal Osborne and other hon. Members, 1626; Reply, Viscount Palmerston 1636

ST. BERNARD'S REFORMATORY, LEICESTERSHIRE—Observations, Mr. Packe and other hon. Members, 1646; Reply, Sir George Grey 1648

PASSPORTS IN FRANCE—Question, Sir William Fraser; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 1651

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY *considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £860,276, Post Office Packet Service 1652
After short debate, Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) £1,600,000, Exchequer Bonds, *agreed to.*

(3.) Motion made, and Question proposed,
"That a sum, not exceeding £14,355, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for the Civil Establishments on the Western Coast of Africa" 1658

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed,
"That a sum, not exceeding £12,105, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for the Civil Establishments on the Western Coast of Africa."—(*Sir John Hay*) 1661
After long debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*
Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(4.) £220,000, Iron-clad ships *El Tousson* and *El Monassir* .. 1681
After short debate, Vote *agreed to.*
Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at Twelve of the clock.

New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan) Bill [Bill 150]—

Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."
Amendment proposed,
To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire what is the relative financial position of Great Britain and New Zealand, with a view of a definite and final adjustment of any outstanding balance, and coming to an understanding as to the liabilities to be borne in future by the Government of either Country,"—(*Sir John Trelawny,*)—instead thereof 1681
Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."
After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 79, Noes 32; Majority 47.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*
Bill *considered* in Committee .. (In the Committee.) 1693
Clause 1 (Sums borrowed under recited Act of General Assembly of New Zealand, not exceeding £1,000,000 and Interest, guaranteed under this Act).
After short debate, Amendment *negatived*:—Clause *agreed to.*
Clause 2 (Treasury not to approve of the borrowing of £1,000,000 until certain provision is made) 1695
After short debate, Clause *agreed to*:—Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*
Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE (1862-3)—

Considered in Committee 1695

(In the Committee.)

After short debate, Resolutions *agreed to.*

(1.) *Resolved*—That the Expenditure incurred for certain Navy Services in the year ended the 31st day of March, 1863, has fallen short of the sums appropriated to those Services by the sum of £870,100; and that the Expenditure which has been incurred for certain other Navy Services and not provided for in the sums appropriated to those Services for the same year has amounted to the sum of £499,702 7*s.* 9*d.*

(2.) *Resolved*—That the said Expenditure for Navy Services unprovided for as aforesaid, amounting to £499,702 7*s.* 9*d.*, has been temporarily defrayed, under the authority of the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, out of the Surpluses which have arisen, as aforesaid, upon other Votes for Navy Services, amounting to £870,100.

(3.) *Resolved*—That the application of so much of the said Surpluses be sanctioned.

(4.) *Resolved*—That the Expenditure incurred for certain Army Services in the year ended the 31st day of March, 1863, has fallen short of the sums appropriated to those Services by the sum of £1,097,725 12*s.*, and that the Expenditure which has been incurred for certain other Army Services and not provided for in the sums appropriated to those Services for the same year, has amounted to the sum of £336,309 15*s.* 8*d.*

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE (1862-3)—*continued.*

(5.) *Resolved*—That the said Expenditure for Army Services unprovided for, as aforesaid, amounting to £336,309 15*s.* 8*d.*, has been temporarily defrayed, under the authority of the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, out of the Surpluses which have arisen, as aforesaid, upon other Votes for Army Services, amounting to £1,097,725 12*s.*

(6.) *Resolved*—That the application of so much of the said Surpluses be sanctioned.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow*, at Twelve of the clock.

Westminster Bridge Traffic Bill [Bill 205]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 1698

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 *agreed to.*
Clause 2 (Power to the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Works to make Bye-laws and Orders).
After short debate, Clause *agreed to*:—Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow*, at Twelve of the clock.

PUBLIC WORKS (MANUFACTURING DISTRICTS)—[ADVANCES]—

Considered in Committee 1698

(In the Committee.)

Moved, That the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorized to make further Advances out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, to an amount not exceeding £350,000, upon security of Local Rates, for facilitating the execution of Works in certain Manufacturing Districts,—(*The Chancellor of the Exchequer*,)—*agreed to.*

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow*, at Twelve of the clock.

Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal Bill [Bill 161]—

Bill, as amended, *considered* 1699

Amendment to add to the end of the Bill, "or in Ireland, in any Court of Common Law, in the name of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners."—(*Sir W. Heathcote.*)

After short debate, Amendment *agreed to*:—Bill to be read 3° on *Thursday.*

Private Bill Costs Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Scourfield*, Bill for awarding Costs in certain cases to opponents and promoters of Private Bills, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Scourfield and Mr. Massey:—Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 221.]

Poor Removal Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Villiers*, Bill to explain the Statute of Her present Majesty for amending the Laws relating to the removal of the Poor, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Villiers and Mr. Gilpin:—Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 222.]

House adjourned at half after One o'clock.

LORDS, TUESDAY, JULY 19.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Bleaching and Dyeing Works Act Extension* (No. 213); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* (No. 214); Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* (No. 215); Militia Pay*; Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* (No. 216); Bank Notes, &c., Signature* (No. 217); Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* (No. 218) Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c.* (No. 219); Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex)* (No. 220).

Second Reading—Sale of Gas (Scotland)* (No. 152); Naval Discipline (No. 205) [H.L.]; Local Government Act (1858 Amendment* (No. 190).

Committee—Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia) (No. 204) [H.L.]; Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans)* (No. 206); Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* (No. 209); Militia Ballots Suspension.*

Report—Accidents Compensation Act Amendment* (No. 158); Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia) [H.L.] (No. 204); Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans)* (No. 206); Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* (No. 209); Militia Ballots Suspension.*

SLAVE TRADE IN THE PACIFIC—Petition from New South Wales, *presented* by Lord Brougham—Petition to lie on the table 1700

Naval Discipline Bill (No. 205)—

After a short conversation, Bill read 2ª, and *committed* to a Committee of the whole House on *Thursday* next.

Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia) Bill (No. 204)—

Bill *considered* in Committee 1700
Bill *reported*, without Amendment.

House adjourned at a quarter before Six o'clock.

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JULY 19.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — *Report* —Patent Office Library and Museum * (No. 504).

SUPPLY—*Resolutions* [July 18] *reported* *—Army and Navy Expenditure (1862-3); Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) [Advances].

WAYS AND MEANS—*Resolutions* [July 18] *reported.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered*—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Bribery at Elections*; Poor Relief (Metropolis); Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment.*

First Reading—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment * [Bill 225]; Poor Relief (Metropolis) [Bill 224]; Bribery at Elections * [Bill 227].

Second Reading—Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* [Bill 211]; Cathedral Minor Corporations * [Bill 220]; Poor Removal * [Bill 222].

Committee—Improvement of Land Act (1864)* [Bill 187]; Contagious Diseases * [Bill 212] *re-committed;* Indian Medical Service [Bill 213]—R.P.; Criminal Justice Act (1865) Extension * [Bill 201] *re-committed;* Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* [Bill 204]; West Indian Incumbered Estates Act Amendment * [Bill 215]; Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000) * [Bill 217]; Clerks of the Peace Removal * [Bill 209]; Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues * [Bill 202].

Report—Improvement of Land Act (1864)* [Bill 187]; Contagious Diseases * [Bill 212]; Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)* [Bill 184]; Criminal Justice Act (1865) Extension * [Bill 201]; Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* [Bill 204]; West Indian Incumbered Estates Act Amendment * [Bill 215]; Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000) * [Bill 217]; Clerks of the Peace Removal * [Bill 209]; Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues * [Bill 202].

Considered as amended—New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan)* [Bill 150]; Westminster Bridge Traffic * [Bill 205].

Third Reading—Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental * [Bill 207].

Withdrawn—Forfeiture of Lands and Goods* [Bill 21]; Church of England Estates * [Bill 127]; Costs Security * [Bill 58]; Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers)* [Bill 198]; Justices of the Peace Procedure * [Bill 138].

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

SUPPLY—REPORT—Resolutions [July 18] *reported.*
After short debate, Resolutions *agreed to.*

Indian Medical Service Bill [Bill 213]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 1702

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (The Secretary of State for India in Council empowered to make Regulations for the Medical Service of Her Majesty's Forces in India, and to empower the Authorities in India to make similar Regulations).

After short debate, Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Hennessy.*)

The Committee *divided;* Ayes 6, Noes 43; Majority 37.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Clause, to add the words "Provided always, That all such regulations shall be laid before Parliament within fourteen days after the meeting thereof, if Parliament be sitting, and if Parliament be not sitting, then within fourteen days after the next meeting thereof."—(*Sir Charles Wood*) 1704

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, to leave out the word "all," and insert the word "no,"—(*Mr. Hennessy,*)—instead thereof.

Question put, "That the word 'all' stand part of the said proposed Amendment."

The Committee *divided;* Ayes 24, Noes 7; Majority 17.

Question again put, "That the word 'all' stand part of the said proposed Amendment.'

The Committee *divided;* Ayes 34, Noes 11; Majority 23.

After short debate, Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee *divided;* Ayes 30, Noes 6; Majority 24.

Question proposed, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill"—

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

Complaints of the Customs Officers—Question, Mr. C. Turner; Answer, Mr. Peel 1705

The Yorkshire Reservoirs—Question, Mr. W. B. Ferrand; Answer, Sir George Grey 1706

Mr. Arnold and the Police—Question, Mr. G. H. Whalley; Answer, Sir George Grey 1707

Denmark and Germany—The Prussians and the Norwegian Mail Steamer "Viken"—Question, Mr. Wyld; Answer, Mr. Layard 1708

Canada—The North American Colonies—Question, Sir John Walsh; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 1708

Lunatic Asylums (Ireland)—Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Sir Robert Peel .. 1709

Forts on the Gold Coast—Question, Mr. C. P. Berkeley; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 1709

Troops for Japan—Question, Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1710

Convent Schools (Ireland)—Question, Mr. Hennessy; Answer, Sir Robert Peel 1711

Paper Manufacture—

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the present position of the Paper Manufacture of Great Britain and Ireland, with respect to Foreign Taxation."—(*Mr. Maguire*) 1711

After long debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Navy—Ships of War—Armour Plating—

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to issue a Commission to consider the various systems now existing of constructing and Armour-plating Ships of War for the British Navy, as well as for the Navies of other Maritime Powers, and to report what, in the opinion of such Commission, should be the system to be now adopted for the British Navy."—(*Sir Frederic Smith*) 1749

After long debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Poor Relief (Metropolis) Bill—

Motion of Mr. C. P. Villiers for leave to bring in a Bill 1771

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

Bill to make provision for distributing the charge of the Relief of certain classes of Poor Persons over the whole of the Metropolis, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Villiers and Mr. Gilpin:—Bill *presented,* and read 1°. [Bill 224.]

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Massey*, Bill to apply a sum, out of the Consolidated Fund and the Surplus of Ways and Means, to the Service of the year one thousand eight hundred and sixty-four, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Massey, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Peel:—Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 225.]

Bribery at Elections Bill—

On Motion of *Sir FitzRoy Kelly*, Bill for the more effectual prevention of Bribery and Corruption in the Election of Members to serve in Parliament, *ordered** to be brought in by Sir FitzRoy Kelly, Sir John Pakington, and Mr. Whiteside:—Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 227.]

Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*, Bill to amend an Act of the present Session, chapter eighteen, as to the Stamp Duties on certain Letters or Powers of Attorney, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer and Mr. Peel :—Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 225.]

House adjourned at a quarter after One o'clock.

LORDS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 20.

MINUTES.]—Public Bill—*First Reading*—Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental* (No. 221).

Their Lordships met; and having gone through the business on the paper, without debate,

House adjourned at a quarter before Four o'clock.

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 20.

MINUTES.] — Public Bills — *Ordered*— Titles (Ireland)* ; Portsea Island (Rights of Way).*
First Reading — Portsea Island (Rights of Way)* [Bill 229] ; Titles (Ireland)* [Bill 230].
Second Reading—Appeal in Criminal Cases Act Amendment Bill [Bill 14] *negatived ;* Facilities for Divine Service in Collegiate Schools [Bill 208] *negatived ;* Defence Act Amendment* [Bill 223] ; Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)* ; Poor Relief (Metropolis)* [Bill 224].
Committee—Cathedral Minor Corporations* [Bill 220] ; Corn Accounts and Returns* [Bill 214] ; Poor Removal* [Bill 222] ; Indian Medical Service* [Bill 213] ; Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment* [Bill 225].
Report — Cathedral Minor Corporations* [Bill 220] ; Corn Accounts and Returns* [Bill 214] ; Poor Removal* [Bill 222] ; Indian Medical Service* [Bill 213].
Considered as amended — Improvement of Land Act (1864)* [Bill 187] ; Contagious Diseases* [Bill 212] ; Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* [Bill 204].
Third Reading — West Indian Incumbered Estates Act Amendment* [Bill 215] ; Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000)* [Bill 217] ; Clerks of the Peace Removal* [Bill 209].
Withdrawn — Inns of Court* [Bill 104] ; Appeal in Criminal Cases Act Amendment [Bill 14] ; Private Bill Costs* [Bill 221] ; Facilities for Divine Service in Collegiate Schools [Bill 208].

Appeal in Criminal Cases Act Amendment Bill [Bill 14]—

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Order for Second Reading be discharged."—(*Sir FitzRoy Kelly*) 1773

After short debate, Order *discharged* :—Bill *withdrawn*.

Facilities for Divine Service in Collegiate Schools Bill [Bill 208]—

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Collins*) 1774

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day month."—(*Mr. Hardcastle*) .. 1776

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

After short debate, Amendment, and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Second Reading *put off* till this day fortnight.

Titles (Ireland Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Monsell*, Bill to provide more certain and economic means for transferring and otherwise dealing with certain Lands in Ireland, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Monsell, Mr. Herbert, and Sir Colman O'Loghlen : — Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 230.]

Portsea Island (Rights of Way) Bill—

On Motion of The *Marquess of Hartington*, Bill to extinguish certain Rights of Way through the Landport Gate, Ravelin, and Glacis, and the Sallyport adjacent thereto, at Portsea Island, in the county of Hants, *ordered** to be brought in by The Marquess of Hartington and The Judge Advocate :—Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 229.]

House adjourned at Two o'clock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LORDS, THURSDAY, JULY 21.

Page

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—On Highways Act Amendment *appointed* and *nominated** (*List of Members*); Thames Conservancy *appointed* and *nominated** (*List of Members*).

Report—Railways Construction Facilities* (No. 160).

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000)* (No. 224); West India Incumbered Estates Acts Amendment* (No. 225).

Second Reading—Weights and Measures (Metric System (No. 164); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* (No. 214); Militia Pay*; Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* (No. 218); Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. (No. 219); Expiring Laws Continuance* (No. 208); Highways Act Amendment* (No. 207); Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal* (No. 212); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* (No. 211).

Committee—College of Physicians* (No. 114); Inclosure (No. 2)* (No. 177); Trespass (Ireland)* (No. 202); Sale of Gas (Scotland)* (No. 152); Naval Discipline* (No. 205) [H.L.]; Local Government Act (1858) Amendment* (No. 190).

Report—Burials Registration* (No. 144); College of Physicians* (No. 114); Inclosure (No. 2)* (No. 177); Trespass (Ireland)* (No. 202); Sale of Gas (Scotland)* (No. 152); Naval Discipline* (No. 205); Local Government Act (1858) Amendment* (No. 190).

Third Reading—Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia)* (No. 204) [H.L.]; Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans)* (No. 206); Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* (No. 209); Militia Ballots Suspension.*

CUBA SLAVE TRADE—GENERAL DULCE—Explanation, Lord Brougham .. 1781

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill (No. 164)—

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Earl Fortescue*) 1782

Amendment *moved*, to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Six Months.")—(*The Marquess of Salisbury*) 1784

After short debate, on Question that ("now") stand part of the Motion? Their Lordships *divided;* Contents 34, Not-Contents 23; Majority 11.

Resolved in the *Affirmative*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* next.

List of Contents and Not-Contents 1786

Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c., Bill (No. 212)—

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Redesdale*) 1787

After short debate, Amendment *moved*, to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months.")—(*Lord Wodehouse.*)

On Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion? Their Lordships *divided;* Contents 31, Not-Contents 18; Majority 13.

Resolved in the *Affirmative*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow*.

List of Contents and Not-Contents 1789

Highways Act Amendment Bill—

Select Committee *appointed* and *nominated.** The Lords following were named of the Committee; The Committee to meet *To-morrow*, at One o'clock, and to appoint their own Chairman:—M. Salisbury, Ld. Steward, E. Romney, E. Powis, E. De Grey, E. Eversley, L. Wodehouse, L. Hatherton, L. Stanley of Alderley, L. Egerton, L. Llanover.

Thames Conservancy Bill—

Select Committee *appointed* and *nominated** as follows:—The Viscount Hutchinson (Chairman), The Lord Abercromby, The Lord Mostyn, The Lord De Mauley, The Lord Methuen; The Committee to meet *To-morrow*, at Eleven o'clock.

House adjourned at a quarter before Seven o'clock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JULY 21.

Page

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered* — Masters and Servants.*

First Reading—Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia)* [Bill 231] (*Lords*); Masters and Servants* [Bill 232].

Committee—East India Revenue Accounts; Consolidated Fund (Appropriation); Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) [Bill 218]; Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2) (*re-committed*)* [Bill 226]; Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* [Bill 211]; Cranbourne Street (*re-committed*)* [Bill 154] — R.P.; Corn Accounts and Returns (*re-committed*)* [Bill 214]; Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment* [Bill 225].

Report — Consolidated Fund (Appropriation); Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) [Bill 218]; Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)* [Bill 226]; Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* [Bill 211]; Corn Accounts and Returns * [Bill 214]; Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment [Bill 225].

Considered as amended—Corn Accounts and Returns * [Bill 214]; Poor Removal * [Bill 222]; Indian Medical Service * [Bill 213], *adjourned.*

Third Reading — New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan) [Bill 150]; Contagious Diseases * [Bill 212]; Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* [Bill 204]; Corn Accounts and Returns* [Bill 214]; Westminster Bridge Traffic * [Bill 205]; Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal [Bill 161] (*Lords*); Improvement of Land Act (1864)* [Bill 187] (*Lords*); Cathedral Minor Corporations* [Bill 220] (*Lords*); Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension* [Bill 201]; Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues * [Bill 202], and *passed.*

Withdrawn — Metropolis Management Act (1862) Amendment* [Bill 219].

NAVY—PAYMENT OF OFFICERS—Question, Mr. C. P. Berkeley; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 1790

BRITISH AND FOREIGN STATE PAPERS—Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Mr. Layard 1791

CONVICTION FOR SALE OF DISEASED MEAT—Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Sir George Grey 1792

RESERVOIRS—Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, Sir George Grey .. 1793

WINE LICENCES—Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, Sir George Grey .. 1794

NAVY—THE "RESEARCH" AND "ENTERPRISE"—Question, Sir Frederic Smith; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 1795

TROOPS FOR JAPAN—Question, Lord Naas; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget .. 1795

PASSPORTS IN FRANCE—Question, Sir William Fraser; Answer, Mr. Layard .. 1795

POOR RELIEF IN THE METROPOLIS—Question, Lord Claud Hamilton; Answer, Mr. Speaker 1796

EDUCATION—INSPECTORS' REPORTS—Observations, Mr. Hunt 1798

JAPAN—DESPATCH OF TROOPS—Questions, Lord Robert Montagu, 1799, 1806; Answer, Viscount Palmerston 1806

CASUAL POOR (METROPOLIS) BILL—Observations, Mr. Harvey Lewis, and other hon. Members, 1799; Reply, Mr. T. J. Miller 1800

NAVY—THE "LORD WARDEN" TARGET—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 1805

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE—KAFFIR WAR—Question, Mr. S. Western; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 1806

NAVY—SHIPS OF WAR—ARMOUR-PLATING—Explanation, Mr. Laird; Reply, Lord Clarence Paget 1806

ROYAL ACADEMY—Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Sir George Grey .. 1808

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS—Resolutions of Sir Charles Wood.
Considered in Committee 1808

(In the Committee.)

1. That the total net Revenues of the Territories and Departments under the immediate control of the Government of India for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1863, amounted to £3,481,927 sterling, and the Charges thereof, for the same period, other than Military Charges, amounted to £3,049,501 sterling.
2. That the total net Revenues of the Bengal Presidency, for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1863, amounted to £11,755,377 sterling, and the Charges thereof, for the same period, other than Military Charges, amounted to £2,060,713 sterling.

East India Revenue Accounts—Resolutions of Sir Charles Wood—*continued.*

3. That the total net Revenues of the North Western Provinces, for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1863, amounted to £5,162,401 sterling, and the Charges thereof, for the same period, other than Military Charges, amounted to £1,497,179 sterling.

4. That the total net Revenues of the Punjab, for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1863, amounted to £2,612,517 sterling, and the Charges thereof, for the same period, other than Military Charges, amounted to £1,192,674 sterling.

5. That the total net Revenues of the Territories and Departments under the immediate control of the Government of India of the Bengal Presidency, of the North Western Provinces, and of the Punjab, together for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1863, amounted to £23,012,222 sterling, and the Charges thereupon, including the Military Charges, amounted to £14,753,114 sterling, leaving a surplus available for the general Charges of India, of £8,259,108 sterling.

6. That the total net Revenues of the Madras Presidency (Fort Saint George), for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1863, amounted to £5,819,048 sterling, and the net Charges thereof, for the same period, amounted to £5,383,285 sterling, leaving a surplus available for the above Presidency, for the general Charges of India, of £435,763 sterling.

7. That the total net Revenues of the Bombay Presidency, for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1863, amounted to £7,831,597 sterling, and the net Charges thereof, for the same period, amounted to £4,831,841 sterling, leaving a surplus available in the above Presidency, for the General Charges of India, of £2,999,756 sterling.

8. That the total net Revenues of the several Presidencies, for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1863, amounted to £36,662,867 sterling, and the Charges thereof amounted to £24,968,240 sterling, leaving a surplus Revenue of £11,694,627 sterling.

9. That the Interest on the Registered Debt of India, paid in the year ended the 30th day of April, 1863, amounted to £3,351,680 sterling, and the Charges defrayed in England, on account of the Indian Territory, in the same period, including Guaranteed Interest on the Capital of Railway and other Companies, after deducting net Traffic Receipts of Railways, amounted to £6,515,601 sterling, leaving a surplus of Indian Income for the year ended as aforesaid, after defraying the above Interest and Charges, of £1,827,346 sterling.—(*Sir Charles Wood.*)

After long debate, Resolutions *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at Twelve of the clock.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—

Order for Committee read:—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" 1857

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *considered* in Committee 1865

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 19 inclusive *agreed to.*

Clause 20, £18,355 (Civil Establishments, Western Coast of Africa) 1865

Amendment, To omit £4,000 for the Maintenance of "Forts and Establishments," (Western Coast of Africa.)—(*Mr. C. P. Berkeley.*)

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Clause *agreed to*:—Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read 3° *To-morrow* at Twelve of the clock.

New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan) Bill [Bill 150]—

Order for Third Reading read:—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time" 1866

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day month."—(*Mr. Hennessy*) .. 1867

After short debate, Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 75, Noes 32; Majority 43.

Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read 3°; Verbal Amendment made:—Bill *passed.*

Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) Bill [Bill 218]—

Bill *considered* in Committee (In the Committee.) 1871

Clause 1 *agreed to.*

Clause 2,

Moved, That the words which referred to the Central Arsenal should be omitted from the Clause.—(*Mr. Angerstein*) 1873

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause *agreed to*:—Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

FORTIFICATIONS (PROVISION FOR EXPENSES) BILL—*continued.*

Schedule—

Amendment proposed, To omit "Pembroke" in the proposed Vote.—(*Sir John Hay.*)
Amendment *negatived* :—Schedule *agreed to.*

Bill *reported*; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow*, at Twelve of the clock.

Indian Medical Service Bill [Bill 213]—

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration 1874

Debate adjourned till *To-morrow* at Twelve of the clock.

Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal Bill [Bill 161]

Order for Third Reading read :—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time" 1874

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Debate be now adjourned :"—(*Mr. Kinnaird* :)—The House *divided*; Ayes 18, Noes 40; Majority 22.

Original Question again proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Warner.*)

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day month."—(*Mr. Whalley*) .. 1876

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question :"—The House *divided*; Ayes 34, Noes 10; Majority 24.

Main Question put, and *agreed to* :—Bill read 3°, and *passed*, with an Amendment.

[The Order of the Day for the Third Reading of the Bill having been read about Three o'clock in the morning, the discussion which followed was not reported.

Sir W. Heathcote, The Attorney General, Mr. Grant Duff, Sir Edward Colebrooke supported the Bill.

Mr. Kinnaird, Mr. Warner, Mr. Newdegate, Mr. Whalley, spoke against the measure.]

Masters and Servants Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Cobbett*, Bill to alter and amend the Law relating to contracts of service between Master and Servant, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Cobbett and Mr. Cox :—Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 232.]

House adjourned at half past Three o'clock.

LORDS, FRIDAY, JULY 22.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report* —Highways Act Amendment* (No. 227); Railway Companies Powers* (No. 229); Thames Conservancy* (No. 226).

PUBLIC BILLS — *First Reading* — Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension* (No. 231); Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues* (No. 232); Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan)* (No. 233); Contagious Diseases* (No. 234); Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)* (No. 235); Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* (No. 236); Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* (No. 237); Corn Accounts and Returns* (No. 238); Poor Removal* (No. 239); Westminster Bridge Traffic* (No. 240); Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment* (No. 241).

Second Reading — Harwich Harbour Act Amendment* (No. 210); Bank Notes, &c. Signature* (No. 217); Bleaching and Dyeing Works Act Extension* (No. 213); Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000)* (No. 224).

Committee—Railways Construction Facilities* (No. 222); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* (No. 214); Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* (No. 218); Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. (No. 219); Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex)* (No. 220); Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal* (No. 212); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* (No. 211).

MINUTES—*continued.*

Report—Highways Act Amendment * (No. 207); Railway Companies Powers * (No. 121); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* (No. 214); Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* (No. 218); Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. (No. 219); Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex)* (No. 220); Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal* (No. 212); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* (No. 211).

Third Reading — Accidents Compensation Act Amendment * (No. 158); Burials Registration * (No. 144); College of Physicians * (No. 114); Inclosure (No. 2)* (No. 177); Trespass (Ireland)* (No. 202); Militia Pay *; Sale of Gas (Scotland)* (No. 152); Naval Discipline * (No. 205) [H.L.]; Local Government Act (1858) Amendment * (No. 190).

MIDDLE CLASS SCHOOLS — Petitions, Lord Brougham; Observations, Earl Granville 1877

REVIVAL OF THE HOLY ALLIANCE—Observations, Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe, 1879; Reply, Earl Russell 1887

BISHOPRIC OF CORNWALL— 1896

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Copy of Correspondence between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Sir George Grey in reference to the Formation of a Bishopric of Cornwall."—(*Earl Nelson*) 1896

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c., Bill (No. 199)—

House in Committee (according to Order): — Bill *reported* without Amendment 1897

Clause 2 (Penalty for placing Poisoned Flesh in Fields, &c.)

Moved to leave out from Clause 2, line 14 ("any Poison or.") — (*Lord Wodehouse.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill?" Their Lordships *divided;* Contents 15, Not-Contents 17; Majority 2.

Motion *agreed to*:—List of Contents and Not-Contents 1897

Page 1, Clause 2, Line 14, after ("Meat") *moved* to insert ("or other Animal matter.")—(*The Marquess of Clanricarde.*)

Question, "Whether the said Words shall be there inserted?" — their Lordships *divided;* Contents 14, Not-Contents 18; Majority 4.

Motion *negatived*:—List of Contents and Not-Contents 1898

After short debate, Amendment *negatived.*

Amendments made; Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow*, and to be *printed* as amended. (No. 243.)

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS AND OFFICE OF THE GENTLEMAN USHER OF THE BLACK ROD—

Select Committee *appointed*:* The Lords following were named of the Committee; the Committee to meet on *Tuesday* next, at Three o'clock: —Ld. Chancellor, Ld. President, D. Richmond, M. Lansdowne, M. Salisbury, M. Bath, E. Devon, E. Carnarvon, E. Malmesbury, E. Chichester, Ld. Chamberlain, V. Eversley, L. Willoughby de Eresby, L. Colville of Culross, L. Ponsonby, L. Foley, L. Redesdale, L. Colchester, L. Wynford, L. Cranworth, L. Chelmsford.

House adjourned at a quarter before Eight o'clock.

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JULY 22.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report* —Bankruptcy Act.

PUBLIC BILLS — *First Reading* — Naval Discipline* [Bill 233] (*Lords*).

Second Reading—Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia)* [Bill 231].

Committee — Cranbourne Street (*re-committed*)* [Bill 154]; Defence Act Amendment* [Bill 223]; Indian Medical Service [Bill 213].

Report — Cranbourne Street (*re-committed*)* [Bill 154]; Defence Act Amendment * [Bill 223].

Considered as amended — Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* [Bill 218].

Third Reading—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*, and *passed;* Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)* [Bill 226], and *passed;* Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* [Bill 211], and *passed;* Poor Removal * [Bill 222], and *passed;* Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment * [Bill 225], and *passed.*

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

Indian Medical Service Bill [Bill 213]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [21st July], "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration."

Question again put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* 1899

Clause (Any person, being a natural born subject of Her Majesty, who may be desirous of being appointed an assistant surgeon in the said forces, shall be admitted to be examined as a candidate for such appointment,)—(*Mr. Hennessy,*)—*brought up*, and read 1°.

After short debate, Motion made, and Question put, "That the Clause be now read a second time:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 11, Noes 31; Majority 20:—Bill to be read 3° on *Monday* next.

SPAIN AND PERU—THE CHINCHA ISLANDS—Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. Layard 1902

VANCOUVER'S ISLAND—Question, Mr. Arthur Mills Answer, Mr. Cardwell .. 1903

ARMY—THE ARMSTRONG GUNS IN NEW ZEALAND—Question, Mr. Bernal Osborne; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1904

TURKEY—PRINCE COUZA AND THE PORTE—Questions, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Baillie Cochrane, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Layard 1904

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE—KAFFIR WAR—Question, Mr. Warner; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 1905

THE WINE LICENSING SYSTEM—Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, Sir George Grey 1906

WAR IN NEW ZEALAND—Question, Mr. Arthur Mills; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 1906

ADJOURNMENT—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till Monday next."

GOVERNMENT MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS—Resolutions of Mr. Cobden .. 1907

Moved, "That the recent great extension of Government manufacturing establishments calls for the attention of the Government. That it is expedient that steps be forthwith taken to place each separate establishment as nearly as possible on the footing of a private manufacturing concern or a public company, by taking a valuation of the fixed and floating capital employed, including the value of the land; and that upon this basis there be an annual stock taking; when, after making all the customary deductions for depreciation of buildings, machinery, and plant, interest of capital, rates and taxes, and other charges, such a price be charged to the Government Departments for articles supplied as shall preserve the capital intact, and that these accounts, with a balance-sheet, be laid annually on the table of this House."—(*Mr. Cobden*) 1907

Long debate thereon:—[Subject dropped].

CASE OF MR. O'MALLEY IRWIN—Observations, Sir FitzRoy Kelly; Reply, The Attorney General 1976

Question put, and *agreed to.*

House adjourned at Two o'clock.

LORDS, SATURDAY, JULY 23.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report*—Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 151).

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Contagious Diseases* (No. 234); Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* (No. 236); Corn Accounts and Returns* (No. 238); Westminster Bridge Traffic* (No. 240); Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment* (No. 241); Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* (No. 215).

Committee—Highways Act Amendment* (Nos. 227 & 228); Railway Companies Powers* (No. 230); Thames Conservancy* (No. 226); Bank Notes, &c., Signature* (No. 217); Bleaching and Dyeing Works Act Extension* (No. 213); Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000)* (No. 224).

Report—Bank Notes, &c., Signature* (No. 217); Bleaching and Dyeing Works Act Extension* (No. 213); Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000)* (No. 224).

Third Reading—Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c.* (No. 219); Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex)* (No. 244), and *passed.*

Their Lordships met; and having gone through the business on the Paper without debate,

House adjourned at half past Two o'clock.

LORDS, MONDAY, JULY 25.

MINUTES.] — *Sat First in Parliament* — The Viscount Gordon, after the Death of his Father.

Select Committee — *Report* — Judgments, &c., Law Amendment (No. 194); Local Government Supplemental (No. 2) (No. 190).

Public Bills — *First Reading* — Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* (No. 247).

Second Reading—Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension* (No. 231); Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues* (No. 232); Consolidated Fund Appropriation (£15,000,000)* (No. 54); New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan) (No. 233); Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2) (No. 235); Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) (No. 237); Poor Removal (No. 239); Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* (No. 216); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental* (No. 221); West Indian Incumbered Estates Act Amendment* (No. 225).

Committee — Expiring Laws Continuance* (No. 208); Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation* (No. 151); Contagious Diseases* (No. 234); Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* (No. 236); Corn Accounts and Returns* (No. 238); Westminster Bridge Traffic* (No. 240); Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment* (No. 241).

Report— Harwich Harbour Act Amendment* (No. 210); Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* (No. 215); Judgments, &c., Law Amendment* (No. 194); Railway Companies Powers* (No. 230); Contagious Diseases* (No. 234); Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* (No. 236); Corn Accounts and Returns* (No. 238); Westminster Bridge Traffic* (No. 240); Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment* (No. 241); Thames Conservancy* (No. 226); Railways Construction Facilities* (No. 222).

Third Reading — Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* (No. 214); Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* (No. 218); Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal* (No. 212); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* (No. 211); Bank Notes, &c., Signature* (No. 217); Bleaching and Dyeing Works Act Extension* (No. 242) Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000)* (No. 224), and *passed.*

Royal Assents—Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 56]; Valuation of Rateable Property (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 52]; Penal Servitude Acts Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 47]; India Office [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 51]; Summary Procedure (Scotland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 53]; Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 54]; Factory Acts Extension [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 48]; Indemnity [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 49]; India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 50]; Street Music (Metropolis) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 55]; Lunacy (Scotland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 59]; Admiralty Lands and Works [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 57]; Pilotage Order Confirmation [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 58]; Public and Refreshment Houses [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 64]; Clerks of the Peace Removal [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 65]; Militia Ballots Suspension [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 63]; College of Physicians [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 60]; Trespass (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 67]; Militia Pay [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 69]; Local Government Act (1858) Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 68]; Cathedral Minor Corporations [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 70]; Railways (Ireland) Acts Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 71]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 72]; Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 61]; Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 62]; Inclosure (No. 2) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 66].

Denmark—Motion for an Address—

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Copies of any recent Correspondence relating to the Treaties between Denmark and Great Britain."—(*Lord Campbell*) 1979

After short debate, Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan) Bill (No. 233)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord President*) .. 1986

After debate, Motion *agreed to* :—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill (No. 235)—

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) .. 1999

After short debate, Amendment *moved* to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months"):—Question, That ("now") stand Part of the Motion? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative.*

Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed:* The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Select Committee *nominated:* The Lord Steward (Chairman), The Earl of Devon, The Earl of Romney, The Earl of Ducie, The Lord Silchester, *agreed to.*

Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) Bill (No. 237)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Lord President*) .. 2001

After short debate, Motion *agreed to* :—Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

Poor Removal Bill (No. 239)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Lord Wodehouse*) .. 2002

After short debate, Motion *agreed to* :—Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

PEERS ROBING ROOM — THE FRESCOES IN THE NEW HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT—MR. HERBERT, R.A.—Motion for

Copy of the Report of the Commissioners lately appointed on the Fresco Paintings in the Palace of Westminster, and of a Letter addressed by Lord Redesdale to those Commissioners in relation to the continued Occupation of the Peers Robing Room for the purpose of such Paintings by which the Peers attending certain Committees have been so long subjected to great Inconvenience.—(*Lord Redesdale*) 2002

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

House adjourned at half past Eight o'clock.

COMMONS, MONDAY, JULY 25.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Naval Discipline * [Bill 233].
Committee—Poor Relief (Metropolis) [Bill 224]; Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia) [Bill 231], *adjourned.*
Report—Poor Relief (Metropolis) [Bill 224].
Considered as amended—Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Act Amendment * [Bill 210].
Third Reading — Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) [Bill 218]; Indian Medical Service [Bill 213], *negatived;* Defence Act Amendment * [Bill 223]; Cranbourne Street * [Bill 154], and *passed.*
Withdrawn—Titles (Ireland)* [Bill 244].

STANDING ORDERS REVISION—

Report from Select Committee read; Standing Orders, as revised by the Committee, read 2005

Standing Order No. 7, as amended by the Committee, read

"7. The Committee on every opposed Railway and Canal Bill, or Group of Railway and Canal Bills, shall be composed of three Members not locally or otherwise interested in the Bill or Bills referred to them; the Chairman to be appointed by the General Committee on Railway and Canal Bills, and two other Members by the Committee of Selection."

After short debate, Amendment proposed, in line 2, to leave out the word "three," in order to insert the word "five,"—(*Mr. Henry Baillie,*)—instead thereof 2008

Question proposed, "That the word 'three' stand part of the Standing Order."

After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 67, Noes 74; Majority 7.

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, That the word "five" be inserted,—(*Mr. H. Baillie*),—instead thereof.

After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 55, Noes 87; Majority 32.

Motion made, and Question proposed, That the word "four" be inserted, instead thereof.

After short debate, Whereupon Motion made, and Question put, "That the word 'four' be inserted,"—(*Colonel Wilson Patten*),—instead thereof:—The House *divided;* Ayes 98, Noes 50; Majority 48.

Further Consideration of Standing Order, No. 7, *postponed* till *To-morrow,* at Six of the clock.

Standing Order, No. 8, as amended by the Committee, and No. 9, as revised by the Committee read

"8. The Committee on every opposed Private Bill (not being a Railway, Canal, or Divorce Bill), or Group of Bills, shall be composed of a Chairman and two Members not locally or otherwise interested in the Bill or Bills referred to them, to be appointed by the Committee of Selection."

STANDING ORDERS REVISION—*continued.*

"9. The Committee on every unopposed Private Bill (not being a Railway, Canal, or Divorce Bill) shall, if the same shall have originated in this House, be composed of the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, who shall be ex officio Chairman of every such Committee, together with one of the Members ordered to prepare and bring in the Bill, and one other Member not locally or otherwise interested therein, such Members to be appointed by the Committee of Selection, and shall, if such Bill shall have been brought from the House of Lords, be composed of the Chairman as aforesaid, and two other Members, to be appointed by the Committee of Selection, of whom one at least shall not be locally or otherwise interested in the Bill; and the Chairman and one other Member of such Committee shall be the quorum thereof."

After short debate, Further Consideration thereof, and of the Report of the Select Committee, *postponed* till *To-morrow,* at Six of the clock.

PARK LANE—Question, Sir John Shelley; Answer, Mr. Cowper .. 2015

THE STANDARDS OF WEIGHT AND MEASURE—Question, Mr. Doulton; Answer, Mr. Peel 2015

NAVY — GREENWICH HOSPITAL — Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 2016

PAY AND CLOTHING OF THE POLICE—Question, Mr. Howes; Answer, Mr. Peel .. 2017

PASSPORTS IN FRANCE—Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Layard .. 2017

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE—BRITISH KAFFRARIA — Question, Mr. Arthur Mills; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 2018

UNITED STATES—THE CIVIL WAR — Question, Mr. W. S. Lindsay; Answer, Viscount Palmerston 2018

ORDER OF ST. MICHAEL AND ST. GEORGE — Question, Lord Ernest Bruce; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 2019

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE—THE KAFFIR WAR — Question, Lord Robert Cecil; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 2019

ARMY—STAMP DUTY ON COMMISSIONS — Question, Lord Hotham; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 2020

CASE OF MR. O'MALLEY IRWIN — Question, Mr. Hennessy; Answers, Sir Robert Peel, Sir George Grey 2020

ARMY—THE ARMSTRONG GUN FACTORY AT WOOLWICH—Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 2021

Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) Bill [Bill 218]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time" 2022

After debate, Bill read 3° and *passed.*

Indian Medical Service Bill [Bill 213]—

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Viscount Palmerston*) 2034

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the words "That the," to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "said Order be discharged,"—(*Mr. Hennessy,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 44, Noes 46; Majority 2:—Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Order for Third Reading *discharged.*

Poor Relief (Metropolis) Bill [Bill 224]—

Order for Committee read:—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. C. P. Villiers*) .. 2039

Poor Relief (Metropolis) Bill—*continued.*

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day month, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie,*)—instead thereof 2043

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *considered* in Committee .. 2056

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow* at One of the clock.

Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia) Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 231]—

Order for Committee read:—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" 2056

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day month, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. James White,*)—instead thereof 2058

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After debate, Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

Education—Inspectors' Reports—Resolution of Viscount Palmerston .. 2067

"That this House, having considered the Report of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the practice of the Committee of Council on Education with respect to the Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, is of opinion that the Resolution passed on the 12th day of April last, with reference to such Reports, ought to be rescinded, and the said Resolution is hereby rescinded."—(*Viscount Palmerston.*) ... 2067

After long debate, Resolution *agreed to.*

Circassians (Turkey)—Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copy of further Papers showing what steps are being taken by the Turkish Government relating to the Immigration of Circassians into Turkey."—(*Mr. Henry Seymour*) 2082

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

House adjourned at half after One o'clock.

LORDS, TUESDAY, JULY 26.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Cranbourne Street* (No. 252); Poor Relief (Metropolis)* (No. 253).

Second Reading—Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* (No. 247); Limited Penalties* (No. 97).

Committee—Weights and Measures (Metric System)* (No. 164); Harwich Harbour Act Amendment* (No. 210); Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* (No. 215); Judgments, &c., Law Amendment (Nos. 250 & 251); Local Government Supplemental (No. 2)* (No. 190); Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension* (No. 231); Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues* (No. 232); Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan)* (No. 233); Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* (No. 237); Poor Removal* (No. 239); Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* (No. 216); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental* (No. 221); West Indian Incumbered Estates Acts Amendment* (No. 225).

Report—Harwich Harbour Act Amendment* (No. 210); Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* (No. 215); Judgments, &c., Law Amendment (Nos. 250 & 251); Local Government Supplemental (No. 2)* (No. 190); Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension* (No. 231); Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues* (No. 232); Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan)* (No. 233); Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* (No. 237); Poor Removal* (No. 239); Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* (No. 216); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental* (No. 221); West Indian Incumbered Estates Acts Amendment* (No. 225); Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation* (No. 151).

Third Reading—Metropolitan District Railways*, Judgments, &c., Law Amendment (Nos. 250 & 251); Expiring Laws Continuance* (No. 208); Highways Act Amendment* (Nos. 227 & 228); Railway Companies Powers* (Nos. 229 & 230); Contagious Diseases* (No. 234); Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* (No. 236); Corn Accounts and Returns* (No. 238); Westminster Bridge Traffic* (No. 240); Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment* (No. 241); Thames Conservancy* (No. 226); Railways Construction Facilities* (No. 222).

Judgments, &c., Law Amendment Bill (Nos. 250 and 251)—

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.
After short debate, House in Committee accordingly 2084

An Amendment made; Standing Orders, Nos. 37 and 38 *considered*, and *dispensed with*; Amendment *reported.*
Bill read 3^{a}, with the Amendment, and *passed,* and sent to the Commons.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—Observations, The Earl of Ellenborough; Reply, Earl Russell 2084

Observations, Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe 2097

POLICE (IRELAND)—Question, The Earl of Leitrim; Answer, Earl Granville .. 2100

PRIVATE BILLS—Order of the Day for the Lords to be summoned, read*:—
Moved, "That the Standing Orders relating to Private Bills be dispensed with for the Remainder of the Session."—(*The Chairman of Committees*) .. 2101

Motion *agreed to.*

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock.

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JULY 26.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS — *Committee*— Naval Discipline * [Bill 233].
Report—Naval Discipline * [Bill 233].
Considered as amended — Poor Relief (Metropolis) [Bill 224].
Third Reading — Poor Relief (Metropolis) [Bill 224]; Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment * [Bill 210].
Withdrawn — Masters and Servants * [Bill 232].

The House met at One of the clock.

Poor Relief (Metropolis) Bill [Bill 224]—

Bill, as amended, *considered* 2101

After short debate, Amendments made; to be now read 3^{o}; read 3^{o}, and *passed.*

BRADFORD RESERVOIRS—Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, Sir George Grey .. 2102

SIERRA LEONE—CASE OF MR. FITZJAMES—Question, Mr. Roebuck; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 2103

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."
After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

THE DISTURBANCES IN NEW ZEALAND—Question, Mr. Arthur Mills; Answer, Mr. Cardwell 2104

FLOGGING GAROTTERS—Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, Sir George Grey .. 2105

PUBLIC RECORDS (IRELAND) COMMISSION—Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, Mr. Peel 2105

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Question, Mr. Richard Hodgson; Answer, Sir George Grey; Observations, Mr. Malins, and other hon. Members .. 2105

CASE OF MR. O'MALLEY IRWIN—*Moved,*
"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to grant Her Fiat to the Petition of Right of George O'Malley Irwin, esquire, or to satisfy his claims without suit."—(*Mr. Hennessy*) 2107

After long debate, Question put, and *negatived.*

House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at Nine o'clock.

LORDS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 27.

Page

MINUTES.] — Public Bills—*Select Committee* — Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)* (No. 235).
Second Reading — Poor Relief (Metropolis) (No. 253); Cranbourne Street* (No. 252).
Committee—Limited Penalties* (No. 97).
Report — Weights and Measures (Metric System)* (No. 164); Limited Penalties* (No. 97.)
Third Reading — Harwich Harbour Act Amendment* (No. 210), and *passed;* Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* (No. 215), and *passed;* Local Government Supplemental (No. 2)* (No. 190), and *passed;* Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension* (No. 231), and *passed;* Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues* (No. 232), and *passed;* Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*, and *passed;* New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan)* (No. 233), and *passed;* Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* (No. 237), and *passed;* Poor Removal* (No. 239), and *passed;* Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation* (No. 151), and *passed;* Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* (No. 216), and *passed;* Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental* (No. 221), and *passed;* West Indian Incumbered Estates Acts Amendment* (No. 225), and *passed;* Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* (No. 247), and *passed.*

Poor Relief (Metropolis) Bill (No. 253)—

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Wodehouse*) .. 2127

After short debate, Amendment *moved* to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months.")—(*Lord Redesdale*) 2129

After further short debate, Question, That ("now") stand Part of the Motion? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative*

Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow;* and Standing Orders Nos. 37 and 38 to be considered in order to their being dispensed with.

House adjourned at Three o'clock.

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 27.

MINUTES.] — Public Bills — *Ordered* — Titles (Ireland) (No. 2)*; Courts of Conciliation*; Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment.*
First Reading — Courts of Conciliation* [Bill 242]; Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment* [Bill 243]; Titles (Ireland) (No. 2)* [Bill 244].
Considered as amended—Naval Discipline* [Bill 233.]
Third Reading—Naval Discipline* [Bill 233]
Withdrawn—Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia)* [Bill 231].

Standing Orders Revision—Report—

Standing Orders, Nos. 7, 8, and 9, and Report of the Select Committee, *further considered* 2131

After short debate, Standing Order, No. 7, as amended, *agreed to.*

Several Standing Orders amended, and *agreed to,* as far as 86 B.

Moved, The adoption of a new Standing Order (86 B),

"The Chairman of Ways and Means, with not less than Three other persons, who shall be appointed by Mr. Speaker for such period as he shall think fit, shall be Referees of the House on Private Bills; such Referees to form one or more Courts; Two at least to be required to constitute each Court: provided that the Chairman of any Second Court shall be a Member of this House."—(*Colonel Wilson Patten*) 2133

Amendment proposed, after "persons," to insert "not being Members of this House."—(*Mr. Massey*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

After short debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned"—(*Mr. Roebuck*) 2138

After further debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 14, Noes 51; Majority 37.

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *negatived.*

Proviso—*Moved,* "And provided that no such Referee, if he be a Member of this House, shall receive any salary."—(*Mr. Darby Griffith*) .. 2145

After short debate, Proviso *agreed to.*

Standing Order 86 B *agreed to.*

STANDING ORDERS REVISION—*continued.*

Standing Order 86 C—*Moved,* "That the Chairman of Ways and Means should be Chairman of the Referees."—(*Colonel Wilson Patten.*)

After short debate, the Order put, and *negatived.*

Order 86 D (Rules of Practice and Procedure to be made by Chairman of Ways and Means) 2146

After short debate, Order 86 D, as amended, *agreed to.*

Order 86 E,

"The Referees shall inquire into all or any of the following matters as to which parties petitioning against any Bill desire to be heard in opposition, viz.—1. In the case of Bills of the Second Class for authorizing the construction of Works, the engineering details of the undertaking, the efficiency of the Works for the proposed object, and the sufficiency of the estimate for executing the same ; 2. In the case of Bills for authorizing a new line of railway, the statistics of the traffic proposed to be accommodated ; 3. In the case of Waterworks Bills, the nature and amount of the existing and the proposed source of supply, the quality of the water in each case, and the provisions as to storage reservoirs ; 4. In the case of Gas Bills, the quality of the gas, the existing supply and its price, the amount of pressure, the cost of production, and the modes of testing the purity and illuminating power of the gas" 2148

Moved, The postponement of Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4.—(*Sir Morton Peto.*)

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

No. 2 *struck out.*

Moved, The adoption of Standing Order, 86 F,

"So soon as the inquiry into the matters referred to them upon any Bill has been completed, the Referees shall make their Report upon the same to the House, and the Report shall thereupon stand referred to the Select Committee on the Bill. No further evidence shall be taken by the Committee to prove or disprove any of the facts reported by the Referees." —(*Colonel Wilson Patten*) 2150

Moved, The insertion, after the word "House," of the words "stating the facts on which their opinion is founded."—(*Mr. Milner Gibson.*)

After short debate, Amendment *agreed to.*

Question put, That the Order as amended, be *agreed to.*

Standing Order, as amended, *agreed to.*

Standing Order 86 G—

"The Select Committee to which any Bill has been referred may, subject to the approval of the Chairman of Ways and Means, refer any question arising in the course of their inquiry which they may deem suitable to be so referred to the Referees for their decision ; such question to be stated in writing, and signed by the Chairman of the Committee. The Referees, so soon as their inquiry has been completed, to return the question, with their decision certified thereon, to the Chairman."—(*Colonel Wilson Patten*) ... 2151

Moved, "An Amendment limiting the questions to be so referred to questions of fact."—(*Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald.*)

After short debate, Amendment *negatived.*

Standing Order 86 G *agreed to.*

Orders 113 and 113 A *struck out.*

Standing Order in lieu of 113 A (Absence of Members by Death or otherwise to be reported)—

"If, at any time after the Committee on a Bill shall have been formed, a quorum of Members required by the Standing Orders cannot attend in consequence of any of the Members who shall have duly qualified to serve on such Committee having become incompetent to continue such service by having been placed on an Election Committee, or by death, or otherwise, the Chairman shall report the circumstances of the case to the House in order that such measures may be taken by the House, as shall enable the Members still remaining on the Committee to proceed with the business referred to such Committee, or as the emergency of the case may require"

—put, and *agreed to* 2152

Standing Order 143,

Moved, To insert after the word "railway," in line 13 of 48, the following words : —

"The amounts subscribed and paid by the persons named and described in the schedule to the Bill, the *bona fides* of such subscription, and the correctness of the names, residences, and description of the subscribers."—(*Mr. Scourfield*) 2152

After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Standing Order *agreed to.*

STANDING ORDERS REVISION—*continued.*

Moved, That the following be a new Order—

"That on every Private Bill to be considered by a Committee, all Petitions presented by the Promoters, Opponents, or other parties petitioning on matters connected with such Bill be printed, and a copy of every Petition be placed in the hands of the Members of the Committee on its assembling."—(*Mr. Torrens*) 2153

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Standing Orders relating to Private Bills *repealed.*

Ordered, That the several Orders, as reported by the Committee and amended by this House, be the Standing Orders of this House relating to Private Bills, and be *printed.* [No. 545.]

Thames Conservancy Bill [Bill 240]—

Lords Amendments *considered.*

Amendments *agreed to,* as far as page 23, line 32.

Page 23, line 32, the next Amendment, being read a second time; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with The Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Ayrton*) 2153

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Other Amendments *agreed to,* as far as Clause 75.

Clause 75, the last Amendment, being read a second time; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with The Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Locke*) 2154

After short debate, Motion, by leave *withdrawn* :—Amendment *agreed to.*

Titles (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Attorney General for Ireland,* Bill for the Recording of Titles in Ireland, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Attorney General for Ireland and Sir Robert Peel :—Bill *presented,* and read 1°. * [Bill 244.]

Courts of Conciliation Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie,* Bill to enable Persons between whom Disputes have arisen to settle their Differences without resorting to Litigation, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie and Mr. Hardcastle :—Bill *presented,* and read 1°. * [Bill 242.]

Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment Bill—

On Motion of *Mr. Baring,* Bill to amend "The Salmon Fishery Act, 1861," *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Baring and Sir George Grey :—Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 243.]

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock.

LORDS, THURSDAY, JULY 28.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS — *Committee*—Poor Relief (Metropolis)* (No. 253).
Report—Poor Relief (Metropolis)* (No. 253).
Third Reading—Poor Relief (Metropolis)* (No. 253) : Weights and Measures (Metric System)* (No. 164); Limited Penalties* (No. 97); Cranbourne Street* (No. 252).

THE PROROGATION—Question, Lord Chelmsford; Answer, The Lord Chancellor 2156

Railway Companies Powers Bill—

Returned from the Commons, with some of the Amendments, *agreed to;* some *agreed to* with Amendments; and some *disagreed to,* for which Disagreement the Commons have assigned Reasons.

Moved, "That the Commons Reasons for disagreeing to certain of the Amendments made by the Lords, and Commons Amendments to Lords Amendments, be now considered."—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) .. 2156

After short debate, An Amendment *moved* to leave out from ("That") to the End of the Motion for the Purpose of inserting ("the Consideration of the Commons Reasons and Amendments be adjourned till To-morrow, and that the Reasons and Amendments be printed."—(*Lord Redesdale*) .. 2156

After short debate, Question, Whether to agree to the said Amendment? Their Lordships *divided;* Contents 8, Not-Contents 18 : Majority 10 :—*Resolved* in the *Negative.*

List of Contents and Not-Contents 2157

RAILWAY COMPANIES POWERS BILL—*continued.*

Commons Reasons for disagreeing to certain of the Amendments made by the Lords *considered: Moved,* Not to insist on the said Amendments. On Question, Whether to insist? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative:* Commons Amendments *considered;* some *agreed to,* the rest *disagreed to,* and a Committee appointed to prepare Reasons to be offered to the Commons for the Lords insisting on their Amendments, and disagreeing to certain of the Amendments made by the Commons to the said Bill; the Committee to meet *forthwith:* Report from Committee of a Reason prepared by them: read, and *agreed to;* and a Message sent to the Commons to return the said Bill, with the Reason.

Railways Construction Facilities Bill—

Commons Reasons for disagreeing to certain of the Amendments made by the Lords, and Commons Amendment to Lords Amendments, *considered* (on Motion): *Moved,* Not to insist on the said Amendments. On Question, Whether to insist? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative:* Commons Amendment *considered,* and *disagreed to,* and a Committee appointed to prepare Reasons to be offered to the Commons for the Lords insisting on their Amendments, and disagreeing to the Amendment made by the Commons to the said Bill, the Committee to meet *forthwith:* Report from Committee of a Reason prepared by them; read, and *agreed to;* and a Message sent to the Commons to return the said Bill, with the Reason.

Railway Companies Powers Bill—

Returned from the Commons, with their Disagreement to the Amendments made by the Lords, *not insisted on,* and with the Amendments made by the Commons to the Amendments made by the Lords, to which the Lords have disagreed, *not insisted on.*

Railways Construction Facilities Bill—

Returned from the Commons, with their Disagreement to the Amendments made by the Lords *not insisted on,* and with the Amendment made by the Commons to the Amendments made by the Lords, to which the Lords have disagreed, *not insisted on.*

House adjourned at a quarter before Seven o'clock.

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JULY 28.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILL—*Withdrawn*—Partnership Law Amendment* [Bill 68].

THE NEW CANON OF WESTMINSTER—Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring 2158

INDIA—THE INDIAN ARMY—Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir Charles Wood 2158

AFFAIRS OF MEXICO—Question, Mr. Kinglake; Answer, Mr. Layard .. 2159

Railways Construction Facilities Bill—

Lords Amendments *considered;* several *agreed to;* several *disagreed to;* several amended, and *agreed to.*

Committee *appointed**

"To draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to the Amendments to which this House hath disagreed:"—Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Hutt, Sir William Dunbar, Lord Clarence Paget, and Mr. Adair:—To withdraw immediately:—Three to be the quorum.

EMIGRATION (AMERICA)—Motion for an Address for

"Copy of Papers on the subject of Emigration to the United States of America, in reference to the prolongation of the war now raging in that country."—(*Lord Edward Howard*) 2161

Motion *agreed to.*

House adjourned at a quarter before Seven o'clock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LORDS, FRIDAY, JULY 29.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report*—On Library; on Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod.

PUBLIC BILLS — *Royal Assents* — Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 73]
Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 74]
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 109]
Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 94]
Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 75]
Registration of Deeds (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 76]
Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 77]
Turnpike Trusts Arrangements [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 79]
Bank Notes, &c., Signature [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 78]
Defence Act Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 89]
Accidents Compensation Act Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 95]
Burials Registration [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 97]
Bleaching and Dyeing Works Act Extension [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 98]
Sale of Gas (Scotland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 96]
Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 100]
Expiring Laws Continuance [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 84]
Bank Post Bills (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 86]
Corn Accounts and Returns [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 87]
Westminster Bridge Traffic [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 88]
Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 56]
Naval and Victualling Stores [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 91]
Public Schools [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 92]
Civil Bill Courts (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 99]
Harwich Harbour Act Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 102]
Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 103]
Local Government Supplemental (No. 2) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 83]
Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 80]
Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 81]
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 82]
Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 104]
Poor Removal [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 105]
Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 106]
Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 72]
West Indian Incumbered Estates Acts Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 108]
Poor Relief (Metropolis) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 116]
Weights and Measures (Metric System) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 117]
Limited Penalties [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 110]
Cranbourne Street [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 111]
Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 118]
Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 115]
Naval Discipline [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 119]
Judgments, &c., Law Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 112]
Highways Act Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 101]
Railway Companies Powers [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 120]
Railways Construction Facilities [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 121]
Contagious Diseases [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 85]
Thames Conservancy [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 113]
Improvement of Land Act, 1864 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 114]
Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 93].

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—Speech of the Lords Commissioners—

The PARLIAMENT was this day Prorogued by Commission.

The LORDS COMMISSIONERS—namely, The LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord Westbury); The LORD STEWARD OF THE HOUSEHOLD (The Earl of St. Germans); The EARL DE GREY and RIPON (One of the Principal Secretaries of State); The LORD CHAMBERLAIN OF THE HOUSEHOLD (The Viscount Sidney); and The LORD WENSLEYDALE—being in their robes, and seated on a Form placed between the Throne and the Woolsack; and the COMMONS being come with their Speaker, the ROYAL ASSENT was given to several Bills.

Then THE LORD CHANCELLOR *delivered* the SPEECH of the LORDS COMMISSIONERS, as follows: —

" *My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

" WE are commanded by Her Majesty to release you from further Attendance in Parliament, and at the same Time to convey to you Her Majesty's Acknowledgments for the Zeal and Assiduity with which you have applied yourselves to the Discharge of your Duties during the Session of Parliament now brought to a Close.

" HER Majesty commands us to inform you that She greatly regrets that the Endeavours which She made, in concert with The Emperor of the *French*, The Emperor of *Russia*, and The King of *Sweden*, to bring about a Reconciliation between the *German* Powers and The

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT—Speech of the Lords Commissioners—*continued.*

King of *Denmark,* were not successful, and that the Hostilities which had been suspended (during the Negotiations) were again resumed. Her Majesty trusts, however, that the Negotiations which have been opened between the Belligerents, may restore Peace to the North of *Europe.*

"Her Majesty, having addressed Herself to the Powers who were contracting Parties to the Treaty by which the *Ionian* Republic was placed under the Protectorate of *Great Britain,* and having obtained their Consent to the Annexation of that Republic to the Kingdom of *Greece,* and the States of the *Ionian* Republic having agreed thereto, the Republic of the Seven Islands has been formally united to the Kingdom of *Greece,* and Her Majesty trusts that the Union so made, will conduce to the Welfare and Prosperity of all the Subjects of His Majesty The King of the *Hellenes.*

"Her Majesty's Relations with The Emperor of *China* continue to be friendly, and the Commerce of Her Subjects with the *Chinese* Empire is increasing.

"Her Majesty has been engaged in concert with The Emperor of *Austria,* The Emperor of the *French,* The King of *Prussia,* and The Emperor of *Russia,* in an Endeavour to bring to Effect an amicable Arrangement of Differences which had arisen between the Hospodar of *Moldo-Wallachia* and his Suzerain The Sultan. Her Majesty has the Satisfaction to inform you that this Endeavour has been successful.

"Her Majesty deeply laments that the Civil War in *North America* has not been brought to a Close. Her Majesty will continue to observe a strict Neutrality between the Belligerents, and would rejoice at a friendly Reconciliation between the Contending Parties.

"*Gentlemen of the House of Commons,*

"Her Majesty commands us to convey to you Her warm Acknowledgments for the liberal Supplies which you have granted for the Service of the present Year, and towards the permanent Defence of Her Majesty's Dockyards and Arsenals.

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"Her Majesty has observed with Satisfaction that the Distress which the Civil War in *North America* has created in some of the Manufacturing Districts has to a great Extent abated, and Her Majesty trusts that increased Supplies of the raw Material of Industry may be expected from Countries by which it has hitherto been scantily furnished.

"The Revolt of certain Tribes in *New Zealand* has not yet been quelled, but it is satisfactory to Her Majesty to know that a large Portion of the Native Population of those Islands have taken no Part in this Revolt.

"It has been a Source of much Gratification to Her Majesty to observe the rapid Development of the Revenues of Her *East Indian* Possessions, and the general Contentment of the People inhabiting those extensive Regions.

"Her Majesty has given Her cordial Assent to many Measures of public Usefulness, the Result of your Labours during the Session now brought to a Close.

"The Act for extending to Women and Children employed in various Trades the Regulations applicable to Factories in general, will tend materially to preserve the Health and improve the Education of those on whose Behalf it was framed.

"The Act for authorizing the Grant of Government Annuities will encourage Habits of Prudence among the Working Classes, and will afford them the Means of securely investing the Results of their Industry.

"The Act for authorizing a further Advance for Public Works in some of the Manufacturing Districts will contribute to alleviate the Distress in these Districts, and will afford the Means of completing many Works of much Importance for the Health of the Population.

"The Act for giving increased Facilities for the Construction of Railways will diminish the Expenses attendant upon the Extension of those important Channels of Communication.

"It has afforded to Her Majesty the most heartfelt Satisfaction to observe the general Well-being and Contentment which prevail throughout Her Dominions, and to remark the progressive Increase and Development of the National Resources, and to find that, after sufficiently providing for the Public Service, you have been able to make a material Diminution in the Taxation of the Country.

"On returning to your respective Counties you will still have important Duties to perform, essentially connected with the linking together of the several Classes of the Community; and Her Majesty fervently prays that the Blessing of Almighty God may attend your Exertions, and guide them to the Object of Her Majesty's constant Solicitude, the Welfare and Happiness of Her People."

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JULY 29.

Page

MINUTES.—New Writ Issued—For Exeter *v.* Edward Divett, esquire, deceased.

Denmark and Germany—Schleswig-Holstein—Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answer, Viscount Palmerston 2188

Turkey—Prince Couza and the Porte—Question, Mr. Taylor; Answer, Viscount Palmerston 2189

The Volunteer Service—Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Hutt .. 2189

Case of Flogging at Sunderland — Questions, Colonel Sykes, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Sir George Grey 2190

Endowed Schools—Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, Sir George Grey .. 2191

India—Finance Accounts—Question, Mr. Torrens; Answer, Sir Charles Wood 2191

Ireland—Inauguration of the O'Connell Statue—Question, Major Stuart Knox; Answer, Viscount Palmerston 2192

The Mount St. Bernard Reformatory—Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Sir George Grey 2193

Scotch and Irish Marriage Law—Questions, Captain Archdall, Mr. Hennessy; Answers, Viscount Palmerston, Sir George Grey 2193

Denmark and Germany—The Armistice — Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Viscount Palmerston 2194

Prison Ministers Act—

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copies of any Papers concerning the Proceedings of the Middlesex Magistrates, with reference to the Prison Ministers Act."—(*Mr. Hennessy*) 2195

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Relations with Mexico—

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copies of any Papers relating to the state of our relations with Mexico."—(*Mr. Kinglake*) 2199

After short debate—

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—

Message to attend The Lords Commissioners.

The House went, and the Royal Assent was given to several Bills; And afterwards a Speech of The Lords Commissioners was delivered to both Houses of Parliament by The Lord Chancellor.

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which

The LORD CHANCELLOR said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to *Thursday* the *Thirteenth* day of *October* next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to *Thursday* the *Thirteenth* day of *October* next.

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE

Sixth Session of the *Eighteenth Parliament* of the
United Kingdom of *Great Britain* and *Ireland*,
Appointed to meet 31 May 1859, and from thence Continued till 4 February 1864, in the Twenty-seventh
Year of the Reign of

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

FOURTH VOLUME OF THE SESSION.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, June 21, 1864.

MINUTES.]—*Took the Oath*— The Bishop of Ely.

Public Bills —*First Reading*— County Constabulary Superannuation * (No. 140); Government Annuities, &c.* (No. 145); Servants Hiring (Scotland)* (No. 146); Valuation of Rateable Property (Ireland)* (No. 147).

Second Reading—Attorneys and Solicitors Remuneration, &c. [H.L.] (No. 120), and referred to a Select Committee; Vacating of Seats (House of Commons)* (No. 105); Banking Co-partnerships * (No. 113).

Committee — Summary Procedure (Scotland)* (No. 89).

Third Reading—Admiralty Lands and Works* (No. 129); Penal Servitude Acts Amendment* (No. 136); Union Assessment Committee Act Amendment * (No. 137); Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland) [H.L.] * (No. 138); Improvement of Land Act (1864) [H.L.] * (No. 122); Naval Prize Acts Repeal * (No. 78); Chain Cables and Anchors * (No. 101), and *passed*.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

Moved, That The Lord Portman do take the Chair in the Committees of the Whole House this day, in the absence of The Lord Redesdale.

Agreed to.

UNITED STATES — OUTRAGE ON A BRITISH SUBJECT BY THE FEDERAL AUTHORITIES—CASE OF MR. LEVEY.

QUESTION.

THE EARL OF DERBY: Seeing the noble Earl the Secretary for Foreign Affairs in his place, I take this opportunity of asking him the Question of which I have privately given him notice, and in regard to which I have furnished him with all the information I have received on the subject, except that contained in a private letter from the brother of the gentleman concerned, and which I shall forward to the noble Earl. If I should fall into any mistake as to the facts the noble Earl will be able to correct me. I am informed that a gentleman of the name of Levey, a British subject, and a merchant at Montreal, recently arrived in Boston by Her Majesty's packet ship *Asia.* Immediately after her arrival in the harbour she was boarded by a United States marshal who, without any warrant or process whatever, took Mr. Levey into custody. Having been removed on shore, this gentleman telegraphed to a Mr. Myers, a relative, long resident in New York, acquainting him of the circumstance of his sudden arrest; and Mr. Myers subsequently met him in custody of the United States marshal. Mr. Levey was then informed—this was Thursday, the 26th of last month—that he should be brought before the Commissary General for the purpose of examination, but he was still kept uninformed of the charge against him. His papers were taken from him, and he was detained in the prison of New York for a period of ten days, without having been informed of the charge that was against him. At the expiration of that time his papers were restored to him, and he was liberated without the slightest explanation or apology, and up to the present moment he has no idea whatever who his accusers were or of the reason of his arrest. So far from this gentleman having furnished any grounds for suspicion against him by the United States Government, I am informed that the predilections of this Montreal merchant have been always in favour of the Federal Government: whether they are so still, after the treatment which he has received, I cannot pretend to say; but Mr. Levey was, at all events, a gentleman against whom not the slightest charge has ever been brought, and yet upon his arrival in the harbour of Boston he was arrested and confined in a prison for ten days, and then ordered to quit his prison without offer of the slightest reparation or apology. I understand that representations have been made on his behalf to Her Majesty's representative at Washington. I wish to ask the noble Earl whether Her Majesty's Government have been informed of these facts, and, if so, whether the noble Earl has taken any steps to procure reparation or an apology, if they have not been already offered spontaneously by the Government of Washington? Although the inhabitants of the Northern States, in the prosecution of the unhappy and destructive war which is now raging in America, might be willing to sacrifice their own liberties, and subject themselves to a despotic rule, I think that we have a right to insist that our fellow-subjects, when travelling upon their own peaceable and lawful business in the United States, shall not be subjected to such illegal and unconstitutional proceedings as those to which I have called attention — that they shall have the protection of the law, and that such loyal and respectable merchants as Mr. Levey shall not be exposed to the humiliation of arrest and the pain of imprisonment—not to speak of the serious loss which a detention for a period of ten days must necessarily impose upon a merchant travelling about in the ordinary prosecution of his business. I do not mean to say that in the present instance any very serious loss has been sustained; but I think it is a case deserving of the attention of Her Majesty's Government, because if such cases are allowed to pass by unnoticed and disregarded, it is impossible to say to what extent these outrages on British subjects may be perpetrated by the Federal Government.

Earl RUSSELL said, that in the latest despatches from Lord Lyons there was no reference to the case of Mr. Levey. It was very probable that by the next despatches some account of it might be received. When such cases as the imprisonment of British subjects did occur—as they unfortunately did very frequently — Lord Lyons always called the attention of the United States Government to them and required an explanation. In case it appeared that Lord Lyons' attention had not been directed to the case, he would write to him and bring it under his notice.

The Earl of DERBY: I cannot help regretting to hear that such cases as the one I have mentioned are of common occurrence in the United States, inasmuch as they certainly have never been communicated to Parliament. The case in question occurred on the 26th of May, and the final release of the gentleman took place on the 6th of June. Having called the noble Earl's attention to this particular case, it only remains for me to express a hope that he will not lose sight of it; but, if the facts as I have stated be correct, that he will seek for an apology and reparation.

Earl RUSSELL: When I said that these cases are of frequent occurrence, I mean that cases of imprisonment are of frequent occurrence. They are not always without reason; for when explanations are required and given, it generally appears that the United States Government have had some reason to believe that the persons imprisoned were engaged in affording assistance to their enemies.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE asked whether any information had been received from our representative in the United States respecting a somewhat similar outrage committed upon some British subjects found on board the mail packet *Scotia?* The *Scotia* was boarded by the Custom House officers at Boston or New York, who searched the passengers' luggage and carried off a number of papers.

EARL RUSSELL said, that as his noble Friend had given him no notice of the question, he could not give him any information on the subject. His noble Friend, however, would remember that the American Government had not agreed with us as to the immunity to be conceded to mail packet ships.

ATTORNEYS AND SOLICITORS REMUNERATION, &c. BILL—(No. 120).

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, I rise to move the second reading of this Bill, which appears to me of a very important character. It contains provisions of various kinds which my experience in the office I have had the honour to hold has convinced me will be of great importance in the improvement of the law. One of the most important, and that with which the Bill commences, relates to the present mode of remunerating solicitors and attorneys. The vicious manner in which this most necessary and most honourable order of practitioners is remunerated lies at the root of many of the abuses in the administration of the law. Their remuneration bears no reference to the skill, ability, or judgment which each individual employs in his work. The skilled practitioner is paid just the same as the unskilled; and this mode of remuneration, which is recognized by the law, leads directly to the great evils of prolixity, unnecessary verbosity, multiplication of proceedings, delay, and expense. The attorney or solicitor is placed in such a position that in common justice to himself he is obliged to conduct his business not in the way which his skill, judgment, and his own conscience would teach him is the most proper; but in the way which alone will obtain for him the ordinary reward of his exertions. Take the ordinary case of a solicitor employed to draw up a deed of an important character and requiring considerable judgment. If he strung together a number of ordinary forms and legal common-places, he would probably prepare a deed which may extend to 200 folios, and for that prolix verbose instrument he gets ten guineas. Suppose that by great care and judgment he reduces those 200 folios to 100, thereby avoiding great prolixity and uncertainty, he finds that he is only entitled to be paid five guineas; and if by a still greater exercise of judgment he reduces the 200 to 50 folios he gets two guineas and a-half—a sum utterly disproportioned to the professional skill exercised in the preparation of such a document. The attorney is now unable to contract for any business which he may be about to transact; he is unable to apply to any standard by which he may obtain his reward; and he is in all cases compelled to seek his reward for direct services, which are unpaid, indirectly through the medium of long drafts, long pleadings, and a repetition of unnecessary writing. Your Lordships are no doubt aware of the great evils arising from this state of things. It operates injuriously on the public at large and on the profession, but still more injuriously on suitors, who are now unable to make an agreement for a more satisfactory mode of remuneration. These evils have been felt and acknowledged for a very long time; but as is usual with defects in English law, which, however frequently they may have been pointed out, are generally put up with for at least half a century before any earnest endeavour is made to remove them, no redress has as yet been obtained. As long ago as 1840—I might go back to an earlier date for a condemnation of the system—a noble and learned Lord on my left (Lord Brougham) said—

> "The other cause of delay and expense is the perfectly faulty mode of remunerating professional men, solicitors especially, but I do not except counsel. This opinion is the result of my whole professional experience and observation, and it is not confined to proceedings in Equity. The subject is one of great difficulty, but it is of yet greater importance, and I feel assured that whatever other changes are effected to improve our system, whether of Equity or Common Law, a

large proportion of the evil will remain unless this difficulty shall be grappled with and overcome."

In the Report of the New York Commissioners, published in 1848, there is this statement—

> "We cannot perceive the right of the State to interfere between citizens, and fix the compensation which one of them shall receive from the other for his skill or labour. Government is instituted for the preservation of order and the protection of rights. It is not its province to make bargains for the people or to regulate prices. This it assumes to do in respect to the dealings between lawyer and client. It fixes the prices of skill and labour. It has no more just right to do this than it has to fix the price of property; it may prescribe the salary of the clergyman or the fee of the physician with as much reason as the compensation of the attorney."

I do not mean to go as far as to say that the costs of an action shall be measured as between the parties, but I mean to apply the system of this Bill to the whole range of transactions between attorney and client. I desire to emancipate the attorney, and at the same time to emancipate the client, being convinced the result will be that the business will be done in less time, at less cost, with a greater amount of certainty, with a greater amount of skill, and that both parties immediately concerned, as well as the public, will be gainers by the alteration. The evil which exists as between attorney and client is best described by one of the former, who says—

> "To give all practitioners an interest in forms and prolixity, and so to tempt them to spin out in every way, instead of lessening, the clerk-work part of their business, manifestly tends to damage the integrity of their minds. But, besides this, it also interposes a difficulty in the way of every improvement. The interest in forms and words begets a bigoted love for forms and words. Whenever a useless form is to be discarded or a simple practice introduced, you are met at once by the attachment, interested or bigoted, of almost the whole profession to that system whereby at present it gets its bread."

In Scotland there has existed for a very long time a system of paying for conveyancing according to the value of the property. The same rule prevails in France and other countries. I propose to remove from the solicitor the difficulty under which he now labours by means of his not being able to make a specific contract with his client, and to enable him to enter into such a contract and to take security for costs to be incurred, which at present cannot be done. Passing on to the next subject of my proposed enactments, the House is aware that, generally speaking, the absolute owners of property may enter into any contracts they think proper. But with respect to reversions and estates in remainder, there is an arbitrary rule which is still observed by the Courts, much to the disadvantage of owners. Generally the owner of property, who has power of sale, may make his contract irrespective of every consideration of value, and the buyer who buys without fraud may be certain of retaining the subject-matter of his bargain. But Courts of Equity, choosing to exercise a sort of moral supervision over the transactions of mankind, have said that whenever a reversion or remainder is sold the duty shall lie on the purchaser when the life falls in of proving that he gave the value for his purchase. The evil resulting from this interposition on the part of Equity has been pointed out by my noble and learned Friend (Lord St. Leonards) in one of his most valuable works. He says—

> "It seems, therefore, an Equity not founded on reason or convenience, which in these cases inquires the calculated value of the subject of the contract, instead of its value according to the well known market price. The effect of such an Equity must ultimately be to injure the very persons in whose favour it was introduced. Reversions will never fetch their calculated value. Fair purchasers will not dare to purchase them at their market price, and consequently they will be thrown into the grasp of usurers, who will give very inadequate considerations for them, running the risk of a suit, in which event they will stand in as good a situation as if they had given the fair market price for them."

I am sure your Lordships will agree with me in the conclusion that this was an interposition, to use the language of my noble and learned Friend, "not founded on reason or convenience." The truth is, that you never can use a Court of Justice for the purpose of prescribing to parties either moral rules of conduct or rules of convenience and expediency in the mode of dealing with their property. The existence of this rule is a fertile source of litigation, and renders dealings with property of this description most insecure and most prejudicial to the owner. I propose, therefore, to sweep away this rule by the Bill now before your Lordships, as an interference with the ordinary rights of property which ought never to have been exercised by a Court of Justice. I pass on now to another rule, which is a simple example of the interposition of the Court, and, I think, is productive of the same description of evil—I allude to that rule which relates to the property of married women. By the common law, a husband is invested upon his marriage with all the personal property of his wife, which is either in possession or which he may reduce into possession during the marriage. Such is the rule of the common law. But Equity has taken upon itself to abrogate in effect the common law upon this question. If a married woman becomes entitled to property after her marriage, and if in order to obtain the benefit of that property it is necessary that the husband should go into a Court of Equity, the Court will not interpose unless the husband makes a settlement upon the wife and upon the children of the marriage. Now, that is an interposition which the Court unquestionably had no authority to make. Equity is bound to follow the law, except in cases where good conscience requires that the rule of law should be modified or controlled. But here Equity had no right whatever to interfere. The mode in which it reasoned appears to have been this:—It said, "The principle of the common law is, that the property of the wife is given to the husband provided the husband maintains the wife." Equity, therefore, might with some reason say, "If we find a case in which property accrues during coverture to a wife who is deserted or is not maintained by her husband, we may then interfere to give effect to the implied condition upon which the rule of law giving the wife's property to the husband is founded." But, instead of limiting its interposition to cases of this kind, which might possibly justify such an interposition, Equity has interfered generally; and hence a great amount of litigation, much disturbance to the peace of families, and much uncertainty with regard to property are introduced. It is true that the wife may allow the husband to have the property; but in many cases she is induced by the trustees to stipulate for a settlement, and this is the source of much dispute and ill-feeling. Experience has satisfied me that benefit would arise by putting a stop to the unnecessary interposition of Equity here. If the parties desire a settlement, it is easy for them to make one; but do not force upon them that which ought to be a matter of contract between them, and of contract alone—you have no right to make for competent parties any agreement beyond that which they desire to make for themselves. I pass now to another point, for which I desire the particular attention of your Lordships, and I trust that the alteration which is proposed will be regarded with approbation by the House. There exists in England, in the distribution of a man's property among his creditors after his death, the greatest anomaly and the greatest uncertainty. Your Lordships are aware that a man's property after death is denominated in law by the technical term "assets"—meaning that which is or should be enough for the payment of his debts, or, more properly, property applicable to the payment of debts. These assets are divided by the law into legal and equitable assets; and the difference is, that where the property consists of legal assets certain debts obtain a priority and a preference, while in the case of equitable assets the debts are paid *pari passu* without distinction. Personality represents legal assets; but if a man charges his freehold estate with payment of his debts, or directs it to be sold for that purpose, the proceeds are equitable assets, and the administration of the estate is governed by different rules. Thus, if A dies leaving legal assets, the property is distributed in one way; if B dies leaving legal and equitable assets, the property is distributed in another way. If a man dies leaving £10,000 in Consols, it is distributed in one way; but if he directs his trustees to raise £10,000 out of his estate, the money is distributed in another way. Your Lordships will recognize at once what a fertile cause of litigation this is, and I propose that such an anomaly should not continue. The history of this distinction is in itself very singular. Debts are divided into specialty and simple contract debts, a specialty debt being evidenced by a writing with a bit of sealing-wax or a wafer, while a simple contract debt may be a promissory note, a bill of exchange, or any paper signed by the party without the wafer or the wax. Now, in ancient times, an act evidenced by writing had a greater value than one which was mere matter of parol evidence; but in those times, writing not being a common accomplishment, persons generally made use of a seal. Thus the seal, which was originally the "signature," became of greater value in the eye of the law as constituting a deed than a simple signature not accompanied by a seal. What reason can there be for such a difference in dealing with simple contract and specialty debts? In Equity no such preference is allowed. Now, the greater number of estates are administered in Equity, and I want the law to be administered in all respects in the same spirit. When a man becomes bankrupt in his lifetime no preference is given in the administration of his estate to specialty debts over simple contract debts. Then why should any such preference be acknowledged in respect of landed property? This, again, is one of those things which it is difficult for any unlearned person to understand. It is one of those numerous anomalies and technicalities which characterize our law, arising from original practices which have long since lost their real value and significance, and which, when examined, it is found do not merit the solemnity which has attached to them. The object of the enactment which I desire to introduce is to bring property in its administration to a simple rule of justice, which requires that all property should be dealt with alike without distinction and without priority of claims, as at present is done in Courts of Equity, leaving still to judgments a certain priority. I will now mention one alteration proposed in the Bill, of a not very material character, with respect to claims for dilapidations. The law as it now stands with respect to these claims is most singular. The succeeding incumbent has a right to sue his predecessor for dilapidations, but all the debts of the preceding incumbent must be paid before the succeeding incumbent's claim for dilapidations is satisfied. I am sorry to say that many instances have been brought before me in which, upon the death of incumbents, their property has been found to be inadequate to satisfy their debts, and consequently the claims for dilapidations have remained unsatisfied. I propose by this Bill to place claims for dilapidations on the same footing as simple contract debts. I will now mention what are the final provisions of the Bill, which, I trust, will meet with your Lordships' approval. At present it is a very difficult thing for a man about to regulate his affairs by will to determine who shall be his trustees. In many cases it is hardly possible for a testator to make a choice with any satisfaction to himself. Many a man leaves his property to his family under circumstances in which he would be glad if there were any public institution in the country to which he could intrust the general management of his affairs — the collection, investment, and distribution of his estate. I therefore propose by the last clause of this Bill to introduce a power, to any person desiring by will or by deed to dispose of his personal estates, to make the Court of Chancery his trustee for the purpose of receiving and administering his estate. I am happy to say that from inquiries I have made, and from letters I have received, the system of administration of estates in the chambers of the Equity Judges is so much better than it used to be, that I will venture to say that an estate is wound up there in less time and at a less cost in nineteen cases out of twenty than it would require if wound up out of Court with the constant aid of a solicitor. I think that this provision will prove of great advantage. With respect to the question of remuneration to the profession, I have received many letters, especially one from the Incorporated Law Society, which expresses the opinion that, subject, of course, to any amendments that may be introduced hereafter, the Bill is entitled to the approbation of that body, as they believe that it is capable of being worked to the great benefit of the profession and of the public. Whatever benefits the solicitor will benefit the client, and whatever benefits both cannot fail to be an improvement of the law and of the general administration of justice.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2^a.—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord BROUGHAM said, the Act which he had succeeded in passing had been inoperative on account of the indisposition of those for whose benefit it was intended to avail themselves of its provisions. The noble and learned Lord was understood to say, that although he saw objections to allowing a professional man to act as trustee and solicitor, yet he thought the Bill contained some valuable provisions which were well worthy of consideration.

Lord ST. LEONARDS said, that the tendency of the law hitherto had been to protect the client against the attorney, who was quite able to take care of himself. At present an attorney or solicitor could not bring an action until he had delivered his bill of costs for one month, to enable the client to consider it and to obtain advice. Parliament had also provided, at a great cost to the country, certain public officers whose function it was to tax the bills of costs sent in by attorneys to their clients. The noble and learned Lord (the Lord Chancellor) sought to make the client's contract with the attorney a specialty debt, although at the time of signing the contract the client could not know the value of the service which he would receive. In a recent case of "Swinfen *v.* Swinfen," an able and learned counsel undertook to manage Mrs. Swinfen's cause upon a contract that he should receive, if successful, £20,000. He did succeed by his talents, zeal, and ability in winning the cause; but when he claimed the promised remuneration his client had changed her mind and refused to pay. It was a contract that was not binding, and he could not recover upon it. But suppose that instead of a barrister it had been an attorney, what would he have done? He would have done precisely what the counsel did; and if this Bill passed he would recover every single shilling of the contract. But if the Bill did not pass, what then? Whatever fair remuneration he was entitled to receive for his skill and services he would be enabled by law to recover; and he ought not to be able to recover any more. There never was a case in which interference was less called for, or one in which the remedy proposed by his noble and learned Friend would work more mischief. It would strike at all confidence, and would inevitably lead to over-reaching and taking advantage of the client. His noble and learned Friend had not grappled with the difficulty. The difficulty was that the attorney must, for example, be paid according to the length of the deed prepared. If he drew a short deed he was paid so much. There were many good as well as short forms, but an attorney was not paid for reducing a long to a short deed. If, however, the deed was an important one, the attorney only drew instructions, and took them to a conveyancer, who drew the deed; and in that case the attorney charged his client as if he drew the deed, and charged the fee to counsel as a fee for advice. The effect of the Bill would be to introduce two classes of attorneys; one would submit to the fees allowed, and the other would make all sorts of contracts with their clients. He had the greatest possible respect for the body, and he could not show his respect for them more than by opposing this Bill. He did not believe that attorneys' bills in the present day were of such a character as to place them under any particular difficulty. The next provision of the Bill was that if there were several trustees, and one of them a solicitor, he might with the consent of his co-trustees, or, being sole trustee, by his own authority, act as solicitor and charge his bill of costs to the trust. If he was sole trustee, he might retain himself—he would become, in fact, his own solicitor, and make out his own bill of costs. There was another objectionable feature in the Bill, and it was this—an attorney was not permitted by law to take a security for future litigation, on this ground—that by allowing a solicitor to take such a security expensive litigation might be incurred, over which the client might have no control. It was then proposed to take away from all the women of England, present and future, the right which the law now gave them to participate in the benefit of property acquired by them subsequently to their marriage. If the wife's property was so settled as at some time to go to the husband, and the husband took it, he took it properly in virtue of the settlement. But where there was no settlement as to the wife's subsequently acquired property, then Equity interfered, and said that if the husband wanted the wife's property he must give her a fair share, to be settled upon her. That, however, would be interfered with by this Bill. Why? Another provision of the measure—to which his noble and learned Friend had not called attention—was, that whatever a man might have done by his will in regard to his real estate, his executors or his administrators should have power to mortgage or sell such real estate and pay off his debts. Before that step was taken, however, they would have to go into a Court of Equity to have an account of the personal estate taken. The law at present provided that the executor or administrator should pay all debts out of the estate, and formerly the law was that if he paid a debt before another that had priority, or paid over the residue before all the debts were paid, he rendered himself personally liable for the unpaid debts. The consequence of that state of the law was that executors generally took the wills into Chancery, and every will was made the subject of a Chancery suit. He (Lord St. Leonards), therefore, two or three years ago, caused a clause to be enacted providing that it should be sufficient for an executor or administrator to advertise for all outstanding claims to be sent in by a certain time, just as the Court of Chancery would do, if a bill were filed. Now, if their Lordships looked down the columns of *The Times* they would see many advertisements from executors requiring creditors to come in and claim payment of their debts or be excluded. Every one of the advertisements was a Chancery suit avoided. But this Bill would indirectly operate to repeal the law as it now stands, and every man's estate would once more be the subject of a Chancery suit. Again, this Bill took away a man's power of testamentary disposition. Under it every man's will might be set aside, and a person to whom he had not given his real estate was to step in and say he would sell or mortgage it and pay off the debts. An enormous amount of the capital belonging to suitors was already in the hands of the Court of Chancery, and the Government had shown a disposition to use the suitors' funds for other purposes than the suitors' benefit, and if the Bill passed he would say to every man in England, "Keep your money out of the hands of that Court." This Bill struck at the true interests, both of attorneys and clients, and in other respects it was most dangerous in principle. He should, therefore, give it his hearty opposition.

Lord CHELMSFORD said, that remembering the speech delivered by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack last Session upon the manner in which Acts of Parliament were framed, he was surprised that such a measure as the present should have proceeded from his hand. Its title spoke of "Attorneys and Solicitors Remuneration," but the Bill contained provisions relating to various subjects of very great importance, and proposed various alterations of the law which were utterly unconnected with each other. It was quite impossible, so far as he could see, to grasp any one principle by which the Bill was pervaded. Each division would give rise to a separate discussion. It would appear, indeed, as if his noble and learned Friend in drawing it up had stumbled on an Act passed in the reign of George II., entitled—

> "An Act to continue several laws for preventing exactions by the occupiers of locks and weirs on the river Thames westward; for ascertaining the rates of water carriage on the said river; for continuing and explaining the several laws for the better regulation of attorneys and solicitors; for regulating the price and assize of bread; for preventing the spreading of distemper amongst horned cattle; also to make further regulations respecting attorney and solicitor, and for further preventing distemper in horned cattle; for more frequently returning writs in the county palatine of Lancaster, for ascertaining the levying of writs of execution, and for allowing Quakers to make affirmation in cases were an oath was required, &c."

That Bill had an advantage over the Bill of his noble and learned Friend, for it fully explained its object. But, various as were the points with which the Bill of his noble and learned Friend dealt, he was afraid it would occasion considerable disappointment after the promises which he had made. He said that, in consequence of the mode in which solicitors were enabled to charge, inducement was held out to them to draw out very long deeds; but the clauses which he had introduced, instead of being confined to conveyancing, empowered all attorneys and solicitors in every case to enter into an agreement with their clients to receive a certain sum of money—so that the necessity of having their bills of costs taxed would thus be obviated. Instead, therefore, of the client being protected by the provisions of the Act of Parliament, which required that an attorney should send in his bill of costs a month before bringing his action upon it, he would, by the clause to which he adverted, get rid altogether of that power of revision, and would be able to enter into an arrangement, and in consequence great over-reaching and oppression might take place. It was even doubtful whether the limited application of the new system to the case of conveyancing only was at all desirable. In reference to the next clause, he might say that he thought there was some inconsistency in the course which his noble and learned Friend had pursued. His noble and learned Friend some time ago compared the family solicitor to the Old Man of the Sea in the story of *Sinbad the Sailor*, whom it was impossible to shake off. Now, however, his noble and learned Friend proposed to place this Old Man of the Sea more firmly than ever on the shoulders of his clients by enabling him to become a trustee and charge his costs. For these reasons, and also because he regarded it as impossible to discuss the various provisions of the Bill on the second reading, he was of opinion that it should be sent to a Select Committee. He should like before sitting down to state that a speech made some time ago by his noble and learned Friend had given great pain to a considerable body of solicitors, inasmuch as he attributed the ill-success attending his Land Transfer Act in some degree to the circumstance that its objects had been thwarted by the profession to which they belonged. That charge could not, at all events, apply to the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association, which consisted of 800 members who had petitioned in favour of the measure. Of course there were instances where solicitors had prevented their clients taking advantage of the Act; but he was perfectly sure, from what he knew of solicitors generally, they were far too honourable a body of men to sacrifice the public good to the promotion of their own selfish interests.

Lord CRANWORTH agreed with the noble and learned Lord (Lord Chelmsford) that there was extreme difficulty in discussing such a subject on the second reading of this Bill ; but he could not agree with his noble and learned Friend that it ought to be discarded because it contained a great number of subjects.

Lord CHELMSFORD : I did not say it should be discarded.

Lord CRANWORTH : With respect to the mode in which attorneys and solicitors should be remunerated, he partly agreed and partly disagreed with it. As to the proposal that they should be allowed to make bargains instead of charging according to the scale of fees provided by law, he would say that *primâ facie* all parties to contracts should be allowed to make arrangements between themselves as to the terms of remuneration, because, as a general rule, contracts ought to be free ; but, on the other hand, it would not be safe to allow an attorney to go to his client and say, You shall pay me so much—or you shall give such a portion of the estate, as was done in Mrs. Swinfen's case. If such a course should be legalized, he thought the remedy would be worse than the disease. The attorneys and solicitors were a very respectable body, but there were many black sheep in the profession, and it would not be safe to leave them to contract bargains subject to no revision. It is absolutely necessary to fix a scale of remuneration in litigated cases, because the defeated party, who has to pay his adversary's costs, cannot be bound by the contract of his opponent with his attorney. He thought it would be quite safe to say that a party might make a contract for costs in reference to matters of conveyancing ; leaving costs in reference to other matters to be left as they were now. As to a solicitor being entitled to charge for professional services in reference to matters with respect to which he was trustee under a will, he doubted whether this should be the case when the solicitor was the only trustee, though it might not be improper in cases where there was more than one trustee. He thought that it was quite right that a solicitor should take security for future costs—and, indeed, he never could discover why this should not be allowed, especially as the costs were liable to taxation. In reference to the clause as to reversions, he must say that he entirely concurred with it. He could not see why a man should not be allowed to enter into the same bargain in reference to the sale of a reversionary interest as of an estate in possession. He could not assent to the 8th section. He thought that the law was quite right that where there had been no provision for the wife before marriage, and property afterwards came to the wife, and was recovered through the Court of Chancery, that the Court should act upon the principle that they would not assist the husband unless he made a fair settlement upon the wife. With regard to all these points, they could be much more conveniently discussed in a Select Committee.

Lord WENSLEYDALE addressed their Lordships, but was quite inaudible.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that he had never thought of opposing the suggestion that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. As to the proposal in reference to the remuneration of solicitors, the Law Society approved of it, except in this, that they did not think that the precaution of having an agreement in writing would be necessary.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *referred* to a Select Committee, but nothing further was done therein.

MOUNT ST. BERNARD'S REFORMATORY.

QUESTION.

Lord BERNERS in putting the Question to the noble Earl the President of the Council, in reference to the riots that have recently taken place in Mount St. Bernard's Reformatory, said, that the Mount St. Bernard's Monastery was one of the fifty-five which had been instituted in this country since 1829 ; and emanating from it there arose what was at first called an agricultural college, but which was afterwards licensed by the Secretary of State as a reformatory. Recently some serious disturbances had broken out in this institution, of which his Lordship read some statements from the public journals, and then proceeded to say that for some years the Reformatory had been in a very unsatisfactory state. As far back as 1860 the Inspector of Prisons reported that there were defects in the management of the establishment, arising mainly from the misconduct and inefficiency of several of the "brothers" or officers, but he added that steps had been taken to place these officers on a better footing, and to secure, as far as possible, both a superior class of men and more of them. In 1862 he anticipated an improvement; but in 1863 he said that his anticipations had been frustrated; that the Rev. Canon Ward had received notice to leave at Midsummer; that after him the establishment was placed in the hands of Mr. Martin, the chaplain, who however had been dismissed, and the place was then managed *ad interim* by Mr. Smith, one of the monks. This person told the boys that if they wanted to smoke—which was against the rules—to do so in private, and where they would not be seen. Accordingly a number of them did smoke in private; and when discovered by a schoolmaster they set upon and assaulted him severely. The Government ought to look to those matters, and see what manner of persons they were intrusting boys to for reformation; more especially as the number of recommittals was greater among Romish than among Protestant boys. The Returns showed that the recommittals of boys discharged from the Protestant Reformatories was 5 per cent, and of those discharged from the Romish Reformatories 8 per cent. The question was whether the Government had any control over this place; and he must say that he believed that they had none except such as was granted by the 17 & 18 *Vict.*, namely, the power of granting licences and of inspection. They had no authority in reference to the appointment or removal of officers however unfit they might be. The main point for consideration was as to what body the reform of criminals should be intrusted; whether it should be intrusted to magistrates, parochial clergy, and gentlemen of such locality, or to Roman Catholic priests, who owed allegiance to another Sovereign than ours. He had that morning received a letter from the chairman of the bench of magistrates at Ashby-de-la-Zouch, stating that Mr. Sydney Turner, the Inspector, had not communicated with the magistrates or the police; and that, therefore, his report must be wholly grounded upon the statements of those connected with the Reformatory. The writer added that he hoped the result would be the total breaking up of the establishment, which had a tendency to demoralize the neighbourhood, and render it in such a state that neither property nor person was safe when these

Lord Berners

young ruffians chose to have an outbreak, the authorities there having not the least power to put it down without the assistance of the police. In another letter which he had received, it was stated that the force at the Reformatory was a perfect farce when compared with the number of boys; and another writer said he believed that every decent person in the neighbourhood would sign a petition for the removal of the Reformatory. He begged now to ask the noble Earl the question of which he had given notice, Whether the Government had received of late any reports of the discipline and management now in practice at the Romish Reformatory, Mount St. Bernard's, Leicestershire, and of the particulars and causes of the mutiny last week of the 180 inmates, again requiring the assistance of the county police force to maintain order in the institution and to protect the lives and property of the inhabitants of the district; and whether the Government were prepared to withdraw the license from that Reformatory.

EARL GRANVILLE said, he was sorry that the noble Lord had been unable to accede to his suggestion that this discussion should be postponed until the papers were laid on the table. It was quite true that a year ago the state of this Reformatory was very discreditable, and his right hon. Friend Sir George Grey had threatened to withdraw the licence if an improvement did not take place. Since then there had been an entire change in its management, the Reformatory was now separated from the Monastery, and three or four gentlemen of position had undertaken to look after it. A superintendent was appointed whom Mr. Sydney Turner thought eminently fitted for the task, and Mr. Turner, who had visited the institution constantly during the past year, found a great improvement in the management, and expressed his surprise at the change that had taken place to order and tranquillity; but he stated that a great many of the boys at present confined there had been spoiled by the laxity that had prevailed under the previous management, and expressed his apprehension that these boys would at some time make a sudden outbreak. This apprehension seemed unfortunately to have been well-founded; but the rebellion broke out, he believed, without premeditation, and from what Mr. Turner called "an Irish impulse," on receiving the news of similar outbreaks in other reformatories. Mr. Sydney

Turner was sent down to examine into the matter, and blamed the authorities for want of decision at the first moment when the rebellion broke out; but their excuse was that they were taken completely by surprise. Afterwards they brought in, at their own expense, a certain number of police, and the outbreak was quelled. All the circumstances were set forth in Mr. Turner's Report, which exonerated the authorities from all blame, with this one exception. Under the circumstances, therefore, the Secretary of State determined not to withdraw the certificate, but to prohibit the admission of any new boys for the present. In a Report which was dated only three days ago, Mr. Turner stated that on visiting the institution he found everything in perfect order, and the boys under control. The Secretary of State therefore felt confirmed in his decision not to withdraw the certificate from the Reformatory.

Lord ARUNDELL of WARDOUR complained that this institution should have been selected for complaint—it ought to be judged by the same standard as was applied to Protestant institutions of the kind. The outbreak at the Castle Howard Reformatory (of which the noble Lord read an account) showed that this Reformatory was not alone in its liability to such rebellions. He was informed that there were 180 boys in the institution and that the present manager had spent £1,200 upon it within the last year. He also begged to deny that this was a monastic institution. The management was a mixed one, partly lay and partly clerical; and the present managers undertook the management when the boys were in a bad state of discipline, and had not recovered from the effects upon their minds of the previous outbreaks.

The Earl of DERBY said, he could not agree with the noble Lord who had just spoken, that this case had been selected for complaint, for he thought that the management of all reformatories was to be looked at in a perfectly impartial manner by the Government. He had listened to the statement of the outbreak at Castle Howard, but the noble Lord ought to remember that "two negatives make not an affirmative," and therefore an outbreak at Castle Howard did not afford any excuse for an outbreak at Mount St. Bernard's. Looking at what had taken place in the Reformatory, he thought his noble Friend (Lord Berners) was justified in bringing the matter before their Lordships—a matter which was likely to affect the character of similar institutions. There could be no doubt but that these repeated outbreaks caused a great deal of alarm in the neighbourhood of the Reformatory. It was stated that this institution was no longer governed by monks, and he was glad to hear it, for he thought that the management of such a place should not be left in the hands of men who, from previous education and training, could not be well qualified for the task. It would, perhaps, have been better had this discussion been raised after the papers had been produced; but, at the same time, he must state that he had the fullest confidence in Mr. Sydney Turner. He trusted that such amendment would be introduced into this Reformatory as would prevent the recurrence of such scandals as were now complained of.

House adjourned at a quarter before Eight o'clock, to Thursday next, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, June 21, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* [Bill 164].

Committee — Court of Chancery (Ireland) [Bill 78] [No Report]; Accidents Compensation Act Amendment* [Bill 143]; Countess of Elgin and Kincardine's Annuity * [Bill 156].

Report— Accidents Compensation Act Amendment* [Bill 143]; Countess of Elgin and Kincardine's Annuity* [Bill 156].

Considered as amended—Pilotage Order Confirmation * [Bill 131]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation * [Bill 149].

Third Reading — Coventry Free Grammar School* [Bill 124]; Sale of Gas (Scotland)* [Bill 125].

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

COURT OF CHANCERY (IRELAND) BILL.

[BILL 78.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee).

Clauses 1 to 11 *agreed to.*

Clause 12 (Appointment of Chief Clerks 15 & 16 *Vict.* c. 80, s. 16).

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "one chief clerk" and insert the words "two clerks." — (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. O'HAGAN (THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND) observed that the Commissioners reported in favour of a chief clerk, and he could not adopt the recommendation of the hon. Baronet without sufficient reason being assigned.

MR. GEORGE said, it was not satisfactory that an important measure of this kind should be hurried through in the present state of the House—[there were not more than 20 Members present]. He could not help thinking that undue haste was displayed in pressing through these clauses.

MR. O'HAGAN said, he had been waiting there half an hour before the House was made. He might express his surprise that those hon. Members who had given notice of Amendments had not come down to move them. He had no desire to hurry through a single clause without the fullest consideration; but it was too bad that hon. Members who had given notice of their intention to move Amendments should fail to make their appearance to move them, and that the Government should then be accused of desiring to press the clauses through the Committee with undue haste. For his own part he was ready to spend any time in order that the Bill should be properly considered.

MR. WHITESIDE said, he thought that the Government were hardly in a condition to treat a measure of this importance so peremptorily. He had been in the House up to two o'clock that morning; and when he came down to the Committee on this Bill, hearing that no House had been made, he went to the library to get a book containing the Report of the Committee on this subject, and he lost no time. On his return he found that the House had been made, that the Speaker had left the chair, that the Bill was being hurried through the Committee, insomuch that eleven clauses had already been passed. His intention had been to propose that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee; but he had lost the opportunity of making the Motion by the precipitancy with which the Committee had been hurried on. It was not for a Ministry that a day or two ago had escaped a Vote of Censure by only half-a-dozen votes, and who last night were signally defeated, to treat the House in this manner. The object of this morning sitting appeared to be not to obtain the opinion of those most competent to give it on this Bill, but to hurry on a Bill, which was not for the interest of the public. The first eleven clauses which had been hurried on contained all that was important. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland knew that he was attending for the purpose of discussing these clauses; the Attorney General for Ireland knew it; and he maintained that it was not a proper course for the Government to force on a Bill without giving Members who were known to be interested in the measure five minutes to pass from one part of the House to another. If the hon. and learned Gentleman thought he could do business in this way, he would find that it was not an insignificant party to which he (Mr. Whiteside) belonged, and that it would enforce due respect for their opinions. When it was first announced that the Committee on this Bill was to be taken at a morning sitting, he (Mr. Whiteside) stated that it would be impossible for him to attend. His hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland said he could not help that, and that he had been unable to obtain an evening sitting for the consideration of the Bill. All he (Mr. Whiteside) could say was, that when he served under a Ministry that possessed some influence in the House, he was always able to obtain an evening sitting for the discussion of any Bill so important, and he should have believed that he had failed in his duty if he had not represented to the Ministry the necessity of fully and properly considering such a measure. It was neither wise nor prudent to appoint the consideration of a Bill of the nature of the one before the House at a time when those who were interested were unable to attend. His object in endeavouring to procure the reference of a Bill to a Select Committee was the fact that he felt convinced that it would be found that the Bill was not only clumsily framed, but would be the means of inflicting upon the country a great and unnecessary expense. No one would venture to say that the Chancellor or the Master of the Rolls concurred in this Bill; on the contrary, the head of the Court was of opinion that all that this Bill proposed should be done by general orders. He found no instance of a Bill of this kind being introduced without the consent of the head of the Court. His silence showed that he did not approve of the Bill. He (Mr. Whiteside) wished to see this Bill referred to a Select Committee, because a Committee of the ablest men of the House had considered the appointment of Vice Chancellors, one for the Court of Chancery, one for the Lands Estates Court, and they said the evidence convinced them that the business was better and more cheaply done by the Masters than it could be by a Vice Chancellor, and they refused to appoint the Vice Chancellor. There was no demand among the public for a measure of that description. No petition had been presented in its favour from the Bar, or the body of solicitors, or the suitors. He wanted to examine witnesses for the purpose of throwing light on the merits of the case, and a Select Committee would enable him to accomplish that object. It would be a complete delusion to suppose that the causes in Ireland with which that Bill would deal were of anything like the magnitude and complexity of the corresponding causes in this country. He wished to know how the smaller causes were to be disposed of, if the measure were passed. Were causes which involved sums of only from £200 to £500 to be brought before the Court of Chancery? It should be remembered that five-sixths of the business of the Masters, whom the Bill would abolish, were performed by the junior counsel, and a comparatively trifling expense was thus incurred. The work of the Masters, too, was discharged in the most satisfactory manner. The solicitors in Ireland, who had the conduct of these suits, were paid very moderately; while it was only natural to suppose that if the business was to be removed to a higher Court, higher prices would be demanded for its management. He believed, too, that one Vice Chancellor would be unable to perform all the work which was at present done by four Masters. The expense, he was assured, would be increased one-third. By this Bill they perpetuated the old system of taking evidence by an Examiner, only they made it seven times worse than it was formerly. Were they to perpetuate the system which was so detrimental in the old Ecclesiastical Court? Why, in the case before the House of Lords now, in Scotland nine months were consumed in taking the written evidence; but it was all taken in Ireland and counsel heard in six days; and it was this system of written evidence, which was an obstruction of justice, which this Bill proposed they should return to! Then it proposed to return to the system of demurrers—a system which had worked most unsatisfactory for suitors. Then on the Chief Clerk question the principle of this Bill was directly opposed to that affirmed by the House in the Landed Estates Bill. Take a case of an estate of £100,000 in court, the estate was gone, and the claimants upon it sent in their claims. Was the Chief Clerk as competent a person to decide them as the gentleman who at present performed that duty? He thought not; and this was a question he wished to submit to a Select Committee. The course they should adopt was that of the Landed Estates Court. It was in comparison with that proposed in this Bill perfect. The Court had done an immense amount of business; its accounts were taken satisfactorily by the Judges at one quarter of the expense and in a quarter of the time that it would take the Chief Clerk. Certainly these Judges were more competent to decide these points than a Chief Clerk. There was at present no court in which the proposed Vice Chancellor could sit, and the fact was that a further expenditure would have to be incurred in the erection of an edifice for that purpose. He would suggest to the Government that if they wished to consult economy in this matter, that the Court of Chancery in Ireland, in addition to the Lord Chancellor, Justice of Appeal, and Master of the Rolls, should consist of two Judges, one to be selected from the Judges of the Landed Estates Court and the other from the present Masters in Chancery, and that no Chief Clerks or other officers with judicial functions should be attached to the Judges, but that the latter should be responsible for the conduct of the entire business in their respective courts. He had intended to move that an Instruction to that effect should be sent to the Select Committee together with the Bill, but he had been informed by the Speaker that such a course could not be adopted. There were three Judges in the Landed Estates Court, and two were ample for the business transacted in that Court, so that if the Attorney General for Ireland were intent upon making a Vice Chancellor, and were at the same time disposed to practise economy, he could effect his object much more cheaply than was contemplated by the Bill before the House—

SIR ROBERT PEEL rose to order. There was a distinct Motion before the House; but the hon. and learned Gentleman, instead of speaking upon that Motion, was going into the details of the different clauses of the Bill. He apprehended that the hon. and learned Gentleman ought to speak upon the Motion, and not to pursue the extraordinary course which he was taking.

MR. WHITESIDE contended that he was not going through the Bill clause by clause, but simply showing reasons why the Chairman should report Progress, with a view to his moving in the whole House that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

MR. MASSEY said, he understood that the hon. and learned Gentleman would conclude by a Motion to report Progress, with a view to an ulterior proceeding, and he was showing reasons why it was desirable that he should take this ulterior proceeding, and that to enable him to do so the House should resume.

MR. WHITESIDE: That was precisely so. He proceeded to point out that there were numerous claims for compensation. Then as to the expense of the Bill—what would it be? There was a building clause, under which offices were to be erected; but before they had any ground for these offices to be built on, the staff was to be appointed and paid, whilst the present officers were doing the work; in fact, the measure could not come into operation for two years. He believed the time at which the Bill was introduced was inappropriate, and it would be well to withdraw it, and have some general orders drawn up and submitted to the Chancellor and the Master of the Rolls for their sanction. Another point he wished to call attention to was this, that Ireland was not in a condition to bear increased taxation, which the Bill would impose. It was idle to expect that a Bill of that magnitude could be passed during the present Session. [The hon. and learned Member, whose address had been listened to throughout with great impatience, and who consequently was very imperfectly followed, concluded by moving, That the Chairman do leave the Chair.]

MR. VANCE seconded the Motion. He had objected from the beginning to the Bill being appointed for a morning sitting, and the result of that day's proceedings proved the correctness of his opinion. When he came into the House there was one Member on the Opposition Benches, and only six on the other side of the House. Many Irish Members were engaged on an important Committee and were unable to attend, and others also were unavoidably absent. It was most undesirable that a Bill of such importance should be considered in so thin a House. His constituents in Dublin strongly disapproved of the Bill, and did not wish to see the present cheap and efficient tribunals abolished. Substantial justice was obtained in the existing courts at a very small cost, and if the present measure were passed, they would necessarily have with the English system the English scale of costs. The most important clauses of the Bill had been passed accidentally and without any discussion, and he hoped that under these circumstances the Government would consent to refer the measure to a Select Committee.

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Whiteside.*)

MR. O'HAGAN (THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND) said, he had listened to the extraordinary performance of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for the University of Dublin with very considerable amazement. He had never doubted his hon. and learned Friend's powers; but here the hon. and learned Gentleman had occupied—he would with all due respect say abused—the patience of the Committee for two hours and a half with a speech which had about as much to do with the Motion as with the affairs of Kamschatka or the Great Mogul. Even the authority of the Chairman could not restrain his eloquence; for although he had given notice of a Motion which the Chairman told him he could not move, he had continued to speak upon it for an hour. The motive for his hon. and learned Friend's proceeding was apparent, and the proceeding was worthy of the motive; but he would put it to his hon. and learned Friend, whether such a course was worthy of his hon. and learned Friend's position? He, therefore, would not follow his hon. and learned Friend into the details upon which he had entered; but there were assertions—marvellous assertions, audacious assertions—in the address of his hon. and learned Friend which he could not allow to pass unnoticed. With regard to his position in reference to this Bill, it was a most simple one; he was the mere instrument in the matter. The Commission, upon whose Report the Bill was founded, was one whose ability and integrity were unquestionable; and after two years' labour they unanimously recommended an adoption of a certain course to assimilate the practice of Ireland to that of England where it was desirable, and it became his duty to introduce this Bill to the House carrying out the recommendations of the Commission. There was not a Member of the Irish bar of position who was not in favour of it. He brought forward the measure and gave ample time for its consideration; on its introduction and the second reading it was discussed, and he found it impossible to pass it except at a morning sitting, which was fixed to-day. He came down at twelve o'clock for the Bill, waited for a long half hour before the House was made; and those who were outside knew whose fault it was that it was not made. The hon. Member for Mallow (Mr. Longfield) had an Amendment on the paper, and was sitting in the House until the Speaker was moved out of the Chair for the purpose of going into Committee; but the hon. Member left the House and did not move his Amendment. Was he, then, to be told he had taken advantage of the hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House? When the hon. Member for Mallow left the House, in rushed the right hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Whiteside) in the fine frenzy that so well became him, and was so usual with him, and made a charge against him (Mr. O'Hagan). The right hon. and learned Gentleman said he intended to move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee; but that question was not yet before the House, and he (Mr. O'Hagan) had only to say that he brought in this Bill on his own responsibility. He believed it was for the public interest, and that it should be carried. If it were not carried it would not be his fault, and he left the responsibility on those who chose to accept it.

Sir EDWARD GROGAN said, he would remind the hon. and learned Gentleman that it was not the duty of the Opposition to make a House, keep a House, and cheer the Minister. The attention of that hon. and learned Gentleman had been drawn to the fact that it was not desirable that this Bill should come on at a morning sitting, and it was proved that this was so by the fact that the Government was unable for so long a time to make a House, and that the hon. Gentlemen most competent to express an opinion on this Bill were absent. He did not blame the hon. and learned Gentleman for pressing on his Bill, but he thought the Irish Members had a right to claim an evening sitting for the discussion of a Bill of this importance to them. He thought much more progress could have been made in the Bill had the opinions and views of Irish Members been consulted.

Mr. BUTT pointed out that several important measures had been disposed of at morning sittings. Three years ago he moved for the appointment of a Commission to inquire into the difference between the English and Irish practice. Finding it impossible to succeed in this House, it was with his consent taken out of his hands and carried by a noble Marquess in the other House. That Commission was appointed, and this Bill was founded on the Report of that Commission. Every person in the courts of justice in Ireland who had been examined had given their evidence in favour of the assimilation of the practice in England and Ireland.

Question put, "That the Chairman do leave the Chair."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 42; Noes 41: Majority 1.

[No Report.]

COURT OF CHANCERY (IRELAND) BILL. [Bill 78.]—THE DIVISION.

The House having resumed at Six o'clock—

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN: Sir, I desire to mention to Mr. Speaker a question which has arisen in my own case at the close of the morning sitting of the House. A division took place at four o'clock, while the House was in Committee upon the Court of Chancery (Ireland) Bill, on the Question whether the Chairman should leave the Chair. I had intended to vote with the "Noes." At the time of taking the division, the Attorney General was named one of the Tellers, and an hon. Gentleman was named another of the Tellers who was not then in the House. I offered to act as Teller in his place, and accordingly remained here while the House was cleared in order to act as Teller for the "Noes." Just, however, as the House was clear, the hon. Member for Northampton consented to act as Teller, and I therefore retired — going however, by mistake, into the lobby of the "Ayes" instead of that of the "Noes." When I got into the lobby I instantly discovered my mistake; but the hon. Member for Horsham told me that, being in the lobby, I should be obliged to vote with the "Ayes." Accordingly I did so vote. But the moment I returned into the House, and before the voting paper was placed in the hands of the Chairman, I informed Mr. Massey of the mistake I had made. I desire to mention this to you, and I respectfully submit that my vote ought to be counted with the "Noes," and not with the "Ayes."

Mr. SPEAKER: One of the difficulties of this case arises from the circumstance that no Report has been made from the Committee to the House. The decision in the Committee was final and conclusive as to the proceedings of the Committee, and the Committee, in consequence of the vote, makes no Report to the House. The hon. Member, as an individual, asks a question of me, which, perhaps, would have been more properly addressed to the Chairman of the Committee, whose decision in Committee is final. The Chairman of the Committee did, in fact, decide the Question by taking the numbers as they were handed to him and accepting that decision, and it is that decision which prevents any Report being made to the House. But if it be the pleasure of the House to be reminded of what has taken place on former occasions, I do not think that the hon. Member could have had any relief under the circumstances of the case. There are several precedents—some of a recent date. In a case in 1856 one of the Tellers for the "Noes" stated that Mr. Wykeham Martin, who was in the lobby with the "Noes," had refused to vote. He had gone into the lobby by mistake. He was informed that, having heard the Question put and being in the lobby with the "Noes," he must be counted with those in that lobby. There is another case which I think is stronger. On the 8th of May, 1860, notice was taken that a Member had been in the lobby with the "Noes," but, having passed the division clerks, had avoided being counted. He stated that he had gone into that lobby by mistake; but, being in the lobby, and having heard the Question put, the Speaker directed his vote to be added to the "Noes." In that case the misapprehension was discovered as early as it was by the hon. Baronet in the present instance. In this case it is not open to me to give any decision. There has been no Report to the House. But what I have stated has been the ruling of the House in similar cases; and I think that the hon. Member, having heard the Question put, and having gone into the lobby with the "Noes," was rightly counted with the "Noes."

THE INCOME TAX COMMISSIONERS AT BLYTHING.—QUESTION.

Sir FITZROY KELLY said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is under the direction or with the sanction of the Government, or of the Board of Inland Revenue, that the Income Tax Commissioners for the district of Blything, in the county of Suffolk, required the farmers within that district appealing under the Act 14 *Vict.* c. 12, s. 3, with a view to relief against the assessment under Schedule B of the Income Tax Act, to make up their balance-sheets from April to April, instead of from Michaelmas to Michaelmas, as heretofore done under the express authority of the Board of Inland Revenue?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he thought that his hon. and learned Friend had not been quite accurately informed as to the circumstances of this case with reference to the intervention of the Government. He appeared to suppose that for a certain period the Commissioners referred to had received the balance-sheets of farmers made up from Michaelmas to Michaelmas, under the express authority of the Board of Inland Revenue. The law required that the accounts should be made up from April to April, and the Board of Inland Revenue had no power to alter or to sanction departures from that system. The administration, as the hon. and learned Gentleman knew, was in the hands of district Commissioners, and upon the point being raised, the Board of Inland Revenue directed their surveyors not to interfere or to make any objection to the proceedings of the Commissioners, limiting their intervention to that single direction. In the case of certain farmers the local Commissioners had accepted accounts made up from Michaelmas to Michaelmas as a basis of account for purposes of appeal; but a similar appeal having been made subsequently, the Commissioners felt it their duty to adhere to the letter of the law, and accordingly required the farmer to produce his accounts made up from April to April. He was quite sensible of the inconvenience which might arise practically from this decision of the Commissioners, but they had acted upon their own jurisdiction; and as the Board of Inland Revenue had not been disposed to interfere in order to enforce compliance with the law, they clearly would not be justified in doing so now when the Commissioners saw fit to adhere to the literal construction of the statute.

Sir FITZROY KELLY said, he would beg to ask, Whether there would be any objection to produce Copies of the Correspondence with the Board of Inland Revenue on this subject?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: None whatever.

NAVY—COURT MARTIAL AT JAMAICA.

QUESTION.

Sir JOHN HAY said, he rose to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether it is true that three young Naval Officers have been tried by Court Martial at Jamaica for insubordination, and have been sentenced, in addition to other punishment, to a long imprisonment in the common gaol at Kingston, Jamaica; and whether the Admiralty have confirmed that portion of the sentence?

Lord CLARENCE PAGET, in reply, said, the Court Martial had awarded the punishment referred to in the Question of the hon. and gallant Member; but the Officer commanding in chief on the station had ordered those young Officers to be sent home to be dealt with by the Home authorities.

THE ASHANTEE WAR.

QUESTION.

Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether it has been taken into consideration that a Sailing Ship leaving Cape Coast six weeks or two months hence, and bound to the West Indies, will be obliged to adopt the "middle passage;" and, in that event, whether the effects of a protracted voyage in such a climate on Officers and Men already debilitated may not be attended by disastrous effects?

Mr. C. P. BERKELEY said, that before the noble Lord answered the Question of the hon. Baronet, he desired to put another Question to him on the same subject, of which he had given him private notice. He wished to ask the noble Lord, What number of Officers and Men now upon the Gold Coast Station the Admiralty have been requested to provide passages for? and to call the noble Lord's attention to the statement made by him on that subject on Friday last. ["Order!"] He would move the adjournment of the House to put himself in order. It might be in the recollection of the House, that the hon. Baronet the Member for Wakefield, in the debate on the Ashantee War, called attention to a certain document, which had been laid on the table from the War Department. The Secretary to the Admiralty replying to the hon. and gallant Member's remarks on that document—

Mr. SPEAKER: I must direct the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that moving the adjournment of the House will not give him an opportunity of referring to past debates.

Mr. C. P. BERKELEY: Then I will simply put my Question.

Lord CLARENCE PAGET: Sir, the middle passage to which the hon. Baronet (Sir James Elphinstone) has referred is, as he stated, necessarily taken by vessels going from that portion of the coast of Africa to the West Indies. The transport will be towed out, as I stated yesterday, into the offing, and will probably leave with a south-east trade; by making a westerly course she will probably carry the south-east trade for a day or two, and then get into the north-east trade, thus making the passage to the West Indies nearly as quick as a steamer. Anybody who knows that part of the world knows that in summer time one can run from the south-eastern into the north-eastern trade with very little delay; and I apprehend that the troops on board that ship will be just as comfortable as they would be in a steamer. I do not know exactly at what the Question of the hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. C. P. Berkeley) is pointed, but I shall be very happy to give him the number of troops upon which the original requisition was founded, and likewise the subsequent arrangement with the military authorities. The first body of troops to be taken away consisted of 480 men, and a certain number of women and children, and were to go from Cape Coast Castle to the West Indies. Subsequently the War Office determined to send about six officers and 200 men from Cape Coast Castle to Lagos, where they will relieve about a similar number, who are to be taken to Sierra Leone.

AFFAIRS OF THE IONIAN ISLANDS.
QUESTION.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, he would beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, To lay upon the table of the House the entire Despatch from Sir Augustus Paget to Earl Russell, of August 10th, in which it is asserted that Count Sponneck was favourable to the neutralization of the Ionian Islands, and which states that "Count Sponneck appears to have no objection to the razing of the fortifications?"

Mr. LAYARD said, he must call the attention of his hon. Friend to the fact that Count Sponneck was not, as represented, in favour of the neutralization of the Ionian Islands, but merely stated that he did not see why the principle should not be extended. It would be detrimental to the public service to produce the entire despatch.

REFORM IN THE ROYAL COURT OF JERSEY.—QUESTION.

Mr. PAULL said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will consent, on the part of the Government, to the further progress, during the present Session, of a Bill entitled "A Bill to amend the Constitution, Practice, and Procedure of the Court of the Island of Jersey?"

Sir GEORGE GREY, in reply, said, he adhered to the opinion which he had formerly expressed, that it was very desirable that reforms in the Royal Court of Jersey, recommended by the Commissioners, should be carried into effect by the Estates rather than by any intervention of Parliament. He would state the intentions of the Government on this subject when the Bill referred to came on for discussion.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES IN THE ROYAL NAVY.—QUESTION.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to advise the appointment of a Royal Commission to consider the pay and allowances of Officers of the Royal Navy?

Lord CLARENCE PAGET, in reply, said, it had not been usual to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the pay and allowances of the Navy as distinguished from other branches of Her Majesty's Service, and he was not aware of any intention to establish a novel precedent.

AUSTRALIAN POSTAGE.
QUESTION.

Lord ALFRED CHURCHILL said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the rates of Postage on Letters between this Country and Australia has recently been doubled; and if so, whether, considering that our Australian Colonies contribute one moiety of the Postal Subsidy required for this service, they have been consulted as to this increase, or have in any way expressed their opinion respecting it?

Mr. PEEL said, in reply, that the revenue derived from letters sent to Australia was not nearly sufficient to pay our moiety for transmitting that correspondence. It had consequently been decided from the 1st of next month to raise the charge on letters to Australia from 6*d.* to 1*s.*, but the same regulation provided that the postage on letters sent by private ships should be reduced to 4*d.*, with a view of meeting the case of poorer correspondents to whom economy was a greater object than expedition. Our postal arrangements with Australia were based on a Treasury Minute of 1855, and it did not, as was supposed, form any part of that arrangement that the rates of postage should not be raised by either party without mutual consent. On the contrary, the Minute contained the following passage:—

> "One of the advantages of the plan we have adopted will be that it will leave the House and the Colonial Government free to regulate the rates of postage in any way they may think fit."

Due notice of the alteration has been given to the Australian Colonies.

THE BALLOT.—RESOLUTION.

Mr. H. BERKELEY said, that in asking the House to agree to the Resolution he rose to propose, he had taken a different course from that which he usually followed, because it appeared to him that the approach of a General Election gave him an opportunity of making some remarks which were certainly called for, and which he trusted hon. Gentlemen would take to their hearts. They had heard of Earl Russell climbing an exceedingly high mountain, and finding on the top of that mountain an inscription which advised him to "rest and be thankful." No doubt he did rest, and, no doubt, he was thankful; but why the noble Earl should insist upon all Parliamentary reformers also resting he could not understand. He could understand the noble Earl asking them to be thankful, and, indeed, he thought the reformers of England were very thankful to the noble Earl for his brilliant exertions in the cause of reform. When, however, the noble Earl asked the reformers in that House to rest, it appeared to him to savour of absurdity. Were there no longer any abuses to redress? Were there no evils to be got rid of? Had they become so perfect and so pure that no reform of the political system was required? Were they arrived at the *Ultima Thule* of reformation? Had England become Utopia? Had they nothing left to do but to enjoy themselves and be happy? An examination of the existing state of things would prove diametrically the contrary. Was there any Act of Parliament at that moment which interfered with intimidation, put down bribery, or prevented other corrupt practices? He would be a bold Member of Parliament who would say that any such Act existed. An Act, it was true, existed which had superseded others having a like object, and which was called the Corrupt Practices Prevention Act. But did that Act put down any of these evils? Why, it was laughed at from one end of the country to the other by every attorney's clerk. The House would permit him to go back for a moment to the formation of the Committee which produced the Report that was laid hold of by the right hon. Baronet the Home Secretary and converted by him into an Act of Parliament. That was shortly after an election of more than ordinary enormity which took place during the Earl of Aberdeen's Administration. Corrupt practices so largely prevailed at that election that the Earl of Aberdeen, from whom no one had a right to expect much reform, declared that no one could be enamoured of our electoral position. Thereupon a Committee was formed. But how was it formed? Almost all the legal talent of the House was engaged upon it. There were the Attorney General and the Solicitor General, ex-Attorney Generals and ex-Solicitor Generals, and hon. Gentlemen from both sides of the House learned in the law, were likewise joined in that focus of law. After a short time that Committee, which was a kind of mountain of law, did as other mountains did—fell into labour and produced a mouse, a most insignificant little vermin, as its offspring. The Home Secretary framed a law upon that Report, and said here is a law that will cure all your evils—there is now an end to all further complaints. There were certain provisions in the Bill that enlisted the sympathies of a great number of Members. It did away with processions, ribands, bands, and other sources of expense which fell upon candidates. Accordingly, Members swallowed the rest of the Bill, which from end to end was perfectly inadequate, if not mischievous, because it guarded candidates at the poll, and fixed all the responsibility and all the punishment upon the electors. When the Bill became law it was reviewed in *The Times* by a man now no more, but who knew more about elections than probably any other man in England. He referred to the late Mr. Coppock. He wrote an analysis of the Bill, which *The Times* endorsed, saying it was evident that it was a "pompous profession meant to be inoperative." He would call the attention of the House, not to Mr. Coppock's analysis, but to the article in *The Times.* The writer showed that the great object of the Bill appeared to be not to unseat candidates, because they were carefully protected against danger, and unless they were personally in fault they might laugh at all the attempts made to turn them out. The candidate was to name certain persons as his agents, and if they committed bribery his seat was lost, but the subordinate agents, who were not appointed, might buy votes by the dozen without affecting the seat, although they would themselves be liable to proceedings. As to intimidation, if a man discharged his tenant or his servant, or ceased to deal with his tradesmen on account of his vote, it would be an unconstitutional act, but although the fact might be undoubted, there might be no means of proving it, and the consequence was that the clause would be totally inoperative. The late Sir Robert Peel in the case of the late Duke of Newcastle, defended his Grace, who had turned out some seventy of his tenants, on the plea that he considered he had a right to do as he liked with his own. Sir Robert Peel did not defend the propriety of the action, yet he said it was impossible to touch it by law, and if they attempted to do so, they would plunge into a course of legislation which was anything but desirable. That was the opinion of Sir Robert Peel. It was likewise the opinion of Lord Macaulay, who, in a speech at Edinburgh, stated that, as for making any law to prevent a man from turning out one of his tenants at will, or discharging one of his tradesmen, it was an absolute absurdity. Well, that kind of legislation had been resorted to in that Parliament, and, of course, the Act became inoperative. As they were approaching the period of a General Election, he trusted the House would permit him to point out what had been done, could be done, and would be done again under the Act. Taking, for example, some large commercial or manufacturing town, he would describe a few of the events which occurred at the time of a contested election. The first thing that was done by the partizans of a candidate was to secure certain persons called "Men from the Moon," that was, persons known to nobody—who came, stayed a short time, and disappeared. Now, a "Man from the Moon" descended upon one of those boroughs, took up his position at some hotel, and next morning went to some licensed victualler and says, "On this day week I shall require forty breakfasts." The "Man from the Moon" was generally accompanied by some mysterious person, perfectly well known to the licensed victualler, but who said nothing. The licensed victualler said, "My price is so and so," to which the "Man from the Moon" replied, "Oh, certainly." He then paid visits to other licensed victuallers, until he had ordered breakfasts to the amount of £400 or £500, and then retired from the busy scene. There might be twenty, thirty, or forty voters at one of the large shipyards or factories of the boroughs, and on the morning of the polling these voters went to breakfast, then to the poll; and after that, hung about, forming part of that crowd which applauded or expressed disapprobation, or assisted in bringing up electors to the poll. That must be hungry work, and about the middle of the day the men, by sixes and sevens, proceeded to certain houses, not completely finished, and there get beef, beer, and spirits, which had been conveyed there over night. At whose expense? Why, everybody knew at the expense of the candidate; but who was to prove it? At the end of the week the men went to receive their wages, but not having been at work on the day of polling, they should not get wages for that day, but they got paid full wages for it after all. Those were facts which could be easily proved. There, then, was treating in the first place which was declared illegal, and there was bribery in the next, for if paying a man who did not work a day's wages was not bribery, what was? How could the only Act which they had to stop bribery interfere with such a case as he had mentioned? The breakfasts were not paid for by the "Man from the Moon," but when the time within which petitions could be presented had passed, another descended and paid the Bills. He had said nothing about the bribery which took place between two and four o'clock, when £5 notes changed hands, and when persons who never had a pound in their possession before paid away large sums in corrupting others. Although these men, when found out, were liable to be punished, the candidate remained untouched. Now, could it be supposed that any of these bribers had such a strong affection for their candidate that they would borrow money to secure his election? If they did not receive it from the candidate in some way or other, from whom did they receive it? He had shown that corruption and malversation flourished *malgré* the Act of Parliament. He would next suppose the Bill in operation, and applied to the case of such a borough as he had described. In the first place no "Man from the Moon" would be needed, no breakfasts required, otherwise a man might have his opponent's voters devouring his tea and toast. For the same reason no dinners would be placed in empty refreshment houses, and what would become of the holyday when no wage would be paid for it, for a man would not be inclined to give away money, which might go into the pockets of his opponent's supporters? He had shown fair reasons for believing that the ballot would supply the deficiency in our present law, and all he asked was that it should get a fair trial. He knew he should be met by the bare contradiction, "Oh! but the ballot won't do this;" but to that he replied that assertion is no argument. He would show that the ballot had done that. Let them turn to the Australian colonies, and they would find that a perfect reformation had been wrought. When the ballot was first proposed there, it was met by arguments a vast deal more able than had been used against it here, but it was supported by that irresistible logic of which Mr. Grote was the author. And what was the result of this adoption? The original opponents of the Ballot in Australia were now its warmest supporters, and it was remarkable that the only class of persons who were opposed to it there were the Roman Catholic priests. Now, in this country and in Ireland the priests were to a man in favour of the Ballot, and it had been stated over and over again by the Irish landlords, that if they got the Ballot it would not be fair play because the vote would be concealed from them, but would be known to the priests. A gentleman in private conversation had said to him, "Don't tell me you can invent any box of which the priest cannot get to the bottom." He had produced an argument from Australia to show that that was not the case. He had on a former occasion shown that they had witnessed the break-down of the greatest democratic republic in the world, and various elements appeared in that chaos, but the Ballot in that wreck of institutions held its own, and appeared destined to restore order. What said a correspondent of *The Times ?* That "if the forms of American liberty last as long as Mr. Lincoln's time of office, the agency of the ballot-box will consign that unlucky functionary to private life, and elect some other president in his stead." Probably so ; but how would it be if there were open voting in America ? Need he ask any man of common sense what chance any man would have against Abraham Lincoln and his hordes of mercenary cut-throats ? Well, were they really become so virtuous—were the constituencies become so pure that the Reformers in that House might rest and be thankful ? He thought not. He would ask the House to allow him to compare the account of our political virtue as given by old Andrew Marvell in 1678, and the account given by Bishop Burnett in the *History of his Own Times ;* and then he would like to conclude with a comparison with the political virtue which they then possessed as pictured by a gentleman well known to that House — Mr. Erskine May. Andrew Marvell said—

> "It was not to be expressed the debauchery and lewdness which upon the occasion of elections are now grown habitual throughout the nation, so that the vice and the expense are risen to such a prodigious height that few sober men can endure to stand to be chosen upon such conditions."

What said Bishop Burnett ? He said that all laws which could be made would prove ineffectual, because to cure so great an evil till there came a change and reformation in the morals of the people would be impossible ; and till the candidates became men of other temper and other principles than then appeared. Let them now see what happened in their own days, according to Mr. Erskine May. It appeared that at Canterbury 155 electors were bribed at one election, and 79 at another. At Barnstaple there were 255 electors bribed, and at Cambridge 111. At one place the sum of £26,000 had been spent in three elections. In 1858 a Commission reported that 183 freemen of Galway received bribes. In 1860 there were strange disclosures affecting the city of Gloucester. This place had long been familiar with corruption. Indeed, in 1816, a single candidate spent £16,000. It appeared that at the last election in 1859, no less than 250 electors were bribed, and 81 persons were guilty of corrupt practices. Up to that time the places which had been distinguished by such malpractices returned members to Parliament prior to the Reform Bill, but in 1860, a perplexing disclosure was made that bribery had also extensively prevailed in the populous and thriving borough of Wakefield, where 86 electors were bribed ; and such was the zeal of the canvassers that no less than 98 persons were concerned in bribing the corrupted. He would ask the House whether, when such was the case, they ought to "rest and be thankful." The time was approaching when the great electoral Saturnalia would be present, and then intimidation would produce as ever its reign of terror, bribery would corrupt, and inebriety would demoralize. That state of things would exhibit itself in a form hardly ever witnessed before on account of the great struggle which would take place between the two great political parties. On that occasion there would be seen all those horrors which he had been in the habit of describing, and the screw would be turned on the country by hosts of attorneys, who well knew how to put the strain on the point which told upon the condition of the elector. Surely, then, it was not too much to ask, seeing that there was no existing remedy for that state of things (for the present Act had proved a dead failure), that the votes should be taken in a manner which had proved successful elsewhere. Consequently, he thought that he was entitled to move the following Resolution :—

> "That, as a General Election is impending, and it is notorious that our electoral system is defective and corrupt in practice, and as we have no law which can put down the intimidation of voters nor prevent bribery, it is therefore expedient that a fair trial shall be given to the vote by Ballot."

Mr. **LOCKE** said, he rose to second the Motion. He would not detain the House long as he did not presume to think for a moment that the Motion would be carried, but he thought thanks were due to the hon. Member for bringing the subject before the House, because at no distant period Gentlemen opposite would have an opportunity of experiencing those evils which his hon. Friend had so ably described. He thought the thanks of the House were due to his hon. Friend for having afforded to each of them an opportunity of ascertaining whether or not they had retrograded on the question of the Ballot. It was just as well, having reference to the day which was not far distant, that they should register their opinions upon such a question for the consideration of the British public. The usual objection to the Ballot was, that it could not be carried out; but he would call attention to what took place on a former occasion. On a former occasion when there was a long debate on the question, an hon. Gentleman who had since become a Member of the Government—he meant the hon. Member for Pontefract—speaking for the first time in the House, described the working of the Ballot in Melbourne so as to convince many Gentlemen that if the system were adopted here it would be a great improvement on the present state of things. The hon. Member removed one of the chief objections urged against the Ballot by showing that at Melbourne a scrutiny could take place in as effective a manner as in any Committee-room of the House of Commons. An argument which was much in favour with the noble Lord at the head of the Government was that the Ballot was un-English; but if its tendency were to prevent intimidation, bribery, drunkenness, and other evils, then every man who wished well to his country ought to vote for the Motion of the hon. Gentleman, especially as a General Election was understood to be impending.

Motion made and Question proposed,

"That, as a General Election is impending, and it is notorious that our Electoral system is defective and corrupt in practice, and as we have no Law which can put down the intimidation of Voters, nor prevent bribery, it is therefore expedient that a fair trial should be given to the Vote by Ballot."

Viscount **PALMERSTON**: Sir, I assure the House that there are many circumstances and (pointing to the clock) a warning-hand which bid me to be brief;

but I am anxious to state, in as concise a form as I can, the reasons why I shall, as usual, oppose the Motion of my hon. Friend. I can only say to my hon. Friend personally that I hope the result will not make him feel so comfortable in his present position [Mr. Berkeley was seated on the Opposition Bench] as to induce him to make it permanent. I should be exceedingly sorry to see him continue where he is now. Nothing can be more honourable to any man than steadily adhering to the cause or party which he has adopted; and the more the cause or the party is going down in public opinion, the more honourable is the devotion of its supporters; and I think my hon. Friend will himself confess that the plan advocated in his Motion is not so strong in popular sympathy as it has been formerly. I object to the Motion because it is founded on an erroneous assumption. The hon. Member deals with the right of voting as if it were a personal right, which an individual was entitled to exercise free from any responsibility, whereas I contend that the vote is a trust to be exercised on behalf of the community at large. Even if the franchise were ever so extended—even if we had a manhood franchise, if every man arrived at the age of discretion were entitled to vote, it would be only a trust, because there would still be a large portion of the community, women and minors, affected by the laws, by taxation, and so on, whose interests would be committed to those who had votes. Indeed, our legislation is based on the understanding that a vote is a trust, and not a right. If a vote were a purely personal right, would not a voter be entitled to ask on what principle of justice you should punish him for exercising it in the manner which he thinks most for his own individual advantage? But you attach a penalty to the man who employs that right of voting in a way at variance, as you deem, with the public interest, for bribery or any other such consideration. I say, then, that a vote is a trust, and I maintain that every political trust ought to be exercised subject to the responsibility of public opinion. The whole political framework of civilized nations rests on the principle of trust. The interests of the community are in various degrees, more or less important, committed to a selected few who are charged with duties, in regard to particular things, on behalf of the people at large; and their action in fulfilling that trust ought to be subject to responsibility towards those on whose account they exercise it. But I contend that the Ballot as proposed is intended to withdraw the voter from that responsibility which the public exercise of the trust confided to him would impose, and in that respect I think it would be a political evil. We have been told about the system in other countries—in America, for instance. But in America, as everybody knows, ballot voting is not secret. It is ticket voting. A man votes for a great number of officers at a time, and he sticks his ticket in his hat, and is proud of the party and the cause he espouses; he does not think of concealing the members, judges, governor, or other officers appointed by public election in the United States for whom he gives his voice. The Ballot, then, I hold, is founded on a mistake in principle, and is at variance with the fundamental assumption on which all our political institutions are based. Well, would it be effectual for the purpose for which it is proposed? I deny that. In this country, I maintain, that a man is proud of his party. He may be thought right or wrong by his neighbours, but I do not believe that when he has been enlisted under the banner of one candidate or the other he is not proud of the side he has taken. So far from wishing to conceal his vote, or sneaking with it to the ballot box, he tells all his friends what he is going to do, and is rather anxious than otherwise that the whole community to which he belongs should know it. If you shrink from a public investigation of the voting, it follows that you must also do away with canvassing committees. You must forbid canvassing. You must make it penal for a man to tell beforehand how he is going to vote. Generally every man has a political bias—a partiality for one party or the other—and it is next to impossible that a majority of electors should vote even by Ballot without their votes being known. Would the Ballot assist those who may desire to conceal their votes? The hon. Member spoke of the protection it would give to the man who was now afraid if he did not vote in a certain way that his landlord would take away his farm, or a customer withdraw his patronage. But would it do so? In the first place the landlord or customer who intended to punish his tenant or tradesman for giving a vote against his wishes would canvass him beforehand, would apply for a promise, and if it were refused would know what that implied, and would deal with the voter accordingly. Perhaps the landlord or customer might wait until the election was over, and then ask the man how he voted. If the elector did not choose to tell an untruth (which would, of course, be demoralizing), he must either give an evasive answer, the meaning of which would be understood, or confess that he had voted against the wishes of his patron. Consequently, the voter would be dealt with in such a case just the same as if he had given his vote openly and without reserve; and as far as protecting the tenant or tradesman from the landlord or customer is concerned, the Ballot would be totally ineffectual. With regard to treating, the hon. Member has told us how an election is conducted, how the public-houses are thrown open, and how men belonging to one party go to the houses taken by their candidate. This would not be prevented by the Ballot. Now, the Ballot would not prevent bribery, because an agent might go to an elector and say, "Here is £5 or £10. I trust to your honour; you shall have this money if you will promise to vote for so and so, but not otherwise." The elector, if without any particular predilection in another direction, would probably be tempted to take the money and give the promise, which, I dare say, he would keep faithfully. I have that opinion of the electors of this country that I believe they generally would keep their promise, at whatever time it might have been exacted. Then as to the public-houses, would it not be very easy for the Man in the Moon, described by the hon. Gentleman, and his friends to make arrangements that the public-houses should be accessible only to those who carried signs or emblems by which it would be known that they were supporters of a particular candidate? I say, then, that the Ballot is erroneous in principle, and would be ineffectual in practice. Objection has been taken to my having applied to the Ballot the epithet un-English. I may vary the expression, and say it is adverse to and inconsistent with the habits and feelings of Englishmen, who are usually proud of their political opinions, anxious to manifest to friends and neighbours what those political opinions are, and to act in accordance with them, and therefore I say that a system of secresy is at variance with the habits, opinions, and practice of Englishmen. For these reasons, without taking up further time, I will only say that I shall vote against the Motion.

Mr. H. BERKELEY said, he would not attempt to answer the noble Lord, because it would take him entirely through *Hansard.* The noble Lord had not said a single word respecting the present state of the constituencies, nor had he tried to defend those Acts of Parliament which had been palmed upon the country as remedies for bribery and corruption. For the existing evils there was really no remedy, except the substitution of a system which had succeeded everywhere for a system which had failed wherever it had been tried. He should certainly take a division, with a view of eliciting the expression of opinion of honest reformers, who were driven to a point, but were no doubt prepared to express that view which was their honest opinion.

Question put,

The House *divided:*—Ayes 123; Noes 212: Majority 89.

AGRICULTURAL POPULATION (IRELAND).—RESOLUTION.

Mr. HENNESSY said, he rose to call attention to the emigration of the Agricultural Population from Ireland, and if any excuse was required for its introduction it would be found in the conflicting statements as to the condition of Ireland which had from time to time been made by different members of Her Majesty's Government. In the year 1860 the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary, then Chief Secretary for Ireland, said that there was in the world no more striking instance of the growth of national prosperity than was to be found in Ireland, but in a very short time he was contradicted by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who said that public attention had not been sufficiently awakened to the calamities which afflicted that country since the year 1859. The statements of the Members of the Government, however, were in their turn denied by the Irish Members, who insisted upon the existence of a more widely spread distress than was admitted from official sources; and in the face of that diversity of statement, it was not wonderful that the Irish people should seek for authentic information on a subject which so nearly concerned them. In March last, he (Mr. Hennessy) called attention to the depopulation of Ireland, and showed that there was a decline of 3,000 in the population of that country every week, and also that the emigration from Ireland at that moment was greater than at any other period during the last ten years. The number of persons who left Ireland in 1861 was 64,292; in 1862, 70,117; in 1863, 117,820; and the Emigration Commissioners stated in their Report, published a few days ago, that if the emigration continued throughout the year 1864, at the rate which it had gone on during the first three months, the number that year would be 156,000; and that depopulation was taking place in a country in which the number of marriages was declining, the proportion of births to deaths was falling of, and the population was declining more rapidly than that of any country in Europe. The emigration was distributed generally over the country. In 1863 the number of persons who emigrated from Leinster was 15,000, Munster, 55,000, Ulster, 22,500, and Connaught, 18,000. From the year 1851 to December, 1863, the total loss by emigration had amounted to 1,431,000 persons, of whom the so-called flourishing province of Ulster had contributed no less than 400,000. The emigration had been regarded by some Members of the Government as possessing a satisfactory character. When the attention of the Lord Lieutenant, for example, was called to the decline of the population, he said that although the grain crops would decline, the green crops and live stock would increase, and both he and the Chief Secretary said that one effect of the emigration would be to diminish poor rates, and increase the rate of wages in Ireland. The fact was, however, that while emigration had been increasing, both the live stock and the green crops had diminished. Last year there were in Ireland 23,715 horses less than there were in 1862; the decline in the number of cattle amounted to 116,615; sheep, 152,201; pigs, 89,522. The total loss of live stock in the year 1863 amounted in value to £1,227,041, the loss in the previous year having been £1,500,000. The cereal crops diminished in 1862 by 72,000 acres, and in 1863 by 144,000, and in both years the green crops also decreased. In 1863 their decrease amounted to 19,358 acres, and the total loss of cereal and green crops in 1863 was 164,077 acres. Mr. Donnelly, in his last report, stated that the total of bogs, waste and unoccupied lands of Ireland had increased to the extent of 74,856 acres. There was no increase worth notice last year, except an increase in the cultivation of flax and meadow-land; but making allowance for that increase, there were 100,000 acres out of cultivation. The prediction that emigration would diminish the poor law expenditure was by no means confirmed by the statement made by the Poor Law Commissioners in their last Report, dated March, 1864. They said that the tide of emigration had had little effect upon the expenditure of the poor rates beyond the amount which the guardians had expended in assisting the emigration of poor persons who might otherwise have become chargeable to the rates. The parties who emigrated at their own expense were not such as would have been likely to become chargeable, but it was possible that some increase of expense might arise from their leaving behind them dependants or relatives who might be either temporarily or permanently thrown upon the rates. He found that in 1863 the Poor Law expenditure increased by £37,000, and the number of paupers in that year exceeded the total in the previous year by 26,000. For the first eight weeks of 1864, the only period as to which information was in the possession of the House, the rate of pauperism had increased from 68,000 on the 2nd of January, to 76,000 on the 20th of February—that was to say, at the rate of 1,000 a week. The third prediction of Her Majesty's Government had therefore failed, like the other two. With regard to the rate of wages, recent information had been gained before the Select Committee upon Irish Taxation appointed on the Motion of the hon. and gallant Member for the Queen's County, to the proceedings of which some prominence was given in the public papers. The hon. Member for the County of Cork (Mr. Maguire) was questioned before that Committee as to the condition of the labouring classes, and said he could not conceive how they could make the two ends meet with the wages they received. In his part of the country he could procure as many men as he wished for 1*s.* a day, and they were most thankful to get it. That statement ought to be put in contrast with that made by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of the Colonies when bringing in his Tenant Right Bill, to the effect that wages in Ireland were ordinarily 1*s.* 3*d.* a day. If that assertion were accurate, a positive decline, instead of an increase, had taken place in the rate of wages. Mr. Lambert, the treasurer to the county of Mayo, before the same Committee, said that the country was in a more depressed condition than in former years, and that the condition of the labourers was not as good as before the famine. The Rev. Mr. O'Regan, P.P., spoke from his own knowledge of three counties — Kerry, Limerick, and Cork—and said—

> "In my part of the country for certain portions of the year men are very gratified if they can get occupation at 9*d.* per day."

An hon. Friend of his who sat on the benches opposite, who owned large property in the King's County, and was chairman of one of the principal railways in Ireland, declared to him in conversation that the Government never made a greater mistake than in prophesying a rise in wages, as both his private and public experience led him to believe that the rate of wages was declining. Of the four benefits then promised by the Government none were found to exist. The population was not only diminishing, but at a rate more rapid than heretofore; the quantity of live stock and of crops, green as well as cereal, was growing less and less, wages were falling, whereas poor rates and pauperism were actually on the increase. With regard to the condition of those unfortunate subjects of the Queen who were driven to leave Ireland he wished to say a few words, and to correct some misconceptions that were abroad. People generally were under the impression that of the emigrants from Ireland all went to the United States, and went with the intention of enlisting in the Federal army. Of the 117,000 who emigrated from Ireland in 1863, 94,000 went to the United States, but as many as 18,000 went to Australia, 4,000 to Canada, and the remainder to other places. Of the total number of 56,000 persons described as general labourers, 40,000 went to the United States and 14,000 to Australia. Of 9,000 farmers, 6,500 went to the United States and 1,500 to Australia; of female domestic servants 20,000 emigrated, 14,000 going to the United States and 5,200 to Australia. The question whether emigrants entered the ranks of the Federal army, and in what proportions, was one of much interest, and some light was thrown upon it by a comparative return which the Emigration Commissioners had published, giving the numbers who emigrated in the last two years preceding the war. The number of Irish single men who emigrated to the United States amounted in 1859 to 37 per cent, and in 1860 to 38 per cent, of the total emigration. During the progress of the war the proportions had been 33 per cent in 1862 and 38 per cent in

1863. The actual numbers of Irish single men who emigrated in those years respectively were — in 1859, 22,000 ; in 1860, 30,000 ; in 1862, 19,000 ; and in 1863, 53,000. The proportion of single men who emigrated since the war began was, therefore, less, if anything, than before it commenced. The Commissioners observed that—

> "Of those who went out many, no doubt, enlisted ; but their number could have but little effect in keeping up the strength of the Federal armies. It must be borne in mind that by the Passengers' Act all boys above twelve years of age are classed as 'single men,' and a deduction, therefore, of at least 12 per cent must be made from the single men for boys between twelve and eighteen years of age. A large proportion of the remainder emigrated as sons or brothers in families, and were, therefore, not likely to enlist. After these deductions are made there would probably not remain in 1863 more than from 20,000 to 25,000 single men out of whom the Federal army would have a chance of obtaining recruits, and it is not to be assumed that even a majority of these took service."

He mentioned these facts for the purpose of showing that the amount of Irish additions to the Federal ranks was not so great as some persons had been led to imagine. And what was the condition of the Irish emigrant arriving in America? He had recently seen a very touching letter from the Roman Catholic Bishop in Toronto written to one of the Roman Catholic Bishops in the North of Ireland, and dated April, 1864, in which he dwelt upon the lamentable condition of the Irish emigrants, and said—

> "How heartrending the sight of these emigrants arriving on our wharves, surrounded by sharpers — the harpies of cities — destined to be swept like a torrent of rain into the sewers of society! Hence the hospitals, the poorhouses, and gaols in the States, and to a great extent in Canada, have more than their proportion of inmates of Irish or their descendants. The emigrant ship, where all sexes are huddled together, breaks down the barriers of modesty, and opens the path, in thousands of cases, to ruin. How many a tear has been dropped by those emigrants for ever having left their home!"

The Bishop gave a touching description of the condition of the female emigrants—

> "The workhouse system of Ireland is most degrading and immoral in its tendency, if the tree could be judged by its fruit. It is humiliating, indeed, to see numbers of poor Irish girls, innocent and guileless, sitting round in those large depots in seaport cities waiting to be hired. Men and women enter those places, and look round to find out the girl that would apparently answer their service. How many of them found the protection of the wolf is known only to God!"

The Canadian Bishop concluded with a strong appeal to the Bishops in Ireland to do something to prevent the Irish emigration. His high authority was corroborated by a statement put forward by a correspondent in *The Times* newspaper. Writing even before the war broke out, that gentleman said—

> "The papers of all the large cities are filled with 'appeals' from the friends of various eleemosynary and benevolent societies and institutions for aid, in which the sufferings of orphans, widows, and children are set out in the most touching terms. Washington is filled with misery, nor have I ever been in any cities in the world in which the Irish and other poor populations appear to live in more squalor, or to endure greater privations than in the vile alleys of New York itself, Pittsburg, Baltimore, New Orleans, and the other large towns of the Union. No delusion can be greater than to suppose the poor emigrant at once attains a greater degree of physical comfort in the States than he has in his own country."

There was abundant evidence that the people of Ireland, if driven from their own country, were not driven to a soil where they could enjoy that happiness which ought to have been theirs at home. To quit their native land was in itself a misfortune which they felt more keenly, perhaps, than the people of any other country in Europe. True, there was a school of political economists which held that a country prospered as its population declined. He found Adam Smith was not of that opinion. He would invite the attention of such economists as the Secretary for Ireland and the Lord Lieutenant to those few words in which Adam Smith said, "The most decisive mark of the prosperity of any country is the number of its inhabitants." His whole work was an argument to that effect, that labour was the source of wealth, and population the source of labour. But it was said they had agricultural labour in Ireland, while what was wanted was manufacturing industry. On that subject he should like to quote another sentence from Adam Smith. He says—

> "The capital employed in agriculture, therefore, not only puts into motion a greater quantity of productive labour than any equal capital employed in manufactures ; but in proportion, too, to the quantity of productive labour which it employs it adds a much greater value to the annual produce of the land and labour of the country, to the real wealth and revenue of its inhabitants. Of all the ways in which capital can be employed it is by far the most advantageous to society."

He therefore asked the Government and the House to do something in the direction of keeping the agricultural population in Ireland and developing her national resources. Now, what could the House and the Government do? He would venture to suggest that the Government had the choice of three courses—they might take one or all of them. They could introduce into that House and no doubt carry certain legislative measures long demanded by the people of Ireland, recommended over and over again by commissions, committees, and Ministers of the Crown—measures, for instance, such as the Earl of Derby introduced in the House of Lords in 1845, but which unhappily did not pass at that time—measures such as were introduced in the following year by the Duke of Newcastle, but which again unfortunately did not pass—measures introduced by the Earl of Derby's Government in 1852, but did not pass. Why did those measures not pass? They were called for by the people of Ireland, and proposed by influential Ministers. If they did not then pass that was no reason why they should not have been re-introduced. He only hoped some Government or another would have the wisdom and strength to carry a measure which would restore concord between landlord and tenant in Ireland, and give tenants some property in the improvements they might make on the land. A measure of tenant right such as that proposed by any of the statesmen to whom he had referred would be sufficient. But other things the Government could do. Select Committees and Royal Commissions had recommended that as Ireland had formerly been treated exceptionally, so exceptional legislation might still be adopted especially by the employment of public money in public works, in reclaiming waste lands, and in various productive works in Ireland. Some time after the peace and down to 1830 a good deal of public money was laid out in that way. The Report of the Select Committee on the state of the poor in Ireland in 1830 said—

> "That the effects produced by these public works appear to have been, extended cultivation, improved habits of industry, a better administration of justice, the re-establishment of peace and tranquillity in disturbed districts, a domestic colonization of a population in excess in certain districts, a diminution of illicit distillation, and a very considerable increase to the revenue."

Unfortunately, from that day, Government had done nothing in that direction. The Royal Commission, presided over by the Earl of Devon, presented one of the most valuable Reports ever made, and what did it say. It said—

> "We believe that in many instances the principles of sound policy and of a wise economy ought to lead to the undertaking, at the public cost, of works of this nature, even although the inhabitants of the district, or the proprietors of adjoining land, are unwilling or unable to contribute. While it is true, on the one hand, that Government ought not to allow the funds of the State to be applied for the improvement of private property, it is equally certain, on the other hand, that expenditure upon works calculated to produce public and general benefit ought not to be withheld because the operation will at the same time confer a benefit upon individual proprietors. This first operation gives encouragement for the outlay of private capital, and affords facilities for its useful application; and the joint effect of the whole is at once to stimulate the industry and increase the comforts of all parties connected with the immediate locality, and to promote the prosperity of the whole surrounding district, and thereby to add to the general resources of the country. We are not, however, advocates for any indiscriminate advances of public money by way of grant. We are only desirous of impressing upon those whose duty calls upon them to consider this matter more particularly, that cases frequently will and do occur, in which it is consistent with a wise economy to grant money from the public funds for the execution of a public work, from which no direct return is to be expected, and towards which the neighbouring proprietors are either unable or unwilling to advance any money."

There had been reports from time to time pointing out the various parts of Ireland in which such works could be carried out; yet the Government had done nothing. Looking at the climate of Ireland, there was no species of public works that would prove so useful and remunerative as arterial and main drainage works on a large scale. But Government had done nothing in that way. Last year they had the Report of Mr. Bateman, to the Treasury, on the state of the Shannon. The great injury done by the flooding of that river was said to be owing to certain Government works which were very ill constructed and only partially completed on the Shannon, whereby a large district was covered with water, and became unfit for bearing crops. Mr. Bateman reported that the injury sustained was very considerable, and that the liability to occasional flooding was such as to render the preservation of crops very precarious, and to arrest all attempts at improved cultivation. It was asserted that the prevention of the inundations would save property, even in one year, to the value of more than £30,000. Mr. Bateman went on to say—

> "I therefore propose to provide works at Killaloe for the passage of 1,200,000 cubic feet of water per minute, without allowing the water to rise on the callow lands, and, at Meelick, for the passage of a flood of 1,000,000 cubic feet of water per minute, similarly confining the water to the river channel, and at all other parts of the

river in proportionate quantities, always keeping down the surface of the river, so that scarcely any of the lands now flooded shall be ever affected."

The total works were estimated at £283,000. That Report had been in the hands of the Government since May, 1863, and yet no steps had been taken to act upon it. A paper had been presented to the House on the River Barrow, which, with its tributaries, extended through King's County, Queen's County, and Kildare. That river was recommended to be deepened, and that operation, if carried out, would, it was believed, effect the object in view to a very great extent. When the enormous amount of land lying waste and uncultivated in the three counties to which that Report referred was considered, it would be at once seen that the deepening of that river—a work so gigantic that no proprietor could for a moment be expected to undertake it —would have the effect which the Government Commissioners pointed out, would afford immense employment to the people and be reproductive in its character. Yet the Government had taken no step whatever, as the result of that Report, any more than of Mr. Bateman's. That was not all. The Chairman of the Board of Works, Sir Richard Griffith—than whom on such subjects there was no higher authority in the United Kingdom—once published a very valuable Report on what might be done with the waste lands of Ireland; and as the Government had never thought fit to take any action in the matter, he would quote the opinion of the Devon Commission as to that Report. The Devon Commissioners said—

> "Mr. Griffith's valuable Report and Table exhibit the amount of waste land in the different counties, classified according to the different degrees of capability for improvement. They show that Ireland contains waste land — improvable for tillage, 1,425,000 acres; ditto for pasture, 2,330,000 acres; total improvable, 3,755,000 acres; waste land unimprovable, 2,535,000 acres —gross total, 6,290,000 acres."

There was a difference between these figures and those of Mr. Donnelly, arising from the latter gentleman giving 9,000,000 acres as being under grass. It was interesting to read the Commissioners' remarks on Sir Richard Griffith's statement as to what might be done with these waste lands, and the effect which their reclamation would have on the population. The Commissioners said—

> "It thus appears that 192,368 families might be permanently provided for upon lots about eight acres in extent by the existing amount of the best quality of improvable waste land, or that the first and second quality added together would furnish the same number of families with farms of about twenty acres each. This would be a permanent provision for that number of families, comprising above 1,000,000 souls, and may be estimated to abstract permanently from competition in the present labour market about 300,000 labourers. And, if a proper selection of the waste land settlers be made, 133,720 families, comprising about 730,460 individuals, would be raised in their condition by the consolidation up to eight acres of small productive lots at present inadequate to their support. This would produce a further abstraction of competitors from the present labour market of more than 200,000 labourers, making, with the former number of 300,000, a total of 500,000 labourers abstracted from competition in the overstocked labour market. And the evidence leads to the conviction that this result can be obtained, not only without any permanent loss, but with a very large permanent gain, as it appears that 3,755,000 acres of waste land, not now giving a gross produce exceeding on the average 4*s.* per acre, may be made to yield a gross produce of £6 per acre, being a total increase from £751,000 to £22,530,000, and that the first three or four years' crops would return the cost requisite to bring about this change."

If any other Government in Europe had had such Reports from men like Sir Richard Griffith and the Devon Commission, they would long since have expended in a country like Ireland large sums of public money on works which, as was said, would in the first three or four years after their execution repay their entire cost. He had said that the Government might introduce a measure which would give to tenants in Ireland compensation for the improvements they might make, and which would have the effect of inducing the Irish farmers to lay out their money on the land, instead of putting it into the pocket of the emigration agent and going to America. The Government might also, as they had been recommended to do by their own officials, deepen some of the rivers of Ireland, and promote main and arterial drainage. In addition to that, he thought they ought to adopt other measures. The fact was, the people of Ireland not only felt that their complaints, addressed to that House and the Government, on the land question, had been disregarded from year to year, but they were under the conviction that any appeal they might make to the Government or the House was of no avail. He challenged any Member of the Government to point to one single instance during the last quarter of a century in which the people of Ireland had made any representation to the Government asking for something for Ireland, and in which the Government had granted it. The Irish people had been in the habit of petitioning that House year after year; but he did not think they had petitioned it much that year. Their petitions had related to the land question, to the relief of the poor, to the education of the poor—all subjects of vital interest to them; yet their respectful requests had produced no effect whatever, and the result was that the people were beginning to think that to them Parliamentary representation was useless. Nothing could be more unfortunate than that they should allow the Irish people to imagine that calamities were steadily advancing upon their country, that it was fast losing its population and its wealth in every branch of industry, and yet that that House was to remain silent, without expressing its regret at such a state of decline, and without urging the Government to take measures whereby capital and labour might be kept in Ireland. On behalf of those whom he had the honour to represent he ventured to make his present Motion, and he did so, likewise believing that if that subject were fully and fairly placed before the House, the people of Ireland would receive justice at its hands. In that belief he now took the liberty of moving the Resolutions which stood in his name.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That this House observes with regret that the Agricultural Population of Ireland are rapidly leaving the Country."—(*Mr. Hennessy.*)

SIR ROBERT PEEL: Sir, the Motion of the hon. and learned Gentleman touches two main points in connection with the condition of Ireland—namely, emigration and agriculture. But on entering into his statement on these two points he has alluded to several other matters to which I desire, with the permission of the House, at the outset to refer. He adverted to the Bill brought in by my right hon. Friend the Secretary for the Colonies (Mr. Cardwell), to settle the question of the tenure of land in Ireland; and I must say it is unfortunate that the Irish people have not more availed themselves of the opportunities which that measure offers them. But, leaving that point, the hon. and learned Gentleman referred to the different, and, as he called them, the contradictory statements of Ministers of the Crown and others as regards the condition of Ireland. On that the House must feel that when a state of depression falls upon a country it is often very difficult to determine accurately what its effects may be till time has enabled us to judge on the subject; and if, perhaps, I took too favourable a view of the condition of Ireland in 1861, 1862, or 1863, I was desirous not to paint things in worse colours than they might turn out. During those few years Ireland has passed through a serious and momentous period. Up to 1859 the prospects of that country were most flourishing, but afterwards she laboured under excessive drought, and then under very wet seasons, and the result certainly has been very disastrous. That I fairly admit. But I think the hon. and learned Member will agree with me that a wonderful revival is taking place. And although the emigration continues to a serious extent, I think I can show him that his statements on that point are not strictly correct. He thinks there are about 3,000 persons a week at this moment leaving Ireland, and also that the emigration is proceeding at a greater rate than last year and the year before. I shall be able to prove that during the month of May last there has been a sensible diminution in the numbers leaving the country. The hon. and learned Gentleman in submitting his Motion to the House laid down four propositions. He said—

> "Look at what the state of the country is, and then consider what the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and others have stated, and see how different it is from the prospect which they held out."

He further stated that the land is going out of cultivation, that emigration is on the increase, pauperism is on the increase, and the wages of labour are diminishing. The hon. Gentleman read a portion of a report from Mr. Donnelly, showing that there was a diminution of land under cultivation. This, however, was partly owing to the diminution of live stock in the country, and to the land, in consequence, not being properly cropped. With respect to pauperism, I receive fortnightly returns from all the poorhouses in Ireland, and I am happy to state that during the last three or four fortnights there has been a diminution of more than 1,000 in the recipients of indoor relief in the unions of Ireland. [Mr. HENNESSY: As compared with the same period of last year?] Yes. The hon. and learned Gentleman has been, I think, rather too severe upon the various Governments of this country in saying that, for the last quarter of a century, nothing has been done for Ireland. There has been, on the contrary, a most anxious desire on the part of every successive Government during that time to bring forward measures for the benefit of that country. He also complained that Sir Richard Griffith made a Report in 1845 which had never been acted upon. I can assure him that there are at the present moment between 200,000 and 300,000 acres that were bog and waste lands at the time when Sir Richard Griffith made his Report, which are at the present moment under actual cultivation.

I will now discuss the two points to which the hon. Gentleman has more particularly referred—the cause of emigration, and the condition of the agricultural population of Ireland. I will not dispute that in one sense it is painful to observe the emigration that has been going on. Every man who has a heart must feel for these poor people, who are leaving the homes of their fathers and separating themselves from their families. It is, however, to be considered that they are leaving their native land to better their condition, that they are going to join other members of their families who have preceded them, and that they have a prospect before long of remitting money to their friends at home, as other emigrants have done, to the amount of hundreds of thousands of pounds. If Adam Smith has shown that labour is the source of wealth, and that population is the source of labour, I must also maintain that Ireland has had for many years a redundant population. There have been in that country a vast number of small occupiers, the holders of five and ten acres, who did not employ labour. A country cannot be in a more disastrous condition than to have small tenures of two, five, and ten acres, which the owners cannot cultivate for their own advantage, and which hold out no prospect for the future. In a humanitarian point of view I may regret the emigration which has been going on; but considering the interests of the country, it is a benefit, and not to be regretted. Emigration has long been felt to be necessary in order to put the population of Ireland on a proper footing. When the population of Ireland was not quite 4,800,000, a Committee of the Irish House of Commons recommended a system of emigration as a necessary means of improving the condition of the people. No doubt the emigration from Ireland during the last twenty or thirty years has been enormous. I have here the exact figures, from authentic Returns. Between 1831 and 1841 no less than 400,000 persons left Ireland for the colonies or foreign countries. That was exclusive of a migration of 200,000 into England and Scotland. Between 1841 and 1851 the total number of emigrants from Ireland was 1,240,000. From 1851 to 1860 was a most important period, for not less than 1,190,865 persons left Ireland during that period. That is, no doubt, an enormous emigration within twenty years, an amount perhaps unknown in the annals of any country. I believe a great deal of the emigration that went on during the latter period is attributed by men of scientific knowledge and experience to the famine that visited Ireland in 1845, 1846, and 1847, which rendered it absolutely impossible for the population of Ireland to live upon the potato root, and obliged them to seek the means of livelihood elsewhere. There was a progressive emigration during 1861 and two following years. In 1861, 66,396 persons left Ireland; in 1862, 72,730; and last year the number increased to 117,820. The hon. Gentleman has quoted some Returns to show that a great number of these persons do not go to the United States of America. I think he is not quite accurate in those statements. A small portion, no doubt, go to Australia or Canada, but the vast majority go to the United States. I believe there is a Return that about 23,000 able-bodied Irishmen entered the Federal service last year. [Mr. HENNESSY: I said between 20,000 and 30,000.] I now come to the emigration of the present year. The hon. Gentleman said it is going on at the rate of 3,000 a week, and that it is assuming even larger proportions than in the previous year. I believe that was the case up to the month of May. The Registrar General states that the emigration during the months of January, February, March, April, and May, this year, amounts to 63,833. The emigration during the corresponding five months of 1863 was 60,246, and during the same months in 1862 only 31,259. So that the increase during the first five months of this year over that of 1862 is nearly double, and is an increase of 3,000 over that of 1863. Since the month of May, however, I am happy to say, there has been a sensible check in the stream of emigration from Ireland. In the month of May itself there was a decrease this year, compared with 1863, of 1,023 emigrants. The information I receive from Cork confirms this statement. There is evidently in the city, which is one of the most important ports of departure, a less desire to emigrate. "The vast tide of emigration," says one account, "has begun to decline in a very perceptible manner." The hon. and learned Gentleman has referred to the state of the Irish women in the United States, and there is, no doubt, a great deal of harrowing truth in the letter he read. It is too true, I fear, that there are thousands of these poor deserted Irish girls who are gaining a precarious livelihood by vice and other unhappy means. I have here a statement copied from the *Cork Daily Reporter*, and taken from the most authentic source, that there are no less than 30,000 Irish females who have left home and friends, and are now walking the streets of New York friendless and deserted. Well, I do hope when that statement reaches the humble homes of those who are about to emigrate, that they will take care to procure sufficient funds to enable them to do so with some prospect of success, and that their friends will see that in leaving the shores of Ireland they are, at least, placed in the hands of those at the other side of the water who will look after their future condition. The hon. and learned Gentleman in the course of his speech asserted that the emigration up to the present time has gone on to the most unparalleled extent, and no doubt it has; but he did not mention that there is a great desire on the part of Irish landlords—and I think it is very meritorious on their part—to get rid of a certain number of the redundant population on their estates, by providing them with free passages to America, in order that they may join their friends and relatives there. There is no doubt that the Reports of Committees and Commissions, over and over again—in 1826, 1827, 1830, 1836, and 1841—have all expressed an earnest hope that the landlords would do all in their power to facilitate the emigration of those who were living on their estates. I read only the other day that a noble Lord who sits on these benches, and who is a large and most respected landed proprietor in the county of Kerry—I mean Lord Castlerosse—had in the most liberal and generous manner actually paid the emigration expenses of seventy persons, all of whom were occupying small holdings and doing badly at home, and his example has been followed by others. The noble Lord thought, and many landlords thought with him, that the best way of improving the country was by facilitating the departure of those poor people, and giving them the means of joining their friends in America. The hon. and learned Gentleman said that the state of Ireland now is worse than it was formerly, and he quoted the opinion of Mr. Lambert, treasurer of the county of Mayo, who was examined the other day before a Committee upstairs. But that opinion must be wholly without foundation in fact, because it is evident to anybody who looks at the Reports of the Devon Commission in 1845, and of the Commissions of 1830 and 1836, that the state of the country then was not to be compared to what it is now. In the Report of the Census Commission of 1841, it is stated that

> "Sixty-eight per cent—*i.e.* upwards of 5,000,000—of the rural population consists of heads of families, without money, capital, or acquired knowledge—*i.e.* labourers or persons who obtain the means of existence by employments requiring little or no instruction. This may include small farmers up to five acres."

Now, I defy the hon. and learned Gentleman to say that such a state of things exists now. And in the State trials Mr. O'Connell referred to this statement as representing nearly 70 per cent of the people in a destitute condition. No one now, not even the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. Maguire) will assert that the state of Ireland is anything like that pointed out by Mr. O'Connell. The Devon Commission, whose Report was published in 1845, state that there were then 2,300,000 persons in a state of absolute destitution in Ireland. Well, I put it to those hon. Gentlemen who know the country, whether that condition of things which was shadowed forth by the Census Committee of 1841 and by the Devon Commission of 1845 now exists. The hon. and learned Gentleman has alluded to those early Commissions. I have taken the pains to read as far as possible the Reports of the Commissions and Committees of 1826, 1827, 1830, 1836, and 1841, and if the House will allow me I will refer to one or two statements in those Reports, showing that from the first those distinguished persons who served upon them always advocated emigration as the sole means of reviving the condition of Ireland. In the year 1826 a Select Committee was appointed to inquire into the expediency of encouraging emigration, and to them the Reports of 1823, 1824, and 1825 on the state of Ireland were referred. That Committee reported thus—

> "The unemployed labourer at home necessarily consumes more than he produces, and the national wealth is diminished in that proportion."

That was the exact reverse of the doctrine laid down by the hon. and learned Gentleman—that population was a source of labour and labour a source of wealth. The Committee then went on to say—

> "Your Committee therefore trust that the most deliberate attention of the proprietors of land in Ireland would be called to this subject, and that they may be induced to make voluntary contributions for the purpose of emigration as a relief from those burdens which, though not legally imposed, are yet found practically to press upon them from the superabundance of the pauper population."

Here is an extract from the Report of the Committee of 1829—

> "The fact is undeniable that generally speaking there is that excess of labour, as compared with any permanent demand for it, which has reduced and must keep down the labourer at the lowest possible amount of subsistence."

And they add—

> "Your Committee would particularly wish to press upon the attention of the House that the evils of population furnishing an excess of labour above the demand for it contain within themselves a self-producing and self-aggravating principle, and that, so long as no measures are taken to restrain them, they must not only continue to exist and increase, but by their very existence must prevent the introduction of that capital which, if introduced, would diminish the redundancy by establishing a greater equality between the supply of labour and the effective demand. . . The evils of a redundant population, with all the incidental consequences, have been universally felt and acknowledged, and various suggestions have been made for their partial relief. But your Committee cannot but express their opinion that a more effectual remedy than any of those temporary palliatives which had been offered is to be found in the removal by emigration of that excess of labour by which the condition of the whole labouring classes is deteriorated and degraded. The question of emigration as connected with Ireland has been already decided by the population itself, and that which remains for the Legislature to decide is to what points the emigration should be directed."

In short, all the Reports say that the remedy for the evils complained of was to be found in emigration, and all urged its necessity. The following passage occurs in the Report of the Commissioners of 1836:—

> "There is not in Ireland the division of labour that exists in Great Britain; the body of the labouring class look to agricultural employment, and to it only, for support; the supply of agricultural labour is thus so considerable as greatly to exceed the demand for it; hence come small earnings and wide-spread misery."

That is but a brief outline of the expressions used in the various Reports.

I come now to the last part of the Resolution—namely, that which regards the state of agriculture in Ireland. The hon. and learned Gentleman has omitted one or two paragraphs which he originally contemplated introducing in his Motion. The hon. and learned Member's Motion expresses a trust that the Government would direct their attention to the subject he has brought under the notice of the House, with a view of devising some means by which the Irish agricultural population may be induced to devote their capital and labour to reproductive employment at home. There is no doubt that the land question has a great deal to do with much of the distress that exists in Ireland. It is clear to every one who considers the question, that in any country where the seasons are uncertain and hazardous, and where the occupier cannot enter on a fair rotation of crops, he cannot easily recover himself from the loss he may incur on one crop. It is a fact that in joint-stock banks there are placed, at the rate of only 2½ per cent, sums principally belonging to the farming class in Ireland, amounting to upwards of £14,000,000, some portion of which vast amount the occupier of land would naturally be inclined to employ in the improvement of the land if he had a certainty of being remunerated for the investment in the course of a series of years by a fair rotation of crops. No doubt the Land Improvement Act of 1860 was intended by the Legislature to work good in that way; but I believe that every one admits that it has been to a great extent a failure. Considering the number of measures which have been passed for the improvement of land, it is to be deplored that the landlords of Ireland have not availed themselves more of the facilities placed at their disposal by the Legislature as they might have been fairly expected to do. At the same time, whatever may be proposed tending to improve the condition of the agricultural population, and the occupiers of those very small holdings in Ireland, is well worthy the attention and consideration of the House. I stated last year, in answer to the Motion of the hon. Member for Kildare, that I considered it desirable that something should be done in that direction; but I always said that, as a proprietor of land myself, I must strenuously set my face against the schemes propounded by some gentlemen in Ireland. In reference to the agricultural produce of Ireland the hon. and learned Gentleman has quoted from the returns of Mr. Donelly, the Irish Registrar General, and has endeavoured to show that land is going out of cultivation, and that a serious state of things is occurring. No doubt it is perfectly true that with regard to the cultivation of cereals there has been a decrease in the acreage to the extent of 143,534, but at the same time there has been an increase in the acreage under flax cultivation to the extent of 64,922 acres in the present year as compared with the last. It is also a curious fact, that while the land under cultivation for wheat decreased in 1863, the produce on the diminished acreage exceeded that of 1862 by 154,858 quarters. With regard to potatoes, there was a slight increase of acreage under cultivation in 1863, amounting to some 5,000 acres, but the yield was no less than 1,927,547 tons more than in the preceding year. There has been a great movement in respect to flax, and nothing is more interesting than the facts concerning the cultivation of flax in Ireland at the present moment. I have a most interesting Return showing the enormous development of this cultivation. In 1854 there were only 151,403 acres under flax cultivation, but in 1863 there were 214,063 acres under that cultivation. This is a great development, and I hope the movement will be attended with success. I am informed that in the course of the present year there is a breadth of land under flax cultivation to the extent of one quarter more than 1863, that is to say, there is at this moment about 300,000 acres under flax cultivation. Considering the benefit which the investment of so much capital in that cultivation must produce, I think that the greatest credit is due to men like the hon. Member for Dungarvan, who was among the first to take up the question of the cultivation of flax. I was reading the other day some Returns from India, showing what has been done there by the people turning to proper account lands fit for the cultivation of cotton and tea. In 1861 the Indian cotton crop produced about £9,000,000, and in 1863 it was estimated at £43,000,000. With regard to tea, the Indian exports of tea in 1861 were worth £17,244, but in 1863 they had risen to £192,242 in value. I am, therefore, entitled to ask, why may not Ireland make an equal advance in the cultivation of flax, if people only turn their attention to it; and I trust that the expectations formed of this movement in Ireland on this subject may be realized. The hon. and learned Gentleman referred to the waste land of Ireland, and said that from the time of Sir Richard Griffith's Report in 1845, the different administrations of the country had done nothing to remedy the state of things. That Report was not the first which was made on the subject. A Report was made and an Act passed in the Irish Parliament as far back as the year 1731, for reclaiming waste and bog land, and up to 1798 a succession of measures was passed in Ireland for the same object, but not a single step was taken to put them in execution. Even so far back as 1809 the British Government issued a Commission, which reported on the practicability of reclaiming the waste lands of Ireland. Nothing, however, was done until the Report of Sir Richard Griffith in 1845. The hon. and learned Gentleman has said that there are 6,000,000 acres of land in Ireland now lying waste, but that statement is, I think, scarcely warranted by the facts of the case. The works were commenced in 1846, the year after the Report; and since that period, of the 3,755,000 acres there stated to be improvable more than one-half have been reclaimed. Therefore, instead of the 3,500,000 acres alleged, there must, I think, be less than one-half that quantity now available for improvement. The hon. and learned Member should recollect that the Lands Improvement Acts authorize loans for the purpose of reclaiming waste lands, and that advantage has been taken of these provisions. Much, no doubt, may yet be done, but I have not the power to state, on my own authority, that the Government is prepared to recommend extensive works such as that reported on by Mr. Bateman. My hon. and learned Friend says that if we look around in Ireland we see in all directions trade, commerce, in fact, everything declining. Surely that cannot be true! We have only to read the Reports of the monthly fairs, and of the trade at Waterford, Londonderry, Belfast, Dublin, &c., to find that in every instance a very considerable development has taken place in the material prosperity of the country. Let us take the case of Waterford for example. The tonnage in 1864 was 398,771 against 386,281 in 1863, thus showing an increase of 12,490 tons, or about 3 per cent. Similar results are to be observed at Londonderry. In 1840 the tonnage of the vessels trading to Derry was 84,178 tons. In 1850 the gross tonnage was 161,539, or nearly twice as much as that of 1840, and in

1860 the tonnage was 247,121, or treble what it was twenty years before. These figures certainly do not bear out the assertion of my hon. and learned Friend. I have received letters from different parts of the country, all affording evidence of the improvement which has taken place in the state of affairs. One correspondent in Kerry writes—

> "You will be glad, I know, to hear that our prospects never were brighter in this country than they are at present, and all our crops are looking splendid, thank God!"

The prospects of Ireland generally are equally good, and I might refer to the Reports from Belfast, Limerick, and elsewhere to illustrate the hopeful condition of the country, if I were not unwilling to trespass longer on the time of the House. It may be true, as the hon. Gentleman has said, that labour is a source of wealth and population a source of labour, but there may be a state of things, as in Ireland, which requires a remedy to be applied in the shape of encouragement to emigration. I agree with the hon. Member that the best capital of Ireland is the industry of her people; and none can deny that an impetus has been given to that industry. Tillage is considerably improved, and the amount of agricultural produce has been increased. In fact, capital is generally being brought into very active and successful exercise. Whatever the past may have been, this is not a time to despond in regard to the future. Ireland is essentially an agricultural country, and exertions are now being made for the establishment of farming societies, which will, I believe, be of great advantage by bringing together different classes for the consideration of matters connected with their common interests. Property is every day becoming more valuable in Ireland, and surely the comfort of the community must be on the increase. I thank the House for the opportunity of showing what has been done for Ireland, and I rejoice to think that in 1864 we do not find, as in past years, political partisans endeavouring to make capital out of the calamities of Ireland. We all of us, I hope, wish to do our best for the regeneration of the country. It has passed through several series of bad years—from 1838 to 1842, from 1845 to 1847, and lately from 1859 to 1863; but, thank God! a happier time seems to have commenced. The improvement is owing, I am bound to say, not so much to the measures of the Government as to the energy of the great bulk of the people. I hope they will continue to be animated by the same spirit, and, whatever Government may hold office in this country, I am sure that there will be an anxious and earnest desire to promote those measures that may tend to promote the advancement and prosperity of Ireland, and thereby to enhance the peace and general welfare of the United Kingdom.

MR. MAGUIRE expressed his admiration of the tone and temper in which the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland had addressed the House. He felt certain that there was no Irish Member, on whichever side of the House he might sit, but would feel that the right hon. Baronet had risen to the dignity of his office, and had demeaned himself not only with courtesy to individuals, but with a gravity that the importance of the subject required. The right hon. Baronet had made a graceful admission that night, and one which he felt the more keenly as it had been his painful duty on many occasions to bring the state of Ireland under the notice of the House. He assured the right hon. Baronet now that the crisis was over, that he was urged to do so from an overpowering sense of his duty. It was painful to Irish Members to have to appeal *ad misericordiam* to the House, for they would rather see the bright than the dark side of the mantle, and he was glad to find that he had been vindicated that night by the statements of the right hon. Baronet. The statements he had made on a former occasion the House would see had been fully justified by the facts. He hoped, therefore, if such a state of things again arose, he should not be met in future as he had been in times past when urging them on the attention of the Government. The right hon. Gentleman had obliterated the past by the frank and cordial manner in which he had represented the true state of things in Ireland. The hon. and learned Member for the King's County (Mr. Hennessy) also deserved credit for having brought this matter under the notice of the House, because the state of things in Ireland, above almost any other question that could be named, ought to interest the Parliament and people of England. They would soon see the House in a state of great excitement, each party levelling its taunts against the other, and banding criminations from side to side in a hearty and deadly struggle for office on the subject of Denmark. In the country of Denmark, however, he had no special interest, and though he admitted its importance, he considered the condition of Ireland and how it could be improved a question of far greater gravity, and one that ought to arrest the attention of both sides of the House; and he believed that the statesman who took up the question of Ireland, and dealt with it boldly and courageously, as the late Sir Robert Peel did, would do more for his own name and honour than if he shone in a great party battle which had only a selfish object for its end. He did not expect that immediate legislation upon the condition of Ireland would follow from this discussion; but enough had been said to convince the House that there was something wrong in the state of Ireland, and to induce the Government to consider the subject during the recess, with the view of introducing some substantive legislation next Session. The right hon. Baronet had said that since 1840 a large number of acres of waste land had been reclaimed; but he had not alluded to the still more startling fact, which could not be disputed, that 200,000 acres of cultivated land had relapsed into sterility in two years. The right hon. Gentleman had also mentioned in proof of the great resources of Ireland, that £14,000,000 of capital were in the banks of that country; but the right hon. Baronet had not urged it to its proper result—namely, that the people allowed it to remain there almost useless, and unproductive, because they had not sufficient faith in the security of the great bank of nature—the land. He believed that not one-tenth of the land of Ireland was properly cultivated, and the reason was that the people had not faith in the security, and they hoarded their money with the object of leaving the country rather than of remaining in it. He believed that until the land question was settled they could not have permanent prosperity in Ireland. It was an exceptional state of things in Ireland and it justified exceptional measures, as had been stated by Lord Derby, Lord Palmerston, and every Minister that had endeavoured to interfere with the land question. There were some exceptions, but as a rule what had been done in Ireland had been done by the tenants; and therefore it was the duty of Parliament to protect the tenant, by giving him compensation for unexhausted improvements, where he was arbitrarily removed from the land. A measure of that kind would soon change the face of Ireland, for the people themselves had a capital in their thews and sinews and in their energy and industry, and there was as great a desire to be energetic and industrious in the humble farmers of Ireland as there was in the people of any country on the face of the earth; and if the Government wanted them to take their £14,000,000 from the banks, where it yielded no more than 1 or 2 per cent, they had only to give them proper security for their investments in land. England had had the sole and uninterrupted management of Ireland for the last sixty-four years. The native Parliament of that country had been destroyed. His firm conviction was that if there had been a Parliament in Ireland at this moment the state of things would have been very different, and the resources of Ireland would be developed. No matter what differences might exist about religion, or whatever causes of strife might exist, there would be sufficient self-interest to develop the resources of the country. After the lapse of sixty-four years Ireland was going back, and although there might be a little activity along her seaboards, that activity was partly factitious, because it was owing to foreign vessels bringing in food, whereas Ireland ought to be an exporting and not an importing country. There was another sign of activity in some parts. But what was it? What brought English vessels into Cork Harbour? Emigration. There were two or three vessels leaving that port every week; but a fortnight ago there were not a sufficient number of vessels to carry off the emigrants. What was the feeling of the people of Ireland on this subject? The feeling of a large portion of the people of the South of Ireland was one of utter insecurity, of disgust with the country, of a desire to change at any risk or any hazard. The Catholic Bishops and clergy and the Liberal press had done their best to dissuade the people from reckless emigration, but they could not stop the rush which was taking place from the shores of Ireland. Of course there were many reasons why the emigration was going on. Higher wages could be obtained in America and Australia; and the fact that they had relatives there of course operated as an inducement to them to cross the Atlantic; but the fact was undeniable that there was a rush from the country, which plainly showed that there was something wrong. The farmer had no security, and, therefore, he would not improve his farm, and therefore there was a smaller demand for ordinary labourers. If the farmer had security that his improvements would become his property, the face of Ireland would be changed, and, instead of being half cultivated, it would be equal to the best parts of England. The state of things was this: nine-tenths of the agriculturists of Ireland held at will. If all landlords were like the noble Lord the Member for Kerry (Lord Castlerosse) and his hon. Friend the Member for Clonmel (Mr. Bagwell), a change in the law of landlord and tenant might not be necessary. But there were hundreds and thousands of estates which had been purchased under the Incumbered Estates Act which were a blister and a curse to the country. The owner could raise the rent of the tenant, could turn him out at a few months' notice, and possess himself of the property. Many owners had done so, and the result was that the people were discouraged and dissatisfied, and were rushing away. An Act had, it was true, been passed in 1860 with a view of improving the condition of the tenant; but that Act had turned out a dead letter, and he trusted that his right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary would, during the recess, turn his attention to framing a measure by which that Act would be amended. It was admitted that since 1831 three millions and a half of people had left the shores of Ireland. It was true that some had gone to join the Federal armies. The blood of many was reeking to heaven, and called for heavy vengeance on some persons who were continuing the unnatural conflict. But if it ceased to-morrow, he believed the tide of emigration would flow on unchecked. The matter was one, he might add, which very seriously affected England herself. There was no recruiting going on in Cork, and very little in Munster. The fighting part of the population had gone to fill the ranks of the Federal army. Now, England ought rather to encourage the people to remain in Ireland than to go away. It would not be well for England to have the population of Ireland reduced to three or four millions. Some years ago it was said that emigration was a panacea for the ills of that country. But Ireland had not only bled from the veins, but from the arteries; and, surely, no one could now say there was a superabundant population. The small landowners were disappearing every day, and the number of large farms was increasing. This, then, was the proper time for a good landlord and tenant law which would allow the people to defend themselves. The right hon. Baronet had certainly spoken in kindly terms; but it would be much more gratifying if at the commencement of the next Session he would lay on the table some measure calculated to improve the condition of Ireland. He admitted that some gentlemen were endeavouring to introduce manufactures into that country; but Ireland being an agricultural country there ought to be a landlord and tenant law of a comprehensive character. Unless some change of that nature took place, if another bad season should occur, the scenes of ruin and disaster which had been witnessed would be again witnessed. The Government of Ireland by England was pointed to by Frenchmen and Italians and Spaniards as a source of shame to the latter, and Englishmen ought, he thought, to be anxious to wipe away any cause of reproach on that score by, at all events, passing a law which in the opinion of nine-tenths of the Irish people was essential to the welfare of their country. The present law was a mockery. What was required was a reality. If that was given, Ireland would be in that position which she would occupy were she governed by her own laws, her own sons, and her own Parliament.

Mr. MONSELL said, the enormous increase of emigration from Ireland gave him the deepest pain, and he was convinced that if it went on the results would be most disastrous. The richer portion of Ireland, such as that with which he was connected, would probably not suffer so much, but in the poorer portions land which was yielding from 16*s.* to 20*s.* per acre rent would be turned to growing bog grass. It was time that the Government and Parliament, in the interest of the landed proprietors themselves, looked the matter seriously in the face. The experiment of bloodletting to cure the evils of Ireland had been tried often enough and had failed. The right hon. Baronet, in the quotations he had made from the Reports of various Committees and Commissioners, had not taken into account the entirely different state of things which at present existed there. The miserable cottiers which then formed so large a part of the population had almost entirely disappeared, and they had to deal with a totally different state of circumstances. It was a remarkable fact that the rural population was diminishing in almost every country. In England, during the last ten years, it had diminished from 2,000,000 to 1,900,000. In Scotland the diminution was still greater; and in France there had been a great diminution, not from emigration, but from the agricultural population seeking employment in the towns. The difference between the rate of wages in town and country in France was not nearly so great as the difference between the wages in Ireland and America, and while the people could get from Ireland in eleven or twelve days, at the rate of from £5 to £6 per head, the emigration was sure to go on if something were not done to stop it. He believed that many persons entertained mistaken notions on the subject of population. When Arthur Young was travelling in France, before the French Revolution, he said that its prosperity depended on the population being reduced by five millions. But the population of France was very much greater now than it was in the time of Arthur Young, and yet the people of France enjoyed a great deal more of comfort and prosperity than they did then. The prosperity of a country depends on the proportion between the capital and the number of hands that require employment, and during the last three years capital had been decreasing in Ireland nearly as fast as population. Unless the condition of the people improved the emigration would go on to a fearful extent. Well, then, what could be done? No doubt that was a most difficult question, but still it must be looked fairly in the face. The question of land tenure had been alluded to, and there would be no doubt that the reason why the land tenure had not been amended ten years ago by the Earl of Aberdeen's Government was the extravagant views put forward by many persons at that time—views which frightened the House, went to subvert all ideas of property, and rendered it perfectly impossible for moderate men to put forward their views. If the same enthusiasm raised by those extravagant views had been excited in favour of Sir John Young's Bill, and if that Bill had been passed, it would have done immense good in Ireland. The right hon. Baronet had spoken of £15,000,000 or £16,000,000 belonging chiefly to the Irish population being locked up in banks. Would it have remained there if it had belonged to the population of England or Scotland? In the one instance there would be security to the tenants for any improvements they might effect in their farms; in the other it was far otherwise. No better advice could be tendered to the Government than to reconsider the Bill of Sir John Young, with a view of seeing whether it could not be re-introduced next Session. Another Bill which would be of great benefit to Ireland would be a Bill such as that which the Attorney General had intimated his intention of laying on the table during the Session—a Bill for the Registration of Titles. Such a Bill based on a proper principle would tend to cheapen the transfer of land, and companies would be found springing up which would buy the large estates which were disposable, and would sell them out in small portions accessible to the people who were the possessors of the £15,000,000 or £16,000,000 of capital. Nothing would more tend to improve the condition by rousing the energies of the farming classes than to make them feel that by industry and saving they could become small proprietors. These two measures would confer enormous benefit on Ireland. There ought also to be, he would say, a good deal more of kindliness of feeling displayed by the Government towards the Irish people. It might be sentimental, but there was no doubt that such hard and harsh speeches as those of the right hon. Baronet during the last two or three years, when he denied the existence of distress in Ireland, and that of the noble Lord at the head of the Government, when he refused to give them the benefit of University education without sacrificing their religious convictions, had had a great effect on the Irish people, and had made them feel that the Government was not at one with them. Under such circumstances the people said, "Let us go to other countries, where we shall be treated with greater kindness." Feeling most deeply the danger to which the country was exposed—believing that the emigration instead of diminishing was likely to increase, and that it was the interest of all parties to try and stop it—he begged of Her Majesty's Government not to remain quiescent in the matter, but to endeavour honestly to grapple with and stay the evil by removing those obstacles which prevented the improvement of the country.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN observed, that the question before the House was not a party question, and ought to be treated by hon. Members as men of business. The present state of Ireland was connected with the land system in that country, and he believed it could not be treated by rotation crops or by endeavouring to make tea gardens of the agricultural districts. The other day he was coming up from Tralee, and in the train with him were no less than eighty-three emigrants. He had seen forty or fifty coming from Tullamore. These cases were illustrations of what was going on in Ireland, and his impression was, that the day would come when not only the tenant but the landlord would suffer from the emigration. He differed from his right hon. Friend (Mr. Monsell) with regard to the measure of the Earl of Aberdeen's Government, as he did not think that was sufficient. Both sides of the House ought to unite for the purpose of settling the Land Tenure Question, and he asked the Government to endeavour to bring about such a settlement.

Mr. M'MAHON said, the day had arrived when English Members ought seriously to consider the question as it concerned England. He cared more for the tenants of Ireland than he did for the Irish landlords. The tenantry of Ireland had been trying for years to obtain some measure which should induce them to stop in Ireland, but it had been refused them, and now they were seeking in America that which was denied to them at home. By going there they improved their own condition, but injured the power of this Empire. [*Cries of* "No!"] The power and greatness of a country depended on the multitude of its inhabitants. He would remind those hon. Gentlemen who cried "No" of the scriptural phrase—"Woe unto the people when the stranger at the gate sits in judgment." The Motion before them was — "This House observes with regret that the agricultural population of Ireland are rapidly leaving the country." Did the House view it with regret? From the tone taken by the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and the manner in which his observations had been received, he feared that the House did not view with regret the fact that the people of Ireland were leaving their country. This country ought to bear in mind that those who were leaving Ireland were not vermin which it was desirable to clear off the land, but men and women, the natives of the soil, and whose labour would be lost to the place of their birth. His right hon. Friend was not exactly correct in stating that opposition had been offered to Sir John Young's Bill from the quarter to which he had referred. He confessed that his own views on the Land Question were extreme, and went much beyond those embodied in that measure, but the Members of the Tenant League in that House had given their strenuous support to Sir John Young's Bill and also to the Bill of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin. If the Government and Parliament wished to bring about a state of prosperity in Ireland, they must settle the question of landlord and tenant in Ireland on the basis on which it was settled in Prussia, in Hungary, and Germany; they must give security and fixity of tenure to the tenant, he rendering a fair value for it. They must go further and get rid of the supremacy of the Established Church, and make the people of Ireland feel that they themselves governed the country, and were not slaves.

Lord ATHLUMNEY said, the House owed a debt of gratitude to the hon. and learned Gentleman by whom the Motion had been proposed, for of all the subjects they could discuss none more deserved their attention. As had been said during the debate, the affairs of Denmark, of Italy, of Turkey, and of the whole world engaged their attention; but what were these in comparison with the affairs of Ireland? He owned that he had been greatly surprised at the observations on the subject of emigration which had fallen from many who had addressed the House. It had been his fortune, or misfortune, to hold a prominent office in the Irish Government during the most disastrous period that had befallen any nation, and from 1846-7 onward a great pressure was placed upon the Government not to check, but to aid the emigration of the surplus population of Ireland. From that time great progress had been made in that direction. Boards of Guardians were empowered to give very considerable aid to emigration, and that movement had to a great extent encouraged the emigration that had since taken place to other lands than our own colonies. The Irish people were deeply attached to their native land, but the warmth of their family affection was unbounded, and there was scarcely a poor family in the distressed districts of Ireland which had not a friend or relation in America beckoning them on to a happier and a better lot. What means had the Legislature of counteracting such a movement? It had been stated that within fifteen years the enormous sum of over £12,000,000 had been sent from emigrants in America to their relatives or friends in the United Kingdom, but principally to Ireland; and that was a specimen of generosity unparalleled in history. Meanwhile, what had happened at home? While the poor were receiving money to take them away, had anything been done to fix their lot in Ireland. There had been three bad seasons, and the small farmers were beginning to think that they would be unable to hold their ground. Their grasp on the land, so to speak, had been loosened, and when invited to go and share the happier lot of their friends they were asking whether it would not be better to accept the invitation. Even recent legislation adopted in a kindly spirit towards the people, had by its tendency to increase evictions unintentionally aided in the removal of the people from the soil. Thus Parliament, with regard to certain tenements, had imposed upon the landlord the duty of paying the rates. Hard times followed; the landlord received no rent, but he had to pay the rates, and who could wonder at his wish to preserve himself and his property as far as he could from ruin? The effect of such a measure might be imperceptible, but it must have some effect in the direction he had suggested. Then, had the Irish landlords done all they could to induce their poorer tenants to remain? Had the condition of these poor people been improved—had they been made as comfortable as they ought to be? Why, the Irish people were at that moment the worst lodged of any people—he was going to say on the face of the earth, but certainly in Europe. Then, with all these inducements to go, and with so few inducements to remain at home, was it astonishing that emigration should continue? Could anything be done to stop it? No! And when it was remembered that these poor persons were going to a happier land, where they would have better wages, better clothing, and better lodging, he thought the Legislature ought not to stop emigration even if they could. This state of things must be left to find its own level. Parliament could do nothing. He had listened to the debate in the hope of hearing some real remedy, but he had heard none that was likely to receive the sanction of the House, and even if it received that sanction he doubted its efficacy. It was said that if the land question were settled, if security was given to the tenant, such an outpouring of wealth would follow as would gratify the most ardent patriotism. But what prospect was there of that? The land question was a very delicate one. It ought to be fairly considered, and the whole truth should be told. What was really the difference at that moment between the Irish tenant and his landlord, and the English tenant and his landlord? He was told that in England the landlord made the improvements, and in Ireland it was the tenant; but if so that was all a matter of bargain. If the English landlord did make improvements, he required a higher rent from his tenant in consequence. Let hon. Members take care that in urging the question they did not injure the Irish tenant. If both parties were put upon their mettle what would happen? If the English system were introduced into Ireland the consequence would be the introduction of English tenants into that country. Landlords in Ireland would then look for men who had a capital of £10 per acre, without which no tenant would be received. The House might depend upon it that the land question must remain as it was—a question of agreement between the parties. The Irish landlord had a very delicate duty to perform. He should perform that duty with forbearance, kindness, and consideration, but more than that he could not do. The real want of Ireland was a state of security. It was useless asking that House to pass a law which could only have the effect of making matters more insecure than they were at present. In all their dealings with the Irish people they should endeavour to show that they were their friends, that Parliament and the Government desired to assist them, and such conduct would do more towards bringing about a better state of things than any meddling with the land question. If the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Wexford (Mr. M'Mahon) met with any response in that House, he should despair of any real improvement, because the proposition of the hon. and learned Gentleman was equivalent to taking property from one set of men and giving it to another set. Under the sanction of Parliament, property had been sold in the Incumbered Estates Court of a value exceeding £20,000,000; and the House, by showing itself determined to maintain the great landmarks of property, would do more to tranquillize Ireland and to obtain the confidence of the people than by any rash meddling between landlord and tenant, and by exciting hopes which it would not in any way gratify.

MR. WHITESIDE: Sir, I cannot refrain from congratulating the noble Lord upon the excellent observations he has made, and in so doing I cannot but remember the efforts he has made to remedy some of the evils which we all deplore. I remember that I had the happiness of supporting a measure for improving the habitations of the poor in Ireland, which was introduced by the noble Lord. He has, however, omitted some of the causes which have led to the present condition of Ireland, and it is very unjust to charge upon the Parliament of this country the evils which have unquestionably overtaken the people of Ireland. When the Irish Parliament was in existence, a class of 40*s*. franchises was created; and I have heard old men describe the condition of the small occupiers, and the miserable dwellings of those who, as a class, existed only to gratify political ambitions. Then he was a man of the most importance who could bring the largest number of small occupiers to the poll, and the result of that state of things was a great social and political evil. If the same course should be tried here, or in any country, the result would be the same. In describing the causes of emigration the noble Lord also forgot to mention one very important cause—the repeal of the Corn Laws. At the time when that question was discussed here it was always said that sooner or later the real effects of the repeal of the Corn Laws would be felt in Ireland. The hon. and learned Member for Wexford (Mr. M'Mahon) who has spoken in such strong terms as to the causes of the misfortunes of Ireland, should have remembered that Mr. O'Connell and the whole body of Irish Liberal Members in this House supported the change, which they were warned must ultimately produce a most serious effect upon the fortunes of their country. The measure for the repeal of the Corn Laws was carried, I believe, by the votes of seventy Irish Members—votes, no doubt, given in a patriotic spirit, but no one can doubt that the effect of that measure has been to make the profitable cultivation of small farms of from six to ten acres a sheer impossibility. In considering the causes of the present state of Ireland these are not facts to be overlooked. Although I do not often agree with the *Edinburgh Review*, yet I do agree with an article which appeared in that review a few months since, which was written in an impartial spirit. The unknown Whig, its author, stated that all legislation of this House of late years has gone against Ireland. That is quite true, although it was never intended to inflict injury or to do injustice to the country, but simply to carry out the theories enunciated with such marvellous eloquence by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The hon. Member for Dungarvan has given notice of a Motion upon the paper duty, but he must know that all the paper mills in Ireland have been destroyed. In carrying out great theories, put forth with great ability by such men as the Chancellor of the Exchequer, we must not be surprised if such consequences follow. It is not long ago that being on a visit to a large farmer in Ireland he pointed out to me as remarkable a man who farmed fifteen acres. He explained it by saying that under the present system, having regard to the price of corn and the climate and condition of Ireland, it was next to impossible for a man to support himself upon a farm of fifteen acres. If that be so, we have only to refer to the tables of statistics, and find out how many farmers of that class there are in Ireland, and then we shall know how many there are to be disposed of in some way or another. The noble Lord is right in saying that the small farmer in Ireland begins to find out that he cannot keep his place in the country. I believe that it is so, and with the noble Lord I think it is a matter of regret. If I am asked why in the county of Armagh the small farmers manage to live, I would reply that they pay their rent when due and continue to live because they produce an article for which they have a market—flax. But as to the pure agricultural districts of Ireland it is impossible for men to live upon such small farms. If that small measure of revolution be given which is proposed by the hon. and learned Member for Wexford—who is speaking less in this House than upon the hustings — what will happen? He spoke of Hungary and of Prussia. I know nothing of Prussia, and there is no country I care less about, or whose examples should have less influence with us. But I have been recently in the county of Wexford, and I found it a thriving county, the farmers in good condition, the landlords and tenants upon good terms, and a strong Conservative spirit pervading them all. I agree entirely with the noble Lord that the tenantry ought to be treated with generosity and kindness, and that is how they are treated in the part of Ireland from which I come, where there are peculiar customs which tend to keep them in the country, and where there is a branch of trade which enables the poor man to live which does not exist in other parts of Ireland. If you can introduce that industry into other parts of the country, you may enable the small man to live, but I am afraid that the legislation which you have adopted, and which you will never retract, and the principles which you have laid down, and which a majority of this House are determined to carry to their legitimate conclusion, will and must tend to continue, and it may be to increase, the emigration from Ireland. I do not entirely agree with the noble Lord that that is a matter for satisfaction—[Lord Athlumney: I did not say so]—a matter which Parliament can do nothing to avert. Parliament can do a good deal when it chooses, and Government can do something when a Government exists which wishes to do something; but a great many Governments exist which wish to do nothing. I should be the last person to cast censure on the Chief Secretary, who has traversed Ireland and seen a great deal, and who knows a great deal about the country. He seems to think that the emigration must continue, but I venture to express my regret at its existence to so great an extent, and I think that there is nothing extravagant in asking the Government, as this Resolution does, to consider a subject of such a startling character, and not for the purpose of introducing any Utopian measure, but with the view of ascertaining whether it may not be possible to do something to alleviate that which every right-minded man must regret.

Mr. BLAKE regretted being obliged to differ from the noble Lord opposite (Lord Athlumney) in much that had fallen from him, particularly in the satisfaction with which he viewed the expatriation of the Irish people, and his belief that emigration was desirable for their interests and that of the country. The noble Lord had asked, what better remedy could be suggested under the existing state of things? He was sorry he was not answered by some one more eloquent than he was; but the remedy was so simple, that expressed in the plainest language it lost nothing of its force, and that was, to cherish the people whom famine and emigration had spared, by securing them just compensation for improving the letting value of the land. If the Irish farmer were assured that he would not be wholly deprived of the fruits of his laborious industry, his toil and savings would be expended on the land, which, if properly cultivated, was quite equal to supporting in comfort many more than now derived a miserable existence from it, and the landlord would have increased security and better rents. The noble Lord had said that, practically, there was little difference between the course pursued by the English and Irish landlords, as if the former made the permanent improvement they put on an additional rent for their outlay, and that the latter let their land for less money on account of the tenant making these improvements. Now this difference, which his Lordship thought so little about, accounted both for the prosperity of the English tenant and the misery of the Irish one. The first was not called on to expend his capital and labour, on first taking possession, on constructing a homestead, main drainage, fences, gates, &c.—all that was done for him by the landlord; whilst the Irish tenant had to do it all himself, and for years had to work against the dead horse. True, the Englishman had, perhaps, to pay 6 per cent additional on his rent for the outlay of the landlord; and, unless he had spare capital, surely it was infinitely better for him to do so, and to be free to devote all his resources to the proper development of the soil. But not only had the unfortunate Irish peasant to incur all this cost, but he ran the risk of offering the landlord an inducement to raise his rent or to dispossess him altogether, in order to have the benefit of the increased value of the land created by his industry. And this was no theory; there were thousands upon thousands of instances where it had occurred, and, unfortunately, were still occurring. No wonder, therefore, that the people abandoned the country, that its productiveness decreased, and that discontent and disaffection prevailed. There were many noble exceptions, he fully admitted, to the practice which too generally prevailed; and he was glad to say the noble Lord was one of them, as he showed himself a kind and considerate landlord over his large estates in the North of Ireland. The House furnished many examples of what proprietors ought to be—for instance, the Junior Lord of the Treasury and the Member for the county Clare—and it was only sought to make men not so well disposed, to do by law what others did of their own free will. Those who acted with him (Mr. Blake) had been charged with putting forward extravagant demands, which could not be complied with. Now he could say, on their part and his own, that they would be well satisfied with either of two things—the tenant-right custom, as it existed in the North, and which made it not only the most flourishing part of Ireland, but also the most advantageous both for landlord and tenant, and where agrarian disturbances were rarely heard of; or pass a similar measure to that introduced by Lord Derby's Government some years ago, and which passed the Commons but was shipwrecked in the Lords. He differed very widely in many things from the Chief Secretary for Ireland, but he could not but admire the moderate, able, and generous speech he made that night. He was always grateful when kind words were spoken of Ireland, and a disposition shown to serve her, and would praise the man who evinced such a disposition, no matter on what side he sat. These were very hopeful words that fell from the hon. Baronet that night, and he trusted he would realize them. His speech showed him to have possessed himself of a good knowledge of Ireland. If he would only, during the recess, inform himself still further as to her requirements, he should become convinced that the real way for preserving the country, both for landlord and Government, would be to secure to the tenant a fair share in the increased value of the land which his industry had created. He and the Friends who acted with him sat and voted on the Opposition side, chiefly because they saw that the existing Government were not disposed to do justice to the tenants. The due protection of the latter was the most vital and paramount of Irish questions beyond all comparison, and until it was settled on just terms, the distractions and misfortunes of Ireland never would cease, and it was hopeless to expect she would become prosperous, contented, or loyal.

Mr. POLLARD-URQUHART said, the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Dublin University (Mr. Whiteside) seemed to think it was in the power of any Government to apply some remedy to the emigration taking place in Ireland. Now, he wished the right hon. and learned Gentleman had thrown out a hint as to the nature of the remedy. He believed that some such Bill as that introduced by the right hon. and learned Gentleman and the late Lord Chancellor for Ireland would do much to stop the exodus. He should like a distinct answer from the right hon. and learned Gentleman as to whether he would be prepared to bring forward such a measure if he was in power. In the present divided state of parties such a declaration might not be without its significance. The other evening the Government only had a majority of seven, and it might turn out that hon. Gentlemen might compromise some of their opinions in favour of the right hon. and learned Gentleman if he would make some such pledge as this, although he did not know whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman would go the length of reimposing the Corn Laws.

Sir FREDERICK HEYGATE said, that no measure of tenant-right would enable the small farmers of Ireland to hold their own. The only remedy for the depressed state of the country would be the development of trade and commerce. Some advantage might be gained from the cultivation of flax, but those who thought that that article could be immediately cultivated to a large extent would be disappointed. It was a matter for serious consideration, whether it was fair to impose the same taxation upon an undoubtedly weak country like Ireland as was paid by one which had the greater means of prosperity, by the development of trade and commerce which were possessed by England.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER said, that as an Irish Member and an English landlord he had taken a great deal of trouble to examine the relation between landlord and tenant in Ireland, and he must confess he had always felt at a loss to understand the conduct of Irish landowners. An English landlord, when a farm fell vacant, put all the buildings into thorough and tenantable repair, knowing very well that unless he did so he might get a tenant, but not a first-rate one, and that his rent would be unsafe. English landlords supplied the tiles for drainage purposes, and expected the tenants to put them in; and in case a tenant grubbed up waste land he was allowed to hold it for a certain time without increase of rent, and after he had obtained fair remuneration for his outlay the proper increase in his rent was determined by valuation. He felt sure that if Irish proprietors dealt in a similar spirit with those holding under them, they would have a happier and more contented tenantry to deal with. The reason why a similar system was not pursued in Ireland he did not know, and he had never been able to find out. If the Irish landlords persisted in neglecting to do what was just, the Legislature, in his opinion, ought to step in and compel them to deal more satisfactorily with their tenants. When the tenant-right agitation was in full strength he had never agreed with the legal notions of its leading advocates, knowing that the views of law which they put forward had no warrant in the history of any country, and were not countenanced by any legal authority. They advanced the doctrine of emphyteusis, which did not apply to the matter, misinterpreted portions of the civil law, and constructed a theory of mutual rights in the soil to which the only thing at all like a parallel was found in India, where it had been productive of endless mischief. At that time feelings were so violently excited that the advocates of tenant-right could not be reasoned with. At present there was no violent agitation in Ireland, and advantage ought to be taken of the prevailing calm honestly and usefully to grapple with the difficulty. It was very well to tell people that in America they would be better off. The heart-rending scenes witnessed on their departure showed that they left unwillingly; they felt there was no place like home, and their right to live in their own country could not be disputed. It was, therefore, with deep regret that he learnt there was a common practice of dispossessing tenants at the end of their term without any compensation for improvements, and of setting up their holdings to auction. [*Cries of* "No!"] He hoped such was not the case in the districts of which hon. Members had cognizance, but he knew that the practice prevailed to a formidable extent.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Sir, it must be owned that the House has listened to a very interesting debate upon a subject which must have excited very strong feelings on the part of every one interested in the national welfare. At the same time, I hope that the hon. and learned Member who brought forward the Motion will be content with the expression of feeling which he has elicited from all sides of the House, and be satisfied to leave the matter as it stands, without pressing his Motion to a division, which might imply a difference of opinion that really does not exist. It is very much to be lamented that circumstances should induce a large number of the people of Ireland to emigrate from their own land. At the same time, I cannot join with those who lament this on account of the emigrants themselves, because, if they go to a country where they are in a better position than they were in in their own, and acquire wealth and comfort, as far as the individuals are concerned you cannot regret the change in their circumstances. A proof of their improved condition is afforded by the fact that the Irish who emigrate to America send enormous sums of money to their friends in Ireland—in one year of the famine as much, I believe, as £1,500,000. Those remittances show that the persons who were able to send them must have been in comfortable circumstances, and in the receipt of good wages; and they likewise do the greatest possible honour to the Irish people, because, however large may have been the means of those emigrants, in the money sent home to their friends and relations an amount of self-denial is implied, an amount of affection involved, reflecting the highest credit on the hearts and feelings of the Irish people. We have been told by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin, that this emigration arises from the repeal of the Corn Laws, the repeal of the paper duty, and other liberal and enlightened measures of Imperial legislation. When he calls on the Government to apply a remedy to the evils he laments, he cannot, I presume, mean that we should re-enact the Corn Laws, re-enact the paper duties, change our spirit duties, and alter all those things to which he ascribes the flow of emigration from Ireland to America. Then we are told that tenant-right would remedy the evils complained of; that if we were to adopt a change of law regarding landlord and tenant, instead of leaving that relation to be dealt with by bargains between man and man according to the plain and simple doctrine that should regulate transactions of that sort—if we would only pass some law which would impose an obligation on the landlord that, as I apprehend, would transfer part of his property eventually to the tenant, that would form such an inducement as would prevent the Irish people from going to America. Now, all these remedies appear to me wide of the mark. It is a simple question of the law of level; and this the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Limerick illustrated very clearly. Its operation is shown in every civilized country in Europe. In England the rural population is gradually flowing from the country to the towns. Why? By the law of level, and because they get better wages in the towns than in the rural districts. In France it is the same. When we talk of Irish emigration, we confine ourselves to the emigration to America, and forget that there is a very great Irish emigration to this island. We forget that every seat of industry in England and Scotland swarms with Irishmen, who have emigrated because they thereby obtained better employment and better wages. In Glasgow, Liverpool, Birmingham, Bristol, South Wales, London, in every part of this island where there is a great demand for labour, and where the wages are high, you find Irishmen flock and settle. Why? Because they are tempted by high wages, better employment; and next, because, being admirable workmen, those who employ labour find it to their interest to employ the industrious Irishmen, and are glad to pay them those wages which make it worth their while to come and stay there. You cannot by any legislation alter that state of things. You cannot alter the laws that regulate human society by any artificial regulations. And this hon. Gentlemen who have spoken on the point this evening admit by their prospective apprehensions, because they say that, great as the emigration is now, yet when the civil war in America shall end that emigration will be much greater. Why? Because the increased demand for labour in America will increase the temptation to Irishmen to go from their own country to America. The thing I lament is not that so many Irishmen go to places where they find themselves better off and more prosperous than in their own country, but that from a great many circumstances owing their origin to an early period long gone by, and a state of things now happily ceased, Ireland is not in such a state that Irishmen find within their own country those inducements to and rewards of labour which they find in other countries. I lament that the rewards of labour are so low in Ireland, and should be glad if anything were pointed out that would tend to alter and improve that condition of things. Part of it arises from the dispensations of Providence in regard to the physical arrangements of the country. There are not in Ireland those great stores of coal which are to be found in many parts of England and in America, and which afford an easy employment for capital and labour. But there are in Ireland great means for many kinds of manufacturing industry. There is no country where there is greater abundance of water power —and water power is in many cases as good as steam power for manufacturing purposes, and I cannot understand why capitalists who intend to employ their capital in manufacturing operations do not go to Ireland more than they do. They would find it to their advantage to do so. I know it is sometimes said that capital is not so secure there; but that, I think, is a great mistake. We hear, no doubt, of agrarian outrages from time to time, but these are totally independent of the operations of manufacturing industry; and I am quite satisfied that any capitalist going to Ireland and taking advantage of its natural resources, both in material power and human labour, would find just as great security as in England, and from the abundance of water power and labour would find it answer his purpose. I trust that is taking place gradually. We heard the other day, I think, of Mr. Whitworth going to establish manufactures in Ireland. One example of that kind will lead others to follow, and I am quite confident that of all things most likely to arrest the tide of emigration would be not attempting to do so artificially and against the laws of nature, but holding out to Irishmen those inducements to labour which they are now obliged to seek across the Atlantic. There is another thing that tends to increase this emigration—the greater facility which steam navigation affords for the passage — not only the greater rapidity in point of time, but the greater cheapness in point of money. It is impossible by any artificial arrangement you can devise to change the laws of nature, or to prevent people going where they consider their position will be greatly improved. All you can do is to endeavour to improve their condition in their own country, and add inducements that may lead them to continue at home. As long as they can improve their condition by going to America, it would be unkind to do anything to prevent them. I quite agree with my noble Friend (Lord Athlumney) that there are no people who are so open to the effect of affection and kindness as the Irish, and no doubt much depends on the conduct of landlords towards their tenants. I think an immense improvement has taken place in that relation of late years. In former times the landlord and occupier of the soil had no common relations whatever. The land was generally let in large lots on long leases for three lives or sixty-one years. The man who had the lease subdivided the land again to other people, by whom it was again subdivided, and those who lived on it had no relations to the real landlord. There was no kindly feeling between them because they had nothing to do with each other, and when the middleman disappeared and the landlord and tenant came together, they had not the reciprocal kindly feelings which are necessary for the social welfare of the country. Well, that state of things is over. I am sure anybody who knows Ireland must know that the landlords are taking much greater interest in their tenants, in everything connected with the comfort of their habitation, in the establishment of schools, and all the other arrangements by which tenants are made to feel their landlord's care for them. Those relations are extending and taking deeper root in the country. I should therefore hope that the hon. and learned Gentleman who made this Motion will not really press so very general a Resolution as this, which would appear to impose on the Government duties which are not expressed, but that any Member who thinks he can produce a particular measure that would contribute to the result he desires will have the goodness to do so, and it will be duly considered; but the affirmation of a Resolution so vague as the present, would merely lead to expectations which would not be realized, and would only tend to aggravate the evils we all deplore.

MR. HENNESSY said, he could not help remarking that the Resolution had been supported by all the Irish Members who had spoken. The first part of the Resolution was—

> "That the House observes with regret that the agricultural population of Ireland are rapidly leaving the country;"

and the next part was—

> "That the House trusts Government will direct their attention to the subject, with the view of designing some means to induce them to devote their capital and labour to reproductive employment at home."

The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary said he would be inclined to support the latter part of the Resolution. The only Question, therefore, was, whether they should express their regret at the people leaving the country?

SIR GEORGE GREY said, he should move the Previous Question.

Whereupon *Previous Question* put, "That that Question be now put."—(*Sir George Grey.*)

MR. WALPOLE said, before the Question was put he wished to make an appeal to the hon. and learned Member for the King's County. He had listened to the debate with great interest, and he must say he had never heard a debate upon an Irish question conducted with greater ability, or conveying more useful information on both sides of the House. He thought that the hon. and learned Member for the King's County had made out a strong case for the second part of his Motion. He considered, however, that if the first part were carried it might lead to apprehensions as to the opinions expressed in reference to emigration. At the same time, if the Motion were negatived, it would most likely leave an impression on the people of Ireland by no means advantageous as regarded the feelings which existed in that House in reference to the relations between the Government and the people of the sister country. He could not conceive any better solution of the difficulty in which the House was placed than to accept the assurance given by the noble Viscount in his admirable speech. He (Mr. Walpole) must therefore say, that if the hon. Member for the King's County should, notwithstanding, go to a division, he should support the Motion for the Previous Question.

MR. MONSELL said, he would venture to make an appeal to the hon. and learned Member for the King's County, grounded on the enormous importance of that Question, and the extreme undesirableness of anything like a difference of opinion being exhibited to the country when they were substantially all agreed. The noble Lord at the head of the Government had reechoed almost every sentiment expressed by the hon. Mover of the Resolution, and the hon. Gentleman would really injure his own cause by dividing the House.

MR. LEFROY said, he had not the advantage of hearing the former part of the debate, but he must say that the statements made by the hon. Baronet below him (Sir George Bowyer) were as unfounded and as unbecoming a man who professed to know anything of Ireland as anything he had ever heard. If the House were forced to a division, he should feel it impossible to support that vague and indefinite Resolution. The noble Lord had stated to them most truly the real position of Ireland, and the means by which they were to arrive at its improvement.

Mr. HENNESSY said, he wished to say a few words out of respect to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Walpole). He had been asked not to go to a division; but what had the Government done? At the last moment, and without notice, they had moved the Previous Question. There had been a belief in the House that the Government would give way, and that there would be no division, and acting under that impression several hon. Members had gone away. The noble Lord had made a speech, in which he promised nothing, and told the people of Ireland that he did not regret the decline of the population. Except that negative fact, there was nothing in his speech. Deeply regretting to differ with the right hon. Member for Cambridge University and others, he must certainly feel it his duty to press his Resolutions to a division.

Mr. ESMONDE said, that although he was as anxious as any man for the prosperity of Ireland, he felt it his duty, if the hon. Gentleman went to a division, to vote against his Resolution, which, even if carried, could lead to no practical result. He did not recollect any debate which had brought home to his mind more forcibly than had been done that night the conviction that there was something good in store for Ireland. He remembered several discussions on the subject, and several Bills which had been thrown out by the advocates of the landlord interest in the House. He thought that a want of moderation had prevented a settlement of the Question.

Mr. BUTT said, he meant to vote for the Previous Question. The effect of that debate would be marred if the hon. Member who had raised it was so indiscreet as to press a division.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, that although he was generally a supporter of the Government, he should call in that case upon his hon. Colleague to persevere with his Motion. To put Resolutions on the paper without seriously intending to carry them to an issue would create a bad impression in Ireland.

Previous Question put—

The House *divided*:—Ayes 52; Noes 80: Majority 28.

Mr. HENNESSY said, he believed his second Resolution, in favour of employing the agricultural population, had not been put.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That this House trusts that Her Majesty's Government will devise some means by which the Irish Agricultural Population may be induced to devote their capital and labour to reproductive employment at home."—(*Mr. Hennessy.*)

Sir GEORGE GREY moved the Previous Question.

Whereupon *Previous Question* proposed, "That that Question be now put."—(*Sir George Grey.*)

Mr. HENNESSY said, he understood that the Secretary for Ireland had consented to the second Resolution.

Sir GEORGE GREY said, he had understood that the Previous Question covered both Resolutions.

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, he believed that the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary was right, but great inconvenience was occasioned by the intention of the Government not being distinctly expressed earlier in the debate. The hon. Member for the King's County had met with rather hard measures from the Government.

Viscount PALMERSTON said, he had hoped that after the appeal made to the hon. Gentleman he would not have pressed the Motion to a division. It was only when the hon. Gentleman insisted on dividing the House that the Government moved the Previous Question.

Mr. WHITESIDE said, he would recommend his hon. Friend not to give the House the trouble of dividing a second time. The Secretary for Ireland had led the House to believe that he would agree to the second Resolution.

Original Motion and *Previous Question*, by leave, *withdrawn.*

ARMY.
REGIMENTAL QUARTERMASTERS.
ADDRESS MOVED.

Sir FREDERIC SMITH said, he rose to move that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, for an inquiry into the condition as to pay and allowances of the Regimental Quartermasters, with the view to place those officers, should it seem expedient, on a better footing. He would not enter into minute details at that late hour, but he wished to remind the House that they were as deserving a class as any in Her Majesty's service. Last July he moved for a Correspondence between the quartermasters and the authorities, which showed the vast extent of the duties performed by the quartermasters and their claims on the service. In a regiment of 1,000 men there was but one appointment to which a private might look forward with certainty as raising him to the position of an officer and a gentleman, that of regimental quartermaster. The post of regimental quartermaster must be held by a man who was raised from the ranks, but when he got into possession of the post he found it valueless. He held in his hand the services of 126 quartermasters. They had 220 medals between them and clasps without number. Their duties were multifarious. They were storekeepers, bookkeepers, and they kept the accounts of the whole regiment with the exception of the paymasters. If there were a vacancy for adjutant or quartermaster, it was given to the senior staff sergeant, whether he was quartermaster sergeant, or sergeant major. But look at the difference of the two appointments. The adjutant received 8*s.* 6*d.* a day; the quartermaster only 6*s.* 6*d.*, and was it possible to live and bring up a family on that sum? Of the 126 there were only six unmarried, and upwards of 100 were married at the time of their appointment. Would not the House give those men the means of supporting their wives and children? His brother officers in the House would bear him out when he said that non-commissioned officers were usually taken from the married men, because the married men were the most steady. Those men were responsible for stores in their charge to the amount of £2,500,000; they had no end of books to keep, and if there was any loss they were held accountable. How was it then that the men came to take the appointment? Formerly the appointment was a good one, and the quartermasters hoped to see the day when they would be put upon a fair footing. Formerly the clothing was in the hands of the colonel as a perquisite. He employed the quartermaster and gave him a handsome remuneration. The regimental necessaries were then provided by the quartermaster at the wholesale prices; he retailed them at shop prices, and received the difference between the wholesale and retail. This enabled the quartermaster to save money for his family. In the colonies the quartermaster was worse off by £20 or £30 than the quartermaster sergeant, and that was a state of things which ought not to exist. He did not ask the noble Lord to promise the men a single shilling, but merely to grant an inquiry, and the result he was sure would be to give these poor men what they deserved. He had intended to move for a Royal Commission, but if the noble Lord would grant an inquiry in a modified form he would not push his Motion to a division. He begged to move an humble Address to Her Majesty, praying that She would be graciously pleased to grant an inquiry into the condition, position, pay, and allowances of the Regimental Quartermasters in Her Majesty's service.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to direct an inquiry to be made into the condition as to provision, pay, and allowances of the Regimental Quartermasters of Her Majesty's Service."—(*Sir Frederic Smith.*)

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, it would appear upon investigating the claims of that most deserving class of non-commissioned officers, that the rate of pay which they received, more especially upon first appointment, was extremely low. He did not, however, at all admit that because the adjutants or paymasters received a higher rate of pay the quartermasters also ought to receive it. All that the House and the Government had to look to was that a meritorious class, as the quartermasters were admitted to be, should not be asked to serve for an inadequate remuneration. He had reason to believe that their remuneration was inadequate. The Secretary of State, however, did not think it his duty to come forward with any proposition to that House to raise the pay and allowances of the quartermasters without first making minute inquiry. It seemed to the noble Lord (Earl de Grey) that a competent tribunal might be composed, partly of officers who had a practical acquaintance with the duties the quartermasters had to discharge and a practical knowledge of their position, and partly of gentlemen who should represent the Treasury. Such a Committee would be appointed as soon as possible, and the Government would be prepared to act upon their recommendation. He hoped that statement would be satisfactory.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

SHERIFF'S SUBSTITUTE (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Bill to authorize the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury to make provision in regard to the

Salaries of certain Sheriffs Substitute in Scotland; *presented*, and read 1°. [Bill 164.]

House adjourned at One o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, June 22, 1864.

MINUTES.] — Select Committee — *Report*— Standing Orders (Parliamentary Deposits) *brought up* [No. 423].

Public Bills—*Ordered*—India Office*.

First Reading—India Office* [Bill 166].

Committee — Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers [Bill 62] [No Report]; Weights and Measures (Metric System) [Bill 24]; Jersey Court [Bill 48], Debate *adjourned*.

Report—Weights and Measures (Metric System) [Bill 24].

Considered as amended—Accidents Compensation Act Amendment* [Bill 143].

Third Reading — Superannuation (Union Officers)* [Bill 133]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation* [Bill 149]; Countess of Elgin and Kincardine's Annuity* [Bill 156], and *passed*.

Withdrawn—Bank of England Notes (Scotland) [Bill 115].

COURT OF CHANCERY (IRELAND) BILL.

Mr. O'HAGAN, referring to the circumstance of the abrupt termination of the proceedings in Committee upon this Bill on the preceding day, moved that

> "This House will, on Thursday next, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House to consider further of the progress of the Court of Chancery (Ireland) Bill."

It appeared from a work which was a high authority upon the proceedings of that House, that this was the proper course to pursue.

Mr. LONGFIELD opposed the Motion. It did not appear from the references to the Journals in the work to which the right hon. Gentleman had alluded, and which was undoubtedly a work of the highest authority, that there had been a single case in which, after the Chairman had been moved from the Chair on a division taken, a Bill had been revived during the same Session. The passage in *May's Law and Practice of Parliament*, which referred to this subject, was at page 449, and was to this effect—

> "Sometimes, however, the proceedings of a Committee on a Bill are brought abruptly to a close, by an order 'that the Chairman do now leave the Chair;' in which case the Chairman, being without instructions from the Committee, makes no report to the House. A Bill disposed of in this manner disappears from the Order Book, and is generally regarded as defunct; but as the House cannot be bound by the decision of a Committee, and has not itself agreed to any vote by which the Bill has been postponed for the Session, it is competent for the House to appoint another day for the Committee, and to proceed with the Bill."

He admitted that this work was a most valuable compilation; but it did not appear from the Journals that there was any instance in which a Bill had, under these circumstances, been proceeded with. The first precedent cited by Mr. May was from 90 *Commons' Journals*, page 497, which was the case of the County Coroners Bill. That measure was brought to an abrupt conclusion, the Chairman being moved out of the Chair. There was no Report, and nothing further was done with the Bill that year. The second case cited was 90 *Commons' Journals*, page 562, the Public Institutions Bill; the third 105 *ibid.*, page 345; the fourth, 111 *ibid.*, 201, Justices of the Peace Qualification Bill; and the last, 112 *ibid.*, 310; in all of which cases the Bills had a similar termination. He had also looked at the references to cases in which Bills had been revived, and not a single one appeared to be the case of a Bill, which being in Committee the Chairman was voted to leave the Chair. It must strike any one that when no Report at all was made that must be the result, because the House could take no notice of a Resolution which was not reported to it. In this very instance the Speaker had held that he, as the organ of the House, could take no notice of a division, because it had not been reported. The cases to which Mr. May had referred in support of his second position, "that it is competent for the House to appoint another day for the Committee, and to proceed with the Bill," were all cases on the consideration of the Report of a Committee, or after one report, and not one of them appeared to have been a case in which the Chairman was ordered to leave the Chair on a division taken. The first was 70 *Commons' Journals*, 384—the Paupers Removal Bill. In that case, as appeared by the Journals, the Chairman was not ordered to leave the Chair, but the Report of the Committee was considered, and they were ordered to re-assemble, and the Bill was re-committed. The same was the case in the second instance cited, that of the General Turnpike Bill, 82 *Commons' Journals*, 365. Under these circumstances, he submitted that there was no precedent for the re-instatement or revival of this Bill. If the Speaker should decide against him on that point, he thought that proper notice ought to have been given of a Motion of this kind, so that hon. Members might not have been taken by surprise.

Mr. BUTT said, the very precedents to which the hon. and learned Gentleman had referred would, if he had read them completely, have shown him that there was no doubt about the authority of the House in this matter. The last precedent was that of the 27th of March, 1827—the General Turnpike Bill. What occurred with reference to that Bill no doubt took place upon an order for taking into further consideration the Report from a Committee of the Whole House, but the House then resolved to re-commit the Bill, and the Committee to which it was re-committed was in the same position as an ordinary Committee. What followed was thus entered on the Journals: — "The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee, but after some time spent therein Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair." The meaning of that was that there was no Report. The proceedings of Committees were not then entered upon the Journals when there was no Report, but in the "Minutes and Votes" of that day the entry was as follows:—"General Turnpike Act Amendment Bill—Report for the considered Bill re-committed; considered in Committee; No Report"—which, with the exception that in this instance there was a division, was exactly the way in which what had occurred with regard to this Bill was recorded. Therefore it was clear, that on the 27th of March, 1827, when the Turnpike Bill was re-committed, the Chairman left the Chair without making a Report, and the Bill was at an end unless something took place. What else was done then? On the 9th of April an order was made in the terms which the Attorney General had adopted upon this occasion—"That this House will, upon Wednesday next, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House, to consider further of a Bill to amend the Acts relating to Turnpike Roads in England." The other precedent was that of the Paupers Removal Bill in 1815. In that case precisely the same entry was made in the Journals—"After continuing some time on the Committee, the Speaker resumed the Chair;" and on the 20th of June, the House set the Bill up again by order, precisely as his right hon. Friend now proposed. It was, therefore, clear that in both these cases the Chairman left the Chair without making a Report, and that the proceedings of the Committee would have terminated if the House had not exercised its inherent jurisdiction, and set it up again. In 1856 the Committee upon the Crime and Outrage (Ireland) Bill was two or three times counted out, and each time the House revived it. As to the question of notice, it had been the practice of Members, in cases in which upon the second reading of a Bill it had been resolved that the word "now" should not stand part of the Question, to replace their Bills on the Orders without giving notice. If, however, his hon. Friends opposite intended to take the sense of the House upon the question whether this Bill should be replaced in the Orders, it would, perhaps, be better that notice should be given of this Motion. He was not at liberty to refer to what occurred in the Committee, but in some place or other he did hear the right hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin state that his object in moving that the Chairman should leave the Chair was not to defeat the Bill.

Mr. O'HAGAN (The Attorney General for Ireland) said, that what he had done he had done upon the advice of the highest authority, and having resolved to take that course, he had communicated with the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin, and with the hon. Member for Mallow.

Mr. WHITESIDE said, that the highest authority in the House was the Speaker, who had not yet pronounced upon this Question. It was true that it was at first his intention to move that the Chairman should report Progress; but Members who were well acquainted with the forms of the House told him that the Motion which he made deliberately, "That the Chairman do leave the Chair," was analogous to the Motion of the "Previous Question" in the Whole House, the adoption of which prevented the revival of the subject during the same Session. At any rate, whether it was possible or not, it was not usual. When a matter had been discussed and a vote taken, it was the practice of the House to have nothing more to do with it during that Session. Although the hon. Member for Youghal (Mr. Butt) had displayed much ingenuity, he had not produced a precedent of a case in which a hostile vote had been taken upon a division obliging the Chairman to leave the

Chair, and in which, upon a Motion made as a matter of course, the Bill had been resumed in the same Session. What he contended was, that there must be in some shape a Report from the Committee to enable the House to proceed. In the present case, however, the House had nothing before it, and according to the principle quoted from Mr. May's book, a course had been taken which had brought the Bill to an end. This was the less to be regretted, as the effect would be that the hon. and learned Gentleman would bring in a better Bill another time. It was a matter of importance that the House should conform to its usual practice. A great Judge said it did not much matter what the practice was so long as it was practice. The right hon. Gentleman in the Chair was not partial to introducing subtle distinctions in the Rules of the House, and if the question must be argued again, due notice ought to be given.

Mr. GEORGE said, that in the case of the General Turnpike Bill it was plain, from the short notice in the Journals of the House, that there could have been no division, as in the case of the Bill in question, where the Chairman had been moved out of the Chair. No one disputed that where there had been a Report, a Bill would re-appear on the Notice Paper, but he contended that when the Chairman of the Committee had been voted out of the Chair by a hostile majority, the House had never interfered. There was, therefore, he submitted, no precedent to justify the interposition of the House in the present case.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Mallow (Mr. Longfield) not having favoured me with notice that he intended to raise this Question, I have been obliged to refer to the precedents since I came into the House. The House will be aware that the Committee have no power to extinguish a Bill. A Bill is referred to a Committee that it may be considered and amended; but the Committee have no power to put an end to a Bill. That power the House retains to itself. On many occasions, some of which have been quoted by the hon. Member for Mallow, the Committee has ordered the Chairman to leave the Chair, and this having been taken as an indication that the Bill is not favourably regarded by the Committee, it has not been revived by its author in the House. But it is beyond the province of the Committee arbitrarily to take a Bill out of the power of the House and to put an end to it. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University (Mr. Whiteside) has said, that when a vote has been taken on a measure, that vote must be regarded as decisive. But such a rule must not be taken without qualification. I would recall to his recollection that within the last few years the Question has been put to the House in regard to the second reading of a Bill, "that this Bill be now read a second time." The House decided in the negative—namely, that the Bill be not read a second time "now." The Motion had not been put in the usual form that the Bill be read a second time "that day six months," and it was in the power of the House, having refused to read the Bill a second time "now," to read it a second time on another day. I remember a few years ago that a Bill was brought in by the late Member for Surrey (Mr. Drummond), who not being satisfied with the decision of the House that the Bill be not read a second time "now," on a subsequent occasion moved that the Bill be read a second time; and the House, having changed its view in regard to the Bill, read it a second time, and it was ultimately passed. Now in this particular case the Bill is not extinguished and put an end to by the Chairman being moved out of the Chair. If the hon. Member for Mallow had examined the precedents with more care, I think he would have found that they do not correspond with the view he has taken of them. There is no Report from the Committee in this case. There was no Report also in the case of the General Turnpike Bill, and in that case the Bill was revived. I have not the smallest doubt that, in conformity with the distinct precedents that have been cited, it is entirely in the power of the House to order the Committee to meet again, and consider the Bill further. It will not be a case of "Progress," because, when the Chairman reports Progress, by a decision of the House which was come to fifteen years ago, the Speaker leaves the Chair without question. Inasmuch, however, as there is no Report from the Chairman, when the House is moved to go into Committee on this measure, it will be competent for any Member to raise the question on going into Committee, precisely as was done in all Bills and at all times before the rule of Progress was established. I believe that what I have now stated is, without question, in conformity with the established practice of the House. [Mr. WHITESIDE: As to notice?] With regard to the question of notice in the case of the General Turnpike Bill, 1827, the Order for the committal of the Bill was made early in the evening, and before the commencement of public business, and, therefore, I have no doubt it was done at that time without notice. Practically the Chairman being voted out of the Chair has the same effect as the House being counted out. We have a measure on which the House has been twice counted out lately, and which has been much opposed — the Weighing of Grain Bill. But although in those cases the debate came to an abrupt conclusion, there has been no question raised that the Member in charge of the Bill had not the power of putting it down for another day.

MR. WHITESIDE inquired whether the Question before the House would be whether the Bill should be resumed?

MR. SPEAKER: It would be in the power of the right hon. Gentleman to raise the Question on the Motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair.

MR. VANCE thought it would be for the convenience of the House that notice should be given for a future day, so that Members might be aware of the course to be taken.

MR. ROEBUCK said, that two questions were involved — one the question of form, which had just been decided by the Speaker; and the other, whether the House would think fit to revive the Committee, and that would come before the House when the right hon. Gentleman left the Chair. The Speaker having decided the question of form, the House could not be taken by surprise, and it would be competent to any hon. Member to move that the House go into Commitittee on the Bill that day three months.

MR. SPEAKER: No doubt it will be quite competent to any Member to move that the House resolve itself into Committee on the Bill on that day three months.

Motion *agreed to.*

Committee to consider further of the Bill *To-morrow.*

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES (VOTING PAPERS) BILL—[BILL 62.]

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. CRAUFURD moved that the Bill be committed that day three months. The law at present provided for the mode in which meetings should be called, the mode in which the poll should be taken, and the mode in which the shareholders should vote. At present a shareholder who was unable to attend a meeting was at the mercy of the shareholder to whom he might intrust his proxy; and if the hon. Gentleman desired to give the shareholder the power of giving a special as well as a general proxy, that might be a very proper thing; and if the Bill did not go beyond that there would be no objection to it. But the Bill applied to all companies. Now under the Companies' Act of 1852 companies had the power of regulating their proceedings, and directing the mode in which votes should be taken. This Bill proposed to override the powers given under that general Act. The hon. Gentleman had seen the force of that objection, and had given notice of an Amendment to exclude all companies except those constituted under special Acts. But the Bill went beyond the power of giving a special proxy paper. The present practice was for a meeting to proceed with the poll immediately, or to adjourn it to some future day; but the second clause of the Bill would compel the adjournment in every instance for seven or fourteen days, and the practical result would be to cause delay when time might be of the utmost importance. The sound principle of legislation was to lay down general rules giving a company power to make bye-laws for the purpose of carrying out its proceedings. The second clause was not only unnecessary but mischievous, because it would hamper the free action of all companies to which it applied. He thought the object of the hon. Member would be attained by giving shareholders special proxies in addition to the proxies provided by the general act; for a fortnight's notice must be given of every meeting, the special business of which meeting was required to be set out, and ample time was thus afforded to every shareholder to send a special proxy applicable to the business to be brought forward. He submitted to the hon. Member the propriety of expunging the objectionable clauses, and thus removing the objections to the Bill. In order to enable the hon. Gentleman to state the course which he intended to pursue, he begged to move the Amendment of which he had given notice.

Mr. AYRTON seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Edward Craufurd,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH hoped that as the hon. Gentleman did not object to the principle of the Bill he would consent to its going into Committee. The present system of proxies enabled directors to do almost as they liked. A case occurred a few years ago, in which a Board of Directors carried a vote of £5,000 to an officer of the company by means of general proxies without the shareholders knowing anything about it until it was done. He proposed to amend the second clause by enacting that, instead of an adjournment for seven or fourteen days, that "when a poll is demanded the meeting shall be adjourned in the usual manner." He would suggest to the hon. and learned Gentleman to postpone the consideration of his objections until they got into Committee.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Manner of Voting).

Mr. CRAUFURD proposed an Amendment to enable the holder of the proxy to vote at the original or any adjourned meeting; but withdrew it, and proposed to omit the second paragraph of the clause.

After a desultory discussion, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. PEACOCKE moved that the Chairman leave the chair, as it seemed difficult to understand the effect of the proposed changes.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Peacocke.*)

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 76; Noes 49: Majority 27.

House *resumed.*

[No Report.]

Mr. Craufurd

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL—[Bill 24.]

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Commttee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Short Title).

Mr. W. EWART said, that having consulted the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, certain Amendments had been agreed to which removed the objections entertained by certain hon. Gentlemen, and he believed those Amendments were of such a nature as to induce the House to inaugurate the metric system, which he hoped would soon be adopted as the universal practice of the country. It had been adopted in many other countries with the greatest possible advantage, and no desire whatever had been manifested for a return to the old systems. The schedules to the Bill had been carefully revised by the most competent authorities, and he believed they would be found quite satisfactory.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (The Use of Metric Weights and Measures allowed).

Mr. W. EWART said, he should move that the clause be struck out, in order to insert an amended clause in its place.

Moved, That Clause 2 be omitted.

Mr. ROEBUCK said, he had no doubt that the proposed system would be an improvement upon the old one, but he did not like the idea of its being a permissive measure. He wished to know if the President of the Board of Trade approved of a permissive Bill on such a subject. If county A continued the old system, and county B adopted the new one, very great confusion would probably arise.

Mr. W. EWART observed, that at the present time the metric system was voluntarily used in many trades and manufactures. It was in an active state, and the object of this Bill was to promote its extension, and to render permissive that which was not now strictly legal.

Mr. HUBBARD thought the explanation of the hon. Gentleman proved that there was no necessity for the clauses which he proposed to substitute for those which had been objected to, because certain operations could now be performed by agreement against which there was no legal objection. If there were any legal restraints on private arrangements, the clause which had been prepared might be necessary; but if that was not the case the passing of such a measure might open a door for making experiments on weights and measures throughout the country. He differed from the sanguine author of the Bill, and did not believe it would be possible to introduce the decimal system in the ordinary transactions of this country. The working people were thoroughly habituated to the existing system. A penny in value and a pound in weight were stereotyped on the minds of the labouring classes. For the purposes of science every facility was at present afforded. He wished to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether there was at present any legal restraint on private arrangements of this description?

MR. ADDERLEY said, the restriction which at present existed was simply this—at present any one who pleased might make use of the system, but it was not recognized by any Act of Parliament, and therefore there was risk of litigation in any contracts based upon it. The present Bill simply legalized transactions which might be voluntarily entered into. With regard to the observation of the hon. and learned Member for Buckingham (Mr. Hubbard), that the labourers were accustomed to the present system, he would only observe that it was the most complicated system in the whole world, differing, as it did, in different parts of the country. Many persons who were carrying on business on a large scale had adopted the metric system, and wished to have it legalized. The hon. and learned Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck) seemed to prefer a compulsory to a permissive system. He (Mr. Adderley) had no doubt that the merits of the system would very soon bring it into general operation; but he certainly was not prepared to make its adoption compulsory on everybody.

MR. LOCKE said, that the present Act regulating weights and measures rendered it illegal to enter into any contract for the sale of goods by any other than the Imperial weights and measures; but a proviso had been introduced into the section, regulating sales by measure which legalized sales by measures other than local and customary measures, which had the effect of neutralizing that section of the Act. Then, again, the section which regulated sales by the Imperial weights contained a proviso at the end of the section, that nothing therein contained should prevent a sale by any multiple of a pound. In consequence of this proviso a sale by the long ton, which is not an Imperial weight, had been held by a decision of the Superior Courts to be legal, inasmuch as the Act did not specify that the multiple should be "numerically expressed." Therefore, in consequence of these two provisoes, the object of the Act, which was to prevent sales by any but Imperial weights and measures, was defeated. However, clauses had been introduced into the Bill to legalize contracts that might be made by parties under the metric system. This was a Bill that might be passed with the greatest safety, and would not occasion any inconvenience, as the schedule contained a table of equivalents of metric and Imperial measures. In consequence of the proviso introduced into the section relating to the sale by measure, articles were now purchased in Covent Garden Market in measures of which nobody knew the contents. To obviate this inconvenience, he (Mr. Locke) had introduced a clause into a Bill which he brought in in 1858, to compel market gardeners and others selling in the market to affix to the vessels in which they sold fruit and vegetables, the amount by Imperial measure which they contained. The market gardeners opposed this clause, and, having met them at the Board of Trade, and argued the question before the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire, then President of the Board of Trade, that right hon. Gentleman, perhaps from being fond of agricultural pursuits, decided in favour of the market gardeners and fruit and vegetable salesmen; the clause was consequently withdrawn and the public left at their mercy. That inconvenience could never arise if the metric system were adopted. By the repeal of the two provisoes in the Act regulating weights and measures, the object of that Act—namely, one uniform system of weights and measures would be obtained with one exception—that is, the reputed quart and pint bottles which enjoyed such a very bad reputation. The reputed quart should be six to the gallon instead of four Imperial quarts, but that was not the case, for you never knew what a bottle contained, or how many bottles went to a dozen. The hon. Member for Stoke-upon-Trent (Mr. Alderman Copeland) had told him that he had received an order to make some bottles which the trade called nineteen to the dozen. Why, if they went on in that way the three-bottle man would certainly not be what he was in former times, in fifty years he would not be as great a drinker as the one-bottle man was now.

Mr. THOMSON HANKEY reminded the hon. Member for Buckingham that, when he, the hon. Member for Buckingham, and himself were governors together of the Bank of England, it had been found convenient to divide the pound troy decimally instead of, as formerly, into 5,760 grains. The hon. Member approved that change, but it was necessary to apply for an Act of Parliament, or the contracts made in pursuance of that alteration would have been illegal. The present Bill would give to every person in the country the same benefit as the Bank of England derived from their Act of Parliament. That, he thought, was an answer to his hon. Friend's objection.

Motion *agreed to.*

Clause *struck out.*

Mr. W. EWART then proposed the following clause in lieu of it:—

> "Notwithstanding anything contained in any Act of Parliament to the contrary, no contract or dealing shall be deemed to be invalid or open to objection on the ground that the weights or measures expressed or referred to in such contract or dealing are weights or measures of the metric system."

Mr. HUBBARD said, that what the Bank of England did, was not to decimalize the pound troy, but to give a decimal expression to the divisions of the ounce. If the object of the clause was nothing more than to legalize voluntary arrangements between individuals for the use of the metric system, he would not object to it. But he wished to ask the right hon. President of the Board of Trade, whether people would be at liberty to make their entries at the Custom House in decimal expressions.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON said, that in passing the measure of last Session the House undoubtedly gave its sanction to the introduction of the metric system into this country. His hon. Friend the Member for Dumfries had, however, agreed not to press the compulsory Bill, and to substitute a permissive one. He gave his vote for the second reading of the new Bill, on the understanding that he was not committed to all its provisions; but the clauses which his hon. Friend had now put on the papers exactly met his views on the subject. The first of the new clauses was simply to the effect that if a contract were expressed in the terms of the metric system, neither party should be allowed to escape from it upon the plea that it was expressed in terms not sanctioned by law. That got rid of the difficulty that by the existing law a contract in such terms as those proposed in the Bill was not deemed binding. The existing weights and measures would still form the legal standards in all cases in which the contracting parties had not of their own accord adopted the new system. On a former stage of the Bill the inquiry was very properly raised, what was a metre? That question was now answered by stating the relative relations between the metre and the English yard, and also generally between the metric weights and measures and the Imperial ones. There was thus no interference with any uniformity which now prevailed. The present lawful standards were left untouched, while facilities were given for the voluntary use of the metric system, which was rendered necessary by the great extent of our foreign trade. Of course, if a large number of persons were to insist on making their contracts in accordance with the metric system, there would be a considerable change in the existing practice; but no degree of compulsion would be used in the matter. Public feeling would be allowed to form itself freely on the subject. The Astronomer Royal had given a great deal of time and attention to the schedule, and it was submitted with his approbation. As to the question which had been asked in regard to the Customs, the use of the metric system would be entirely voluntary, and neither party to a transaction would be entitled to force the other to adopt the metric terms against his will.

Clause *agreed to.*

New Clause *agreed to:*—

> "3. The table in the schedule hereto annexed, shall be deemed to set forth, in terms of the legal weights and measures in force in this country, the equivalents of the weights and measures therein expressed in terms of the metric system, and such table may be lawfully used for computing, determining, and expressing, in legal weights and measures, weights and measures of the metric system."

Schedule of Tables of Equivalents.

Mr. AYRTON urged that the calculations should be carried to the utmost possible point of scientific accuracy. Mr. Whitworth asserted that by a contrivance of his invention a measurement could be made of the millionth part of an inch; and making allowance for a certain degree of professional enthusiasm, he believed that the 100,000th part of an inch really could be measured. In the Schedule, however, the measures of length were carried to only four places of decimals, and this was also the case with the measures of surface. On the other hand, the weights were carried as low as the ten-millionth part of a dram. He thought that greater uniformity should have been observed in this respect in compiling the table, and that an effort should have been made to obtain the greatest exactitude.

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, he would consider the point raised by the hon. and learned Gentleman.

Schedule *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* as amended, to be considered on *Monday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 165.]

BANK OF ENGLAND NOTES (SCOTLAND) BILL—[BILL 115.]

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

SIR JOHN HAY: Sir, in rising to move the second reading of this Bill I wish to say a few words in explanation, because when the Bill was introduced there was no opportunity of explaining fully the object it has in view. It cannot be said that legislation is unnecessary, because in the present Session two Bills have already been introduced to the notice of this House—one by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, which he withdrew with a view at some future time to legislate more largely and comprehensively on the subject. The other Bill was introduced by three Members of this House, representing three of the large commercial constituencies of Scotland; and that measure was also withdrawn on the understanding that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would at an early period consider the whole subject, and bring in a comprehensive measure to meet the wants of Scotland in this particular. It must be known to this House that Scotland differs from England, there being no legal tender there except gold. In England, to avoid expense, the Bank of England is authorized to issue notes which are convertible into gold when presented at their establishments. Now, for the solvency of the Bank of England paper the whole kingdom stands pledged; and while Scotland and Ireland are pledged to this solvency, England alone has the benefit of the issue of the notes. The £14,000,000 which is guaranteed by the country is by the taxation of the whole kingdom. In fact, in times of great pressure the country has stepped in and has relieved the Bank by suspending cash payments to meet the notes payable on demand. As I have already stated, this has been done by pledging the credit of Scotland and Ireland as well as of England for the solvency of that establishment. It was only yesterday that the hon. and learned Member for Clare (Sir Colman O'Loghlen) intended to introduce the Bill of which he has given notice, to endeavour to extend to Ireland the privilege which this Bill contemplates extending to Scotland. Now, this was no narrow question, agitated by any particular individuals; but it is the general wish of the commercial classes, both of Ireland and Scotland, to derive the benefit which is afforded by the credit of the paper of the Bank of England, and in their transactions to avail themselves of the credit of that establishment to whose solvency they are pledged. Some gentlemen have doubted, whether it would be advantageous in the interest of free trade in banking, that the issue of Bank of England notes should be made a legal tender in other parts of the kingdom; but I venture to say that the monopoly in Scotland is already so stringent that the introduction of those notes to relieve the commercial classes from the monopoly of the present Scotch banks, would be found to be a great advantage to them. The reason why this measure has not been asked for has been, that the people have rested contented with the assurance of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he would introduce a Bill upon the subject. At the present time, few new banks are opened in Scotland; and while commerce has largely increased, the number of banks has diminished. In 1844, I think, there were twenty-three banks in Scotland, and to them was guaranteed the power of issue upon their credit, without reference to the bullion they held, but in accordance with the amount of issue during the three years previous. Since that time, two of the banks have disappeared entirely from the scene, and others have amalgamated; so that, at this present moment, there are only fourteen banks in Scotland carrying on the business of banks, and they have concentrated in their hand the whole of the issue of the country. It is true that in addition to the fixed issue guaranteed, which was £3,000,000, and has now been reduced to £2,500,000, they have the power to issue against the gold which they hold; but the introduction of the Bank of England paper would relieve them from considerable pressure. Annually the banks, at certain periods, have to be inspected under the sanction of the Government, and they are to show that they are in possession of the amount of bullion to cover that issue which they have over and above their fixed issue. I am informed that early in this year considerable pressure existed in London, and that to satisfy the Government Inspector in Scotland, something like £1,500,000 was withdrawn from the Bank of England to be carried to Scotland, there to be exhibited against the issue; and having performed that duty was returned to the Bank of England. It seems to me that it would have been a far wiser and more satisfactory mode of procedure if these banks, instead of running the risk of removing bullion from London at a time when there was a tightness in the money market, had had it in their power to produce Bank of England paper as a certificate of their solvency, that their credit was good, and that gold was forthcoming if required to meet their calls. I would also add that I think there would be very great commercial convenience in extending the benefits of a uniform currency, generally recognized by all portions of the United Kingdom. I trust to hear from the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he is shortly about to extend this privilege to Scotland, and I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir John Hay*.)

MR. FINLAY said, that in proposing that the Bill be read a second time that day three months, he would state in a very few words the reasons which had led him to take that course. The object of the Bill was to make the notes of the Bank of England a legal tender in Scotland, with especial powers to the Bank to establish branch establishments in Edinburgh and Glasgow. Now there was no law to prevent the people of Scotland from accepting the notes of the Bank of England at present if they choose to do so. These notes were, as far as that goes, exactly on the same footing as the Scotch notes. There was, therefore, no grievance to be redressed, nor any injustice to be removed. If this Bill passed into law, the people of Scotland would have no choice in the matter —they would be obliged to receive the notes whenever they were tendered, whether they willed it or not. Such a law would be in entire opposition to the fundamental principles upon which the issue of bank notes had always been carried on, and which he hoped would not be departed from—namely, that every creditor was entitled to demand the payment of debts due to him in the coin of the realm, and if he accepted Bank of England notes he did so for his own convenience and at his own risk and responsibility. They all knew that the Bank of England had no power to issue notes for smaller sums than £5, whereas the Scotch banks had the power to issue £1 notes. They should, therefore, have this anomaly—that the branches of the Bank of England in Glasgow and Edinburgh would be restricted to £5 notes, while their rivals next door would have the power of issuing £1 notes. Such an inconsistency could not long be allowed to exist. Further legislation would be necessary, and they would either have to allow the Bank of England in Scotland to issue £1 notes, or to prevent Scotch banks issuing notes under £5. It was not very likely that the Bank of England would issue £1 notes in Scotland, for if they did, then they would have to do it in England. If they did not do this, then they would have to adopt the other alternative and prohibit the Scotch banks from issuing £1 notes, and the excellent system of banking in Scotland would be destroyed. Besides it was not fair towards the Scotch people themselves to introduce such a Bill as this without giving them ample opportunity of considering its scope and tendency. There was another objection to the Bill. If it pass into law it would create a new and perhaps considerable demand for Bank of England notes. How was this to be met? The great complaint against the English Bank Act of 1844 was that it did not supply a sufficient number of notes in times of panic. Therefore, by creating new demands for notes, they would increase the evil, which had already led twice to the suspension of the Act. The fact was if the Bank of England note should be made a legal tender in

Scotland, that House must be prepared to go into the whole currency question, and he submitted that this was not the time for bringing under the consideration of the House a measure of such vital importance and interest.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Finlay.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. K. HODGSON thought that the question as regarded the circulation of the notes of the Bank of England in Scotland could only be treated as a great public question. He did not see how it would be possible to carry out this Bill, making the Bank of England notes a legal tender in Scotland without providing some place in Scotland where Bank of England notes could be exchanged, as they were done at the Bank of England and its branches. Now, that would be attended with considerable expense. The system of banking in Scotland and the system of banking in England were so widely different that it would be scarcely possible for the Bank of England to carry on banking business in Scotland in order to compensate them for the expense that this new issuing department would cause. Although it might be right that measures dealing with the circulation in Scotland and Ireland should be introduced, still he thought that this must form part of a great measure, which must deal with the whole banking system in England, Ireland, and Scotland, and that it would be quite impossible to consider the case of Scotland alone. He thought a great deal of weight ought to be attached to the objection that the Bank of England had no lower notes than £5, and that if it were to establish branch banks doing business in Edinburgh or Glasgow they would have to carry on their business in gold and in £5 notes, and that if they were to use £1 notes they could only do so through the issues of the other banks. That would be a great anomaly; and, under all the circumstances, he thought his hon. and gallant Friend would do well not to press the Bill on this occasion. It was part of a great measure; by itself it could not be worked to any great advantage, and he thought his hon. and gallant Friend would best consult the objects he had in view by withdrawing his Bill.

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE did not think that any great danger would be likely to arise from making Bank of England notes a legal tender in Scotland; nor did he believe that the anomaly which it would introduce would be greater than that which now existed—that £1 notes were allowed on one side of the Tweed and were not allowed on the other. But he thought there would be some difficulty in the way of introducing such a measure as that now proposed. When his hon. and gallant Friend (Sir John Hay) brought forward his former Bill, he (Sir Edward Colebrooke) gave him his support, considering that the present system of banking in Scotland laboured under a defect which was not foreseen when the Bank Act of 1845 was passed, which it was for the Legislature to consider, and the duty of the Government to deal with. He agreed with his hon. and gallant Friend that they should use every effort to break down the monopoly which now existed, and to restore the system to something like the condition in which it existed before these unwise restrictions were placed upon it. The objections which had been taken were not so much to the currency as to the question of banking. The principle of the late Sir Robert Peel was to place restrictions upon the currency, but to leave banking perfectly free. In dealing with the question, however, Parliament acted on different principles with regard to Scotland and England. The effect of Sir Robert Peel's measures had been to lead to a large extension of the banking system in England, especially in London, but it had acted in an opposite direction in regard to Scotland. He could not say that any great evils had arisen from the restrictions now existing; but he could not regard the subject without alarm when he saw that the present banking system was like a Tontine proprietorship, and that on the failure or absorption of one of the banks the currency was taken up by another, which extended its branches to the different parts of the country. There was no doubt that, in the public opinion of the country, there practically existed an impediment in the way of the establishment of new banks. This system could not be safe or sound, and it was one which the Government should attempt to remedy. But the question was — Would the Bill before the House act in that direction? He was for free trade in banking; but he felt some alarm lest, if they allowed the Bank of

England the privilege of establishing branch banks in Scotland, and if they were thus to get a share in the monopoly, they should turn round and act as an obstruction in the way of the change which was desired. The hon. Member for Bridport (Mr. K. Hodgson) had stated that, in consequence of the different banking systems which prevailed in Scotland and England, the issue of bank-notes in Scotland would not be a profitable business. That showed the extreme difficulty that would arise from the banks seeking to trade simply upon an extension of issues of Bank of England notes. They might, by depositing gold in the Bank of England, have a command of them; but all that they would gain by that would not be sufficient encouragement for them to do so. But if the Bank of England, by the establishment of branch banks in Edinburg and Glasgow, entered on banking business in Scotland, they might become interested in the maintenance of the existing monopoly. It was desirable that the subject should be considered more largely than could be done by discussing the Bills introduced that Session, and he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer would tell them what were his views, and that he would, if not this Session at least in the next, bring in some legislation on the subject. If he did not do so, he (Sir Edward Colebrooke), for one, would not consent to allow the question to rest, and should certainly press for inquiry into the operation of the system as it had hitherto existed.

Sir ANDREW AGNEW said, he was sorry to have to oppose his hon. and gallant Friend, but the fact was that a great number of his constituents were excessively suspicious of the English sovereign, and they certainly would strongly object to have Bank of England notes forced upon them, instead of their own £1. He submitted that the people of Scotland should be allowed, as far as possible, to manage their own affairs; and he hoped that on the present occasion the Scotch Members would not be overridden by the tyranny of an English majority. Scotland was prepared to stand by its £1 notes, and there was no reason in the world why it should be obliged to accept English paper.

Mr. DALGLISH said, he would be one of the last men to oppose any real improvement in the banking system of Scotland, but he protested against this constant meddling on the part of private Members who have no specific knowledge of the improvements required. If the Government would bring forward a measure to improve the Scotch banking system he should gladly give it his earnest and cordial support; but he objected to so important a question being constantly brought before the House for no other apparent object than to benefit certain Joint Stock Companies who wanted to establish themselves in Scotland. The hon. and gallant Member (Sir John Hay) has stated that the Government give their security to the Bank of England for their notes. But he (Mr. Dalglish) was not aware that the Bank of England notes had any such security. The Bank of England had no guarantee for the excess of their circulation but the bullion in their cellars; but the hon. and gallant Gentleman wished the Scotch banks to hold Bank of England notes as the security for their excess. Now, although the people of Scotland were always very glad to get Bank of England notes, yet they would prefer gold as a security for the excess of their circulation, and he was sure their opinion was entirely adverse to the present Bill.

Mr. THOMSON HANKEY said, that as the hon. and gallant Gentleman had been good enough to show him this Bill, and to ask him if he saw any objection to it as connected with the Bank of England, and having stated that he saw no objection to Bank of England notes being made a legal tender in Scotland, he wished to state the reasons why he should vote for the Amendment. This Bill appeared to him to involve a new principle of legislation in banking, and he did not think that they were prepared to go into so wide a question at the present time. It was necessary to consider well before they arrived at the conclusion that Bank of England notes should be made a legal tender in Scotland. His hon. and gallant Friend complained, as he understood him, of a want of paper circulation in Scotland; but he begged to remind him that the banks in Scotland could issue their own notes provided they had gold to meet them in their banks. The Banks of Scotland could issue any quantity in exchange for gold. Why did they not do so? Because the expense was so great that it did not pay them to do so. It was an expensive operation to the Bank of England to issue notes; and the Scotch banks found that it was not profitable to do so. He thought, therefore, that it was too bad to ask the

Bank of England to undertake what the Scotch banks found an unprofitable business. He trusted his hon. and gallant Friend would not press the Bill.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I think the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir John Hay) must feel from the discussion that has taken place that it is not agreeable to the House to proceed further with this Bill. I confess I am of opinion that there are various reasons why we are not in a position to do so. In the first place, a Bill of this sort cannot be proceeded with without concert with the Bank of England. It is an extraordinary proposal to give powers to the Bank of England without knowing that the Bank of England is prepared to exercise those powers; and to entail upon the Bank of England responsibilities of considerable importance without having obtained its assent beforehand. It is impossible to consider the question of making Bank of England notes a legal tender in Scotland apart from the question of the establishment of branches of the Bank of England in Scotland. We cannot consider that question without entering into an inquiry on the subject touched upon by my hon. Friend the Member for Argyleshire, as to the manner in which the Bank of England is to conduct not only its issuing business, but its banking business in Scotland. This is a consideration which I do not think falls within the view of the hon. and gallant Member. No doubt he contemplates the establishment of branches by the Bank of England, but he knows nothing of the willingness of the Bank of England to establish these branches. He is providing for matters in which he must have the assent of the Bank of England, without knowing that he will have the co-operation of that important body. The hon. and gallant Member seems to think that Scotland and Ireland, in common with England, guarantee the circulation of the Bank of England to the extent of, at all events, £14,000,000. That is an erroneous supposition altogether. There is no guarantee for the circulation of the Bank of England, or any part of it, by the State. The state of the case is this: that the Bank of England has lent the State £11,000,000, which stands in the form of a debt to that institution; and it has besides £3,000,000 invested in the public securities The State is, therefore, a creditor to the Bank to the extent of £14,000,000; but surely the fact that the Bank has lent to the Government that sum does not afford any claim to Scotland or Ireland to make a demand upon the Bank of England. I agree with my hon. Friend the Member for Argyleshire that a measure of this kind would be viewed with the greatest suspicion in Scotland. Hitherto it has been the policy—and I think, under the circumstances, the wise policy—of the State to keep entirely apart the treatment of the subject of circulation in the three kingdoms. I believe with my hon. Friend that to force the Bank of England notes on Scotland would be greatly resented—partly by the existing Scotch banks, and to a very great extent by the people of Scotland. There is a great deal of national sentiment still remaining in Scotland. My hon. Friend the Member for Wigtonshire (Sir Andrew Agnew) expressed a hope that in this matter Scotch Members will not be overridden by an English majority. I am quite certain that the Scotch Members, although they may not be very numerous, yet backed by the opinion of the people of Scotland, are perfectly well able to take care of themselves; and the last thing which we will see is the representatives of Scotland overridden by a tyrannical English majority in the matter of their small note circulation. Now, apart from this there is, in my opinion, this objection to the measure. It is a measure which belongs to a state of things entirely different and very remote from the state of things which now exists. You cannot possibly combine a system of legislation with respect to the circulation of the three countries in the present state in which the circulation exists. It is needless to enter into the question whether, abstractedly, that would not be desirable. I think it would be most desirable to have a uniform system throughout the three kingdoms; but, looking at the state of affairs which exists in Ireland with regard to the currency, and also to the system which prevails in Scotland, I must say that I consider the realization of any scheme at present for a uniformity of currency in the three countries as altogether impracticable, or at any rate remote. The proposal of the hon. and gallant Baronet seems to me to presume that we have already arrived at a point in our currency legislation little short of absolute uniformity. If there is to be a note which is to circulate in Scotland and Ireland, it ought to be a note proceeding from some authority which stands in direct relation to the people of Scotland. But the Bank of England is an institution which is absolutely and entirely English; it has no relation to the people of Ireland or of Scotland, and I do not know how we could consistently establish a system of uniformity of tender unless that legal tender rested on the authority and guarantee of the common Legislature. In my opinion we are still remote from that state of things in which a national issue could be the rule of currency in this country. I do not at all recede from the opinions which I ventured to state on a former occasion in reference to the law relating to banking in Scotland—namely, that some amendment is required. But I admit that there is a speciality in the case of Scotland arising from the usages of the people, and the conditions upon which banking is carried on there. I should not, therefore, think it wise or safe to presume to give any authoritative pledge as to the time or the mode in which it would be right to attempt legislation on the subject. All I will say is, that I consider it the duty of the Government of the country to look for a suitable opportunity for such legislation; but, on the other hand, I think it is the bounden duty of the Government not to attempt legislation of a comprehensive character on a subject so difficult and so important, except at such a period and under such circumstances as would afford a reasonable hope that the proposals they made were likely to meet with the assent of Parliament. There is much to bear in mind with regard to the relations of the three countries, and the time of bringing such a matter under the notice of the House, which must be thoroughly digested and matured before any decision is arrived at. I think the House is not called upon to arrive at such an abstract decision as that which is involved in the Motion of the hon. and gallant Baronet. At the same time, it would be utterly futile at the present period of the Session to pretend to deal with questions affecting the national currency, or the uniformity of a paper currency throughout the three kingdoms. Those are questions which, at this moment, the House would be wholly incapable of entertaining with the slightest prospect of advantage. Let us be content to proceed in a question of this kind step by step, and not to deal with it as one of abstract principles, but rather with a due regard to the practical wants of the three countries. Further improvements may doubtless be made in the law which regulates the state of banking and currency, but they should be introduced cautiously and circumspectly, and not by a measure premature in its character, and which, if adopted by this House, would be productive of great inconvenience.

MR. HUBBARD said, the right hon. Gentleman had not alluded to the circumstances which fully justified the hon. and gallant Member for Wakefield in introducing this subject to the notice of the House—namely, that, notwithstanding the very great progress in Scotland in wealth, there had been no new banks established; while in England they had multiplied to an extent hitherto unknown and unprecedented. In point of fact, in Scotland there had been an absolute diminution in the number of those institutions. Was it right that the banking facilities afforded in Scotland should be confined to the number of existing banks, which had among themselves an absolute monopoly? It was as a free trader opposed to monopoly that he joined in asking for Scotland the same avenues for the use of capital which existed in England. The hon. and gallant Member did not ask to share with the existing institutions the power of issue they now possess — that would be properly refused by the Government—but he asked simply for the power of existence. He tells you that he could not open a bank in Scotland without having some means of currency. He must use either gold or notes. If he issues gold, according to the hon. Baronet (Sir Edward Colebrooke) the people of Scotland hate sovereigns to such an extent that they will not take them. Then how was the hon. and gallant Member to work his bank? He must issue notes. And whose notes is he to issue? They must be the notes of the existing banks—of his own rivals, in fact; and every time he undertakes a commercial transaction he must advertise his rivals in trade. The hon. and gallant Member simply asked that a new banking establishment should be released from the liability of advertising its rivals, and should be enabled to supply notes of the Bank of England. He asked no more than that he should be provided with Bank of England notes. At present, Bank of England notes in Scotland were not a legal tender; but Parliament can make them so. The objection which his hon. Friend the present Governor of the Bank of England (Mr. Hodgson) entertained to that course was that by such an issue the

Bank of England would have to incur considerable expense. It was perfectly true that they would have to incur considerable expense, for which they would get no equivalent if they issued against bullion; but by allowing the Bank to issue for Scotland against securities a remuneration would be provided to the Bank, while the net profit of the issue would be received by the State. The object of the present Bill was simply to constitute Bank of England notes a legal tender; but surely the moderation of the demand ought not to be a reason for rejecting it. If a bank in Scotland is satisfied to take Bank of England notes, the demand is so moderate that, taken by itself, one would be puzzled to find a reason for refusing it. Having now said so much in justification of his hon. and gallant Friend's measure, he would not advise him to press his Motion to a division against an unwilling Government. No such measure could be satisfactorily introduced without the cordial assent of the Government, and it would be impossible to carry such an operation out without the assistance of Government. There was a great contrast between the existing state of things in England and in Scotland with regard to banking, but it was not so much with regard to the system of banking as to the currency. The whole subject was well deserving of the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he trusted the day was not far distant when there would be one uniform Imperial currency.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN observed, that having taken a great interest in the subject, he had given notice of a Motion for the introduction of a Bill to render bank notes a legal tender in Ireland, as the hon. and gallant Member opposite proposed to do in regard to Scotland. He was disappointed at the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman (the Chancellor of the Exchequer), because he seemed to hold out no hopes that the principle on which this Bill was based would be accepted in another Session. Still he thought that this discussion would not be without some good, as it would tend to facilitate the introduction of some general scheme of banking whenever the Chancellor of the Exchequer should turn his attention to the subject. He did not think that the real question before the House was a question of currency at all. It did not in the slightest degree affect the issue of £1 notes. It would be just as well to say that making sovereigns a legal tender in England or Ireland would affect the question of making £1 notes a legal tender. There ought to be some note which should be a legal tender in Scotland; and as a £5 Bank of England note was a legal tender in England, he did not see why that should not be adopted in Scotland, so that there may be as great uniformity as possible between the three countries. Great stress was laid upon the objection that the establishment of such a system in Scotland would necessitate the institution of branch banks in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and other places. He could not see the force of that argument. For instance, years ago London was much further from Cornwall than it is now from Edinburgh, and yet there had been no difficulty in rendering the tender of a £5 note legal in Cornwall, notwithstanding there was no branch bank there. If Bank of England notes were not made a legal tender in Scotland, he was afraid that the banking business in that country would become an absolute monopoly. At this moment there were only twelve banks in Scotland, while in England there were more than 100 joint-stock banks, and above 300 private banks. He believed that during the present year the Scotch banks had issued notes to the extent of £1,172,000 in excess, and therefore they had none to give to any new banks that might be started; whereas, if Bank of England notes were a legal tender, they could readily get them from the Bank of England. It was not proposed that the Bank of England should be compelled to give notes; the Bill was simply permissive. At present the Bank of England note could not be used in Scotland without paying a percentage; and that would be done away with if they were made a legal tender. Upon account of the convenience, he thought the Government ought to render its assistance towards putting down the monopoly which at present existed.

Mr. BLACK: Sir, we are certainly greatly indebted for the sympathy and compassion which the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Hubbard) has displayed towards poor Scotland. He states that we are suffering under such a monopoly that, even supposing he were to bring gold into the country, it would be impossible for him to obtain as many notes in exchange for it as would be required. Now, I can assure the hon. Gentleman that if he will only bring proper security, or bring the gold, he will find it a very easy matter on our part to print as many notes as he may desire. The hon. Member has also stated that there has been a great progress in the population and wealth of Scotland, and that it has not been met by the currency, which ought to have gone hand in hand with it. Now, what has been one great cause of the prosperity of Scotland? In my opinion it has been these very banks, and the machinery upon which those banks have carried on their business. They have done more than anything else I know of to promote the prosperity of Scotland. And the hon. Member for Buckingham (Mr. Hubbard) tells us that at present there is an entire monopoly in the banking system of Scotland, and that there are only in existence some thirteen banks. Now, if he would allow me to correct him, there are upwards of 600 banks in Scotland. I do not know that there is any country in the world so well supplied with banks. In every village where there are not more perhaps than 1,000 inhabitants, you will find one or two banks. I gave the House some time ago a calculation of the number of banks which we possess in Scotland in proportion to the population, and in proportion to the value of property, and I believe we have nine or ten times as many banks for the population as there are either in England or Ireland. In such a town as Inverary, for example, where there are not more than 1,000 inhabitants, there are two banks, and the competition between those banks is quite as keen as between any of the banks on the joint-stock principle in England. In point of fact, I do not believe that any country in the world is so well supplied with banks as Scotland is at the present moment. What is it that is sought to be enacted by this Bill? It proposes that the Bank of England notes shall be made a legal tender. But the hon. and gallant Baronet has not told us whether the people of Scotland desire to have these Bank of England notes imposed upon them at all. In my opinion they are perfectly satisfied with the notes they now have; and I believe if Scotland were polled all over it would be found that they would far sooner take the notes of the banks of Scotland than those of the Bank of England. And even the Bank of England has no desire for a change. Surely, then, if neither the people of Scotland nor the Bank of England desire a change, why should this Bill be introduced? If the object of the Bill is to make Bank of England notes a legal tender all over Scotland, why should not the same privileges be given to the Glasgow and Edinburgh banks? Why should they not have the power of opening branches in England in order to assist their issue? Why, at any rate, should the privilege of opening branches of English banks be confined to Glasgow and Edinburgh? Why should they not be allowed to open branches anywhere? I believe the question to be so important that it is entirely futile to suppose that we could legislate upon it this Session, and I therefore join in the appeal which has been made to the hon. and gallant Member to withdraw his Bill.

MR. PEACOCKE said, the question raised by the Bill was not an abstract but a practical one. The simple proposition was that Bank of England notes should be made a legal tender in a country where it might fairly be said there was no forced circulation except bullion. There was an opposition to the Bill on the part of twelve Scotch banks which objected to having their monopoly broken in upon; but the general mercantile community of Scotland desired to have some such measure as that passed; and if the hon. and gallant Gentleman pressed his Motion to a division he should certainly vote with him. It was said that it would be a hardship to make people in Scotland accept these notes, and that it would be impossible for the £5 Bank of England notes to circulate side by side with the £1 notes of Scotland; but how, he asked, could the one description of notes displace the other?

MR. GOSCHEN thought, that simple as might be the proposal to establish Bank of England notes as a legal tender in Scotland, the House ought to be very careful before adopting it. The object of the Bill was to compel the people of Scotland to take a description of notes which it was said they did not want; and it appeared that those who took them would be obliged to incur the expense of sending them up to London to be exchanged for gold.

MAJOR HAMILTON said, that one of the reasons why the people of Scotland did not care to have Bank of England notes forced upon them was that they held their own notes to be as good, if not better. When the Western Bank of Scotland failed, its notes were as good on the day of the failure as they were the day before. The people of Scotland do not care to have

Bank of England notes forced upon them. Whenever a person presents a Bank of England note to be cashed at a small village, he is asked to write his name across the back of it. The probable reason is that the people of Scotland, however good the Bank of England notes may be in England, are rather alarmed at having such a document placed in their hands in Scotland. I should like to know whether any gentleman was ever asked to write his name over a £5 note issued in Scotland.

Mr. BAXTER thought the hon. and gallant Member opposite would do well to rest satisfied with the discussion that had taken place, which had been very much in favour of the principle of his Bill. The speech of the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. Black) would give the impression that the Scotch system of banking was perfect, and could not possibly be altered for the better; but every one who was well acquainted with the subject was perfectly aware that the law relating to it was extremely defective, and must sooner or later be amended. But as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had held out the prospect that probably next Session there would be a revision of the whole system, and had guarded himself against expressing an opinion hostile to the principle of the present Bill, it was not advisable to press the matter any further on that occasion.

Colonel FRENCH said, he had not heard a word in that discussion to show that there would be any impropriety in extending to Scotland and Ireland the privilege which England had enjoyed for the last thirty years.

Sir JOHN HAY believed that it would be unwise, after the appeals which had been made to him, and considering the period of the Session, if he were now to go to a division. At the same time he thought that the discussion which had taken place, and the interest displayed in the subject, fully justified him in introducing the question to the notice of the House. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that in his opinion it was desirable that any change should be made step by step. He sincerely trusted that the discussion which had now taken place would be one step towards the change, which the majority of the people of Scotland desired to see. He hoped that early next Session the Chancellor of the Exchequer would bring in a Bill to give to Scotland and other parts of the United Kingdom those privileges in connection with banking of which they are now deprived. He would now, with the leave of the House, withdraw the Bill.

Amendment, and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

JERSEY COURT BILL—[Bill 48.]

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Mr. LOCKE: Sir, before you leave the chair, I wish to make one or two observations with regard to this Bill. It will be in the recollection of some Members of the House that the second reading took place a considerable time since, and the Bill has been postponed from time to time until at length we have arrived at the stage when the House is asked to go into Committee upon it. The reason why I am anxious to make some observations on the matter is this, that the state of opinion in the Island of Jersey has undergone a very great change since I first introduced the Bill to the notice of the House. The Bill, as I stated on a former occasion, is similar to the one which was introduced into this House in the year 1861. Indeed that Bill, which was introduced by Mr. Serjeant Pigott, was precisely the same as the Bill which is now before the House for its consideration in Committee. It was founded upon the Report of the Commission which sat in 1859 and 1860, and which was composed of Sir John Awdry, the right hon. the Earl of Devon and Richard Jebb, Esq. They were the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the civil laws of Jersey, and their Report, with appendix, was presented to both Houses of Parliament in the year 1860. Now, in the year 1861, Mr. Serjeant Pigott introduced his Bill into this House. The Government of that day, Sir George Cornewall Lewis being at the head of the Home Department, entirely approved of the provisions of the Bill; and, in point of fact, the Bill, as I have stated, was entirely founded upon the Report of the Commission. But Sir George Cornewall Lewis at that time stated that it was inexpedient for Mr. Serjeant Pigott to go on with the Bill, as the States of Jersey had not had a sufficient opportunity of considering the recommendations of the Commissioners, and he was anxious that they should be submitted to their consideration with a view that they might themselves legislate upon the subject. Therefore it was that Mr. Serjeant Pigott withdrew the Bill in the year 1861, which I have had the honour of re-introducing in the present Session. Now, it is needless for me to go into the complaints that have from time to time been made by persons resident in the Island of Jersey of the mal-administration of the laws of that Island in consequence of the Royal Court of Jersey not performing the duties of a Court in the way in which we, at this time of day, expect that a Court should perform them. It is quite sufficient to refer to the Report in which the Royal Commissioners stated numerous objections to this Court; in point of fact, they condemned it altogether, and made suggestions which have been embodied in this Bill. I will just call the attention of the House to some of the statements in the Report of the Royal Commissioners. They say that whatever may have been in earlier times the merits of this very ancient tribunal, the constitution of which they had discussed, it was their deliberate conviction that the Island, with its great wealth and population, its large foreign commerce, and all the important and complicated interests which have arisen in it, has at the present day so completely outgrown its judicature, that any reforms which shall leave the duties of the Superior Court in the hands of a numerous body without professional education, whose attendance is precarious, and for whose nomination no one is responsible to public opinion, will be absolutely nugatory. They, likewise, state that it appeared to them that it was essential that the Royal Court should in future consist of a small number of Judges of competent legal attainments and experience, with salaries sufficient to give the public a right to demand their punctual attendance, and nominated, during good behaviour, by some authority responsible for the propriety of the selection. They proposed, therefore, that the number should be three — namely, the Bailiff and two puisne Judges, to be nominated by the Crown, and to hold office during good behaviour. The Commissioners added that they should receive salaries of £1,200, £1,000, and £1,000 respectively; all Court fees of every description being paid, as soon as the necessary arrangements could be made, into a common fee fund. They further stated that they saw no advantage in continuing the Crown Officers as essential members of the Court, and recommended that one Judge should sit alone for duties which would be in the main similar to those to which the *nombre inférieur* is now competent, so far as such duties might be retained, whilst there would be less frequent but stated and calculable sittings of the Full Court. These are the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners, and that is all, in point of fact, that this Bill pretends to effect. It having been shown most clearly by the Commissioners of 1859, that without a reform of the Royal Court of Jersey no good could be expected from any other reforms that might be made, it was, therefore, thought right that this object should, if possible, be attained—that they should go at once to the root of the evil which exists there—namely, to reform that Court, and give a tribunal to the Island which would be effective. It has been asserted by some that the inhabitants of Jersey are a peculiar race of people, that they conquered this country, and have a right to go on precisely as they please. They entirely forget that a very large proportion of the inhabitants of that Island are at the present moment English people, and that whatever, as the Commissioners say, might have been the merits of their very ancient tribunal in former times, they are now discontented with the system under which twelve Jurats are elected by simple ratepayers, the only qualification for the office being that they shall possess a sum of £30 a year, and shall not be butcher or baker, or belong to some other one or two trades. That being the only qualification for the Judges of the land, English persons and the great bulk of the Jersey people are entirely discontented with the system, because they say, very truly, that it is perfectly monstrous that these men without the necessary knowledge of law—and nobody knows whether they ever had any—should have the power of pronouncing decisions in that Court, simply because the Bailiff was a lawyer. But that functionary does not direct the Court. He does not say what is the law, and leaves it to the jury to decide upon the fact. These Jurats are the Judges both of law and fact, and when a question of law has to be decided, they put it to the vote, and the Bailiff has no more power or authority than any one of the Jurats of the Court. Now, this has been found to act in the most inconvenient manner. One great objection is, that when evidence is taken in a case, it is necessary to have the same Jurats every time the Court meets, in order that the business may proceed; but in addition to their being Jurats, they likewise are members of the States, and they have, in point of fact, thrust upon them such numerous duties, that it is utterly impossible that they can attend to their judicial functions. The consequence is, that they are neglected, and great injustice is thereby done to the people in the Island of Jersey. Now, as I stated, the inhabitants of Jersey are a very peculiar people, and they arrogate to themselves a position higher, I believe, than that of anybody in this country. They say that they conquered us, but they entirely forget that Henry the First conquered them again. I do not however think it is worth while to go into these ancient matters. The question is, what is necessary to be done at the present time of day? What is necessary for the comfort and the security of the life and property of the inhabitants of the Island of Jersey? And, moreover, what is necessary for the interests of those who are trading with them, and having communication with them every day? In former times there was a very small population in the Island of Jersey. At the present time there are no less than 60,000 inhabitants, or nearly so, and a great portion of these are English. It appears by the last census what are the precise numbers of each description of individuals in that Island. In addition to that, they own 50,000 tons of shipping. There are most important questions coming under the notice of the Royal Court from day to day; and how have these questions to be decided? They have to be decided by these twelve men, called Jurats, who do not necessarily know anything about the law, and, I believe, the only appeal there is is to the Privy Council, and that, I think, cannot be in regard to any matter under £200. Therefore, the condition in which the people of Jersey find themselves is certainly not one that anybody else would envy. They do not themselves now envy it. They have always had a strong desire to legislate for themselves. They certainly have had a strong jealousy of any legislation with respect to the Island being undertaken by the Imperial Parliament, and the desire of those who were anxious for reform was, that whatever could be done in that direction should be done by the Queen in Council; and very early in this year a petition was forwarded to the Queen in Council, signed by many of the most respectable persons in Jersey, and holding high positions, praying for a reform of the laws of Jersey, and asking for the very reform which is contained in this Bill. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department presented that address. The Return which was moved for by an hon. Member of this House of the correspondence which passed between the States of Jersey and the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department, has been presented to the House, and I would recommend those Returns to the attention of hon. Members. I will only say that they show on the part of the Home Secretary the strongest desire that the States of Jersey should legislate for themselves, and he points out to them what is necessary. On the other hand, I think, it appears from that correspondence, that the States of Jersey set themselves entirely against any reform whatever. But beyond that, I have been supplied from time to time with the Jersey papers containing accounts of the debates which have taken place in the States with reference to the Bill now before the House, and with the exception of some five or six of the representatives, who have shown themselves anxious for, and made a motion in the States with regard to, that reform which is contained in the Bill, the States have shown that they set themselves entirely against it, and that they are determined not to have any reform whatever. It was only lately that a proposal was made in the States to separate the judicial and legislative powers vested in the Jurats, and it was negatived by an immense majority. In point of fact, they would not take it into consideration; and, therefore, hon. Members will see that it is impossible to expect that the States of Jersey will make any attempt at all for the reformation of the Royal Court and of the laws of the Island. At all events, that is the opinion to which a vast portion of the inhabitants of Jersey have at last come. As I stated, they are extremely reluctant that Great Britain should legislate for them, and they sent up a petition to the Queen in Council, asking her to do that which is embodied in the Bill, and many signed that petition who are now ready to sign this, and some of them have done it. There was a strong feeling against the interference of this House, but that feeling has since then been changed. I presented yesterday to this

House two petitions from inhabitants of Jersey, to which were attached no less than 3,900 signatures. That was a greater number than was obtained by the States even for the petitions presented against the Bill, and notwithstanding that intimidation of every kind has been used by the persons in authority in Jersey to prevent the people from petitioning this House in favour of the Bill. But in spite of all that, no less than 3,900 signatures have been appended to the petition which I presented yesterday, stating what their grievances were under the present system, and asking this House to pass this Bill to relieve them from the state in which the Royal Court of Jersey has placed them. I think that is a most remarkable circumstance—that the Jersey people, feeling as they do a disinclination to come to this House, because they say they have always been separated from the Imperial Parliament, yet so strongly do they feel the state in which they are placed by reason of the mal-administration of the laws of Jersey through the Royal Court, that they have cast aside scruples on this subject, and have, to the large number of 3,900, petitioned the House to pass this Bill. I think, therefore, that this Bill comes before the House supported by the people of Jersey. They ask for reform; and I feel satisfied of this, that no technical objections which may be taken —none of that old and antiquated feeling — those notions which might have been entertained in former days — will be allowed to weigh with this House, and induce it to reject this Bill. Such being the state of things, just let us consider what ground there can be for refusing to pass the Bill. My hon. and learned Friend opposite (Mr. Rolt) has put a notice on the paper that he intends to move that the States of Jersey be heard by their counsel, and to adduce evidence at the Bar of the House in opposition to the Bill. I suppose he will contend that Parliament cannot legislate for the Island of Jersey. Perhaps he will hardly say that, but that it is unconstitutional for Parliament to do so. Parliament has however, over and over again, legislated for the Island of Jersey. Parliament in the year 1805, upon the Smugglers Act, legislated for the Island of Jersey, and precisely the same objection which my hon. Friend says he is going to make on the present occasion was made then. It was, however, overruled both in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords, the Bill passed, and I believe it is the law of the land at the present moment. I know my hon. and learned Friend's ingenuity and power, but he cannot erase that Act of Parliament from the statute-book; nor can he get rid of the report in *Hansard* in the year 1805, when the same objection was made and entirely overruled. Well now, upon what grounds will the House refuse to legislate for the Island of Jersey? These persons forming the Court choose to adopt a certain course and say, "Oh, we may do as we like with our own." But has not every Englishman, Irishman, and Scotchman a right to go to Jersey? Do they not go in large numbers to Jersey? Is not a great proportion of the population of Jersey either English, Irish, or Scotch; and do they not tend very much to the wealth and advantage of that Island? Well, are they to submit to be governed by those barbarous laws? Are they to submit to have a tribunal like that in Jersey which, as I understand, makes a distinction between Jerseymen and other people, which exercises an influence which no Judge in any other land has a right to exercise? They have no right to be armed as legislators of the States and likewise as Judges. They perform all these duties together in this small Island, where everybody is at their beck and call, and instead of their duties being separated, they are all mixed up together, so that it is utterly impossible to make them attend to any of them properly. At all events, they have no time to perform their duties as Judges. But now it is a somewhat remarkable fact that many of these very men, these Jurats, who, before they were Jurats, thought rightly and thought properly, on becoming Jurats seem to have taken leave of their senses. I may also mention one hon. Gentleman, named Mr. Francis Godfray, who has been sent by the States to this country to stir up hon. Members in this House, and to induce them to oppose this Bill; what did he do? When he was examined before the Royal Commissioners, a gentleman writes me a letter to tell me what occurred. The gentleman who writes this letter says that although he cannot sign a petition to the House of Commons in favour of the Bill, for he does not like the interference of the British Parliament in the affairs of the Island of Jersey, still he cannot allow Mr. Godfray, who has come over to England for the purpose of inducing people to oppose this Bill, to do this without telling what occurred when he was examined before the Commissioners. And about this there is no question. The letter which this gentleman has addressed to me is dated the 6th of May in the present year, and he says he is opposed to any interference of the British Parliament, but still when a public man, such as Mr. Godfray is, becomes inconsistent, he considers it to be his duty to expose that person, especially when such a man is a member of the States, and one of the deputies appointed to the British Parliament to induce them not to pass this Bill. The Commissioners sat in 1846, and the proceedings were published in 1847. It was an inquiry into the state of the criminal law of the Channel Islands, and in pages 211 to 214 of the Report it will be found that when Mr. Godfray was examined, he then said he was in favour of reforming the constitution of the present Royal Court. In reply to one question he said, "I am decidedly of opinion that the Court is badly constituted," and having explained to the Commissioners the evils of the present system, Mr. Godfray says—

> "I proposed a change in the institutions of the Island. I proposed, with the concurrence of the majority of the States, to do away with the twelve Jurats, and replace them by two Judges, elected by the people, but that these two Judges must be qualified, as having been lawyers of long practice. That was the principal feature of the change."

Now this was the change Mr. Godfray then proposed, and that is substantially what is now proposed to be done by this Bill. The only difference is that he says the two Judges were to be elected by the people and were to be of long standing and practice. He proposed that the twelve Jurats were to be done away with, and so does this Bill. The fact is this Bill and Mr. Francis Godfray's former opinions entirely coincide. I have here in my hand a host of opinions which were expressed by Jersey lawyers at that time against the system, and setting out what changes ought to be made, but I will not trouble the House with them. I think when I have mentioned Mr. Godfray, who is sent over by the States as their deputy and agent for the purpose of preventing this Bill passing, I do not think I could instance a better person than he is. Mr. Godfray has come over here to do what I have stated, and he is a member of the States, and expresses their opinions. I have stated the Report which the Commissioners came to, and the recommendations which they make. They were extremely simple, and they recommended that this should form the basis of the alteration of the Court of Jersey, and I have not heard anybody state that they have an objection to this Bill, with the exception of the hon. Member for Harwich (Captain Jervis). He has certainly put a Motion on the paper, and objects to the form of the Bill and the enactments in it, while the objection which the hon. Member for Gloucestershire makes is, that the House ought not to legislate upon the subject. But it is admitted that the House has the power, if it pleases, to legislate; and, as to the Bill itself, that it is a right measure, and that it is an improved and proper one, and that these Jurats shall not be allowed to exist any longer. I have only heard one single exception to the Bill itself, and that is, as I have already stated, the Amendment of which the hon. Member for Harwich has given notice. His proposal is to strike out Clause 15. Now, if you strike that clause out, you will find you will not have any money to pay the Judges, and he thinks that without money to pay the Judges, in all probability there will be none. And that is a sailor-like way of looking at the thing, and no doubt a very sensible one; but still at the same time, when we get into Committee on the Bill, I think I shall be able to meet that difficulty, and to accommodate the hon. Member for Harwich. But let us go into Committee on the Bill. Do not let us be led away. I trust the House will not be led away by any sophistry, causing them to suppose that they have no power to legislate. It is admitted on all hands we have the right and power, and have exercised that power before on numerous occasions. As well might it be said that the writ of *Habeas Corpus* does not extend to the Channel Islands, because they once did think that they could seize British subjects, and do as they pleased with them. But the Courts of Law settled that matter, and I trust this House will settle this matter, and will not allow the States of Jersey, who are ruling over English subjects as well as their own, to say they will uphold a Court like this. Two Commissions, of 1846 and of 1859, both treated it entirely as a nuisance which ought to be abated; and I trust the House, whatever my learned Friend urges on this matter, will be true to itself, and extend to Jersey those privileges which we enjoy, namely, a proper code of laws and a proper court of justice.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Locke.*)

Sir GEORGE GREY: Sir, I stated yesterday in answer to a Question put to me, that I would to-day intimate the course which the Government thought ought to be taken in regard to this Bill. The House will recollect that upon the second reading I expressed my entire concurrence in the object which this Bill sought to attain—the reformation of the Royal Court of Jersey. I stated that the Report of the Royal Commission had shown that there are great defects in the administration of justice in Jersey, arising out of the constitution and forms of procedure in that Court, and that the Commissioners had pointed out those reforms which they thought essential to the due administration of justice in Jersey. But I said at the same time that so long as there was any hope that these reforms would be carried into effect by the States of Jersey themselves, it was inexpedient that Parliament should interfere. A Bill was brought in by the present Mr. Baron Pigott; but it was objected to on the ground that the Report of the Royal Commission had been so short a time before the States that it was desirable to give them ample time to consider the reforms which it pointed out. On that occasion the right of Parliament to interfere was most distinctly affirmed. There can be no doubt that Parliament can interfere in case these reforms cannot be carried into effect in any other manner. The correspondence which has been laid on the table since the Bill was introduced, will show how the matter at present stands. The States in their last communication have declined to entertain the questions referred to them by the Lieutenant Governor. They have done so on the ground that to proceed to take into consideration the suggestions of the Commission and the recommendations of the Lieutenant Governor while this Bill was pending, would imply that they are acting under the coercion which might be supposed to be placed upon them by this measure. In answer to that, I informed them that if it was really intended to take up this question, and that if this Bill was the only obstacle to an entering into the consideration of these reforms—that, if this Bill was withdrawn and legislation by Parliament postponed, they really resolved to carry out themselves the suggestions made to them by the Commission—I should be sorry by further supporting this measure to put any obstacles in the way of their considering these questions. I have had no answer to that communication. But, at the same time, I think it desirable to proceed in this matter with due care and deliberation, and that we should still even avoid the semblance of depriving the States of Jersey of dealing with their own institutions, and of carrying the reforms suggested into effect, if they should see fit to do so. Under these circumstances, and in the spirit of my letter to the Lieutenant Governor, I express my hope—and I trust the House will agree with me in the expediency of that course—that my hon. Friend will not proceed with the Bill in the present Session. As I have already stated, I think Parliament has a perfect right to interfere; and if, during the interval, those reforms which are essential to the administration of justice in Jersey are not carried into effect, I do not think the Government can offer any obstacle during a future Session to the progress of a Bill of this kind. I do not mean to say that the Government approves of the Bill in all its details, but of a Bill the object of which is the reformation of the Royal Court of Jersey. I believe that there is a growing feeling in the Island itself not only in favour of these reforms, but in favour of the intervention of Parliament to give them effect—owing to the indisposition of the States to undertake them. I cannot help thinking that with the pressure put upon the States by the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners, and by the growing opinion in Jersey in favour of these reforms, they will hardly place themselves in opposition to public opinion, and refuse to act upon the suggestions which have been addressed to them. In their last communication I understand them to say they are not opposed to these recommendations, and are not disposed to object to the views which are entertained by the Government. Under these circumstances, I hope that my hon. and learned Friend will not press the Bill, and that it will not be necessary for the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Paull) to make his Motion. I trust that the result will be that this alleged obstacle to the consideration of these reforms being removed, the States will fairly undertake the consideration of the recommendations of the Commissioners and the Lieutenant Governor, and that before another Session some Act will have been passed which will carry into effect the reforms so much desired.

MR. ROEBUCK hoped his hon. and learned Friend would withdraw the Bill, but on the distinct understanding that it was the opinion of the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State that that House had full right and power to interfere in the affairs of Jersey, and that if something was not done by the States before the beginning of next Session he would, should he be in office, be prepared to lay on the table a Bill for reforming the Royal Court.

MR. PAULL: I have undertaken to make the Motion of my hon. and learned Friend the Member for East Gloucestershire (Mr. Rolt) who is unable to be present, and the reason why he intended to submit that Motion was that the States of Jersey are entirely misrepresented in this matter. The statement which was made by my hon. and learned Friend opposite (Mr. Locke) as to the appointment of the Commission, and the proceedings which took place under that Commission, is perfectly correct. The States are quite willing to consider these recommendations, but they are not willing that the Royal Court, which has existed for so many hundred years, should be abolished entirely in the way which it is now proposed to do. They protest against a question of this kind being taken up by any private Member of Parliament. They find that, although the Royal Commission was issued at the recommendation of the Government, and that these Commissioners have visited the Islands, and have received information from those most competent to judge, the question has not been taken up by Government as might reasonably have been expected, and as I think the House will say they ought to have done. If pressure is indirectly to be brought on the Island of Jersey—if the Government are content to leave a measure which they are disposed to support in the hands of a private Member—if, under these circumstances, the authorities of the Island, who ought to be represented in this House by the Government, are left to be bandied about the lobby, to take up their position in some hotel and to issue circulars to endeavour to secure the attention of Members of Parliament to their views, I say that nothing can be more unfitting and impolitic than that an Island which is not a conquered country, but is one of the most ancient and loyal dependencies of the British Crown, should be treated in this manner. For ages, peace, loyalty, and harmony have existed there, more, perhaps, than in any other portion of the British dominions. They have long enjoyed a distinct judicature and a distinct legislature. In every case in which Bills of Parliament have been passed for England and extending to Jersey, that legislation has not taken effect immediately in these Islands. The Acts have been referred to the Legislature of Jersey, and have been, in some instances with Amendments, registered, and have thereby become the law of the Island. The long address which has been delivered by my hon. and learned Friend precludes me from going into this case as I would wish to do. But I may say that the people of Jersey do not desire this Bill to be withdrawn: They join issue with the hon. and learned Gentleman, and they rely on making their case good before the House. They say that they are still ready to make reforms and to receive the recommendations of the Imperial Government; but they are not disposed to submit to allow their internal and domestic institutions to be dealt with in the way that this Bill proposes to deal with them. You are proposing by this Bill to appoint paid Judges and to dispose of taxation, which you are not empowered to deal with. I think the House will be of opinion that when the right hon. Gentleman (Sir George Grey) talks of great care and deliberation, there has been a great want of care and deliberation on the part of the Home Office. It is greatly owing to him that matters have been brought to their present position, and that the Gentlemen representing these Islands have been obliged to attend here from day to day. They only knew of the second reading of this Bill in time to be here the day before it came on; and consequently they were not able to organize an opposition. They received no such assistance and protection as they might have expected from the Home Office; and have had to go from one Member to another. They have retained an eminent counsel to appear before the House, and they are perfectly prepared to join issue with the hon. Gentleman. I myself have no interest in the matter, nor do I know all the merits of the case; but feeling that

Parliament has no right to deal in this off-hand manner with institutions that have existed so long, I myself should be disposed to protest against the withdrawal of the Bill, and to insist that the States should be heard by their Counsel at the Bar of this House, and should have an opportunity of refuting the allegations which have been made against them so recklessly by the hon. and learned Gentleman. I know that at this period of the Session it will be extremely difficult to find a day on which the House could hear the counsel of the States at the Bar, and certainly that is the only ground on which I could agree to the withdrawal of the Bill.

Mr. AYRTON moved the adjournment of the debate till to-morrow.

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

INDIA OFFICE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Cowper, Bill to vest the Site of the India Office in Her Majesty, for the service of the Government of India, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Cowper and Mr. Peel.

Bill *presented**, and read 1°. [Bill 166.]

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, June 23, 1864.

MINUTES.] — Public Bills—*First Reading*—Countess of Elgin and Kincardine's Annuity* (No. 149); Superannuation (Union Officers)* (No. 154); Bribery (No. 155) [H.L.]; Cathedral Minor Corporations* (No. 157) [H.L.]

Second Reading—Facilities for Divine Service in Collegiate Schools (No. 117) [H.L.]; Beer Houses (Ireland)* (No. 134); County Constabulary Superannuation* (No. 140).

Committee—Vacating of Seats (House of Commons)* (No. 105); Banking Co-partnerships* (No. 113).

Report—Vacating of Seats (House of Commons)* (No. 105); Banking Co-partnerships* (No. 113).

Royal Assents—Under Secretaries Indemnity [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 21];

Registration of County Voters (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 22];

Local Government Supplemental [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 26];

Naval Agency and Distribution [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 24];

Naval Prize [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 25];

Naval Prize Acts Repeal [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 23];

Chain Cables and Anchors [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 27];

Common Law Procedure (Ireland) Act (1853) Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 28];

Insane Prisoners Act Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 29];

Court of Justiciary (Scotland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 30].

DENMARK AND GERMANY—THE CONFERENCE.—OBSERVATIONS.

Earl RUSSELL: My Lords, a short time ago I had the honour to inform your Lordships that in all probability in a few days I should have to announce to you that the Conference had agreed to the bases preliminary to a peace; or, upon the other hand, that the object of the negotiations had failed, and that war would be renewed on the termination of an armistice. My Lords, I am sorry to say that the latter alternative appears to be most likely. On Monday next I shall lay upon your Lordships' table, by command of Her Majesty, the Protocols of the Conference, and in so doing I shall state what has been the general course of the negotiations.

BRIBERY AT ELECTIONS BILL.

BILL PRESENTED. FIRST READING.

Lord BROUGHAM, in presenting a Bill for the Prevention of Bribery in the Election of Members to serve in Parliament, said, he found in the other House great expectations, he might rather say apprehensions, were entertained, of a general election this Session, and be they well or ill grounded, at all events this was certain to happen next Session. He was, therefore, led to the consideration of those corrupt practices he had so often brought to the attention of the House, and in which he had proposed Resolutions some years ago as well as introduced measures. His noble Friend, then President of the Council (Lord Lansdowne) admitting all that the Resolutions asserted, complained that no measure was propounded, and he (Lord Brougham) pledged himself to bring one forward. That pledge he now rose to redeem, in presenting a Bill to the House for the future prevention of bribery and corrupt practices. Nothing could be more futile than the objection sometimes taken to such a measure originating in that House—their Lordships had the same right as the other House to take up the subject, and they had exercised that right again and again. The very Bribery Bill of George II.'s time was a remarkable instance. There were two important provisions of the Act inserted in this House (as their Journals of May, 1729, showed). One was a money clause, raising the penalty from fifty to five hundred pounds. Unhappily having never been enforced, as, indeed, none of the Act had been, except the other section, added by this House, which had been constantly in active operation, he meant that provision that the last determination of Election Committees should be binding on all persons and in all times. The Commons were minded to object to these Amendments of the Lords, but Sir W. Pulteney (afterwards Lord Bath) reprobated this objection as soon as it was urged; he said—

> "The Lords were the proper guardians as well as the Commons of the purity as well as freedom of the election; and the Lords were the guardians, not only as a branch of the Legislature co-ordinate to themselves (to wit, the House of Commons), but as the supreme court of judicature of the realm; and no man having a value for liberty could grudge the Lords the honour of rendering the Bribery Bill more complete and more efficacious."

This sound and rational opinion prevailed, and the Commons (though by a very narrow majority) accepted the Lords' Amendments. It was lamentable to reflect how this and all former measures had failed to suppress these pernicious and demoralizing practices. They had, on the contrary, gone on increasing at each dissolution. Nothing could be worse than the facts stated on the best authority. His esteemed Friend, Sir John Pakington, showed, in bringing in his Bill some years ago, that the purchase of votes either directly, or under various pretences of head money, employment of messengers, or charity, was in many boroughs universal. In one, having 3,000 voters, 18 in every 27 were thus bought or sold at £10 a head, so that the candidate must know that he paid £18,000 for his seat. In another place 13 in 14 of the voters took bribes; £5 at the beginning was the price, but it rose as the polling went on, and it became £40 or £50, till at the close as much as £100 had been paid in one or two instances; and the candidate's expenses were as much as £8,000, almost all spent in corrupting the electors. He knew from a learned Friend of his (Lord Brougham's), Member for a county, that he had actually seen a gentleman walking round the streets of a town during a contested election, and provided with a large sum, all of which he paid in what was called head-money, that is in buying the voters. Now it was very lamentable to think how so many measures devised for checking this offence had failed. One of the latest had been proposed by his esteemed Friend Sir John Pakington, but, though well calculated for its purpose, had been defeated by the Select Committee of the Commons, expunging the provisions which contained the proviso which he (Lord Brougham) had the honour of proposing, that every Member and every candidate, on the request of a voter, should make a solemn declaration, not only that he by himself or his agents had given no money in bribes, but that he was wholly ignorant of any money having been so applied. The present Chief Justice of England, then a Member of the House of Commons, a strong supporter of this proviso, which he said he should himself have proposed if Sir John Pakington had not, observed that no person having the least regard for his character, could possibly make the declaration, if thousands of his money had been spent in bribery by his agents. The House of Commons' Select Committee, however, struck the declaration out of the Bill; and when it came up to this House, as without it the Bill was not merely useless, but mischievous, their Lordships refused to pass it. All attempts to check bribery having proved fruitless, and it being generally supposed to have increased under all the laws made against it, he (Lord Brougham) ventured to hope that the course he now took might prove more successful. When his Act of 1811 effectually put an end to the slave trade, which all the penalties and the loss of ships had not materially affected, the effect was produced by treating it as a crime, because though the gains of the traffic were such as to make men run the risk of capture, they would not expose themselves to the risk of being tried and condemned; so he trusted that those who encountered the expense of contested elections, and exposed themselves to the pecuniary penalties of the Acts of George II. and George III., from the anxiety to have a seat in Parliament, and their agents hired to bribe for them, would not expose themselves to the risk of being sent to the treadmill. The Bill which he presented was drawn according to the provisions of the existing Acts, that of George II. in 1729, and that of Lord Eldon in 1809, with this difference, that it made those offences punishable as a misdemeanour with a year's imprisonment, with or without hard labour, and he prayed their Lordships to give it a first reading.

A Bill for the more effectual Prevention of Bribery and Corruption in the Election of Members to serve in Parliament—*presented* by the Lord BROUGHAM and VAUX; read 1ª, and to be *printed*. (No. 155.)

MOUNT ST. BERNARD'S REFORMATORY.

EXPLANATION.

EARL GRANVILLE, referring to the debate which had taken place on a previous evening, said, he desired to read to their Lordships a letter which had just been received by the Secretary of State for the Home Department—

"Office of Reformatories and Certified Industrial Schools, 15, Parliament Street, S.W.

"Leeds, June 22, 1864—St. Bernard's Reformatory.

"My dear Sir George Grey,—I observe that Lord Berners asserted, on the authority of some parties at Ashby, that on my inquiry into the recent outbreak, I had not inquired of either of the magistrates or the police upon the subject, and that my report, therefore, could not be depended on.

"I beg to mention for your satisfaction on the matter, that I had a full private conference with the superior of the Ashby divisional police, whose men were in charge of the delinquents, and that from him I had the full particulars which I have given.

"As to the magistrates, I found the report made in Mr. Ashby's letter to you substantially correct, and the managers of the reformatory fully admitted the circumstances detailed. There was, therefore, no reason for troubling them on the subject.

"The business in hand was not so much to settle the facts—for they were plain and undisputed—but to get at the cause of the disturbance, and to see whether that was a transient and incidental impulse that might be safely expected not to occur again, or a corrupt and inefficient style of discipline that would be sure to lead to a recurrence of the riot. I think I had fair grounds for concluding in favour of the first of these alternatives.

"I should be glad if the inaccuracy of the charge made by Lord Berners against my inquiry could be brought out. I have the honour to be yours very faithfully,

"SYDNEY TURNER.

"The Right Hon. Sir G. Grey, Bart., M.P."

FACILITIES FOR DIVINE WORSHIP IN COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS BILL [H.L.]

(No 117.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD, in moving the second reading of the Bill, said he had been asked to undertake the charge of the measure by a clergyman in his diocese, who was at once the incumbent of his parish, the patron of the living, and the founder of a large chartered school in his parish, and who in these three capacities found himself inconvenienced from the want of some such powers as this Bill would confer. He had submitted the Bill to Convocation, and he believed that no objection had been taken to it in either House; and he had received communications from a large number of beneficed clergymen, all on the whole in its favour. The object of the Bill was twofold. The first provision was to allow the Bishop of a diocese to license one or more of the masters of any collegiate school or college, being in priest's orders, to perform divine service in the chapel of a school, and to administer the sacraments strictly to the inmates of the school exempt from all control from or responsibility to the incumbent of the parish. In Committee on the Bill he proposed to strike out the words in one of the clauses "or connected therewith," as he thought they were too large, and might include those who properly belonged to the care of the parish clergyman. He should also propose to introduce a provision for the disposal of the alms collected at the communion in these chapels. When one of these schools was built in a small parish, there was sometimes great inconvenience occasioned to the parishioners, the church of the parish being, perhaps, hardly large enough to receive the pupils without displacing the other worshippers. It was desirable that the boys should have full facilities for their religious duties, while at the same time the latter ought not to be incommoded. There was also a special advantage in making the head of a school the religious instructor. It sanctified the relation between master and pupil, and it might also be said to carry out the wishes of the parents who had selected the head of the school as the instructor of their boys. Neither was it really an interference with the proper duties of a parochial clergyman, because the parish church was founded for the parishioners and not for these schools, which had sprung up since. No one would be more ready to oppose any interference with the rights and independence of the parochial clergy than himself, but he believed that nothing but good would flow from this Bill. He had received a letter on this point from the parish priest of Hurst Pierpoint, in Sussex, in which parish there was one of the largest of these schools, who expressed his hearty gratification at the Bill. The only other provision of the Bill was to allow, with the consent of the clergyman of the parish and the Bishop of the diocese, the parish church to be used for these services until a chapel should be built for the school; of course at times which would not interfere with the regular service of the church. He hoped, therefore, that their Lordships would allow the Bill to be read a second time.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2^{a}.—(*The Bishop of Oxford.*)

The Earl of SHAFTESBURY said, he entertained grave objections to the Bill; and he hoped that the right rev. Prelate would be induced either to withdraw the measure altogether for the present Session, or give their Lordships ample time for its consideration. He would undertake to say that the provisions of this measure were wholly unknown throughout the country. It was only ordered to be printed on the 20th June, and he was sure that not twenty of the 20,000 beneficed clergy throughout the kingdom knew a word about it. It appeared to him that the Bill would interfere seriously with the rights and independence of the parochial clergymen of the Church of England. The 3rd clause authorized the use of the parish church (with the consent of the incumbent) as the college chapel. Now the Rubrics directed that the money collected during the Sacrament should be applied to pious and charitable uses; but here there was no provision that the minister of the parish should receive it—it might be applied to building the college chapel. Then Clause 5 would enable the Bishop to license any one to perform "the services aforesaid," though it was difficult to put a precise meaning upon that expression. The effect of the clause would be that the Bishop of the diocese would have power, with or without the assent of the rector or vicar, to thrust any one into his pulpit. He did not say that such was the intention of the right rev. Prelate, but that was the interpretation which the Bill would bear. That being the case, without going further into the provisions of the Bill, to many of which he entirely objected, he must express his hope that the right rev. Prelate would not press the measure, otherwise he (Lord Shaftesbury) should feel it his duty to move that it be read a second time that day six months.

The Archbishop of CANTERBURY said, that he certainly was not prepared for the opposition threatened to the Bill, which simply legalized that which had been constantly the practice in parishes where there were chartered schools, and set at rest some questions which had sometimes been raised in matters of detail. He certainly should be very sorry to see any Bill adopted by Parliament which would affect injuriously the position of the parochial clergy.

Lord PORTMAN said, that the most rev. Prelate had spoken of chartered schools, and if the Bill were confined to them the objection to it might not have been very strong; but the provisions of the Bill went much further, and, therefore, if his noble Friend divided their Lordships upon the question he should vote for the Amendment.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, he was of opinion that the Bill would introduce a very dangerous innovation. He had no doubt of the good intentions of the right rev. Prelate who had introduced the Bill; but, at the same time, he must observe that there was no grammar school in the kingdom which might not come within its provisions. There was nothing which, from the earliest times, had been more specially enjoined by the founders of these institutions than that the scholars should attend divine service in the parish church—it was the particular desire of the founders to connect their foundations with the parochial system. This desire their Lordships were now asked by this Bill entirely to set aside. They were asked to sanction a measure which would allow within the walls of any private chapel the performance of a service in which any amount of ceremony, any sensuous observance, might be displayed, though it might be entirely at variance with the mode in which Divine worship was usually performed in parish churches. There would be in such cases no public superintendence, and there would be no opportunity of discovering what were the forms of worship, or what ceremonies and solemnities were introduced. He thought it would be better to adhere to the old and wholesome injunction in the charters, that the master with his scholars should attend the parish church on the Sunday. With respect to some of the latter provisions, he would ask the right rev. Prelate to pause before proceeding with them, and if the right rev. Prelate persisted, he thought the best course would be to support the Motion which the noble Earl had threatened.

The Bishop of LONDON said, that after the expression of opinion they had just heard he thought it might be wise to defer the second reading, but was surprised to hear that there was anything dangerous in the principle of the Bill. The system which it was sought to establish was that in use at all the great schools; and at

Rugby it was regarded as one of the greatest improvements introduced by his illustrious predecessor, that he had the boys in the school chapel and kept their religious instruction entirely in his own hands. The greatest satisfaction was expressed with that change, though if the law had been put in force it might have been put a stop to by the clergyman of the parish. The intention now was to legalize that which could be at present done only by sufferance. At the same time, if any danger was likely to result from the Bill, it might be well to give time for consideration.

EARL GREY said, he trusted his noble Friend (the Earl of Shaftesbury) would withdraw his opposition and allow the Bill to be read the second time. There might be questions of detail which it would be necessary to consider in Committee, but the principle of the Bill was a very simple one, the object being to give facilities for affording religious instruction in schools. He could not say that the law as it at present stood was in a satisfactory state. The law allowed Roman Catholic and Dissenting ministers to give religious instruction to the boys under their care, and why should ministers of the Established Church be debarred from doing so?

EARL RUSSELL thought that his noble Friend's objections were not entirely without foundation, for some of the provisions of the Bill would seriously interfere with the rights of rectors and vicars. The object of the Bill might be a very desirable one, but without the general consent of the clergy it might lead to considerable evil; and the clergy ought, therefore, to have time to consider its provisions. The right rev. Prelate who spoke last (the Bishop of London) had stated what was the practice at Rugby, and said that it was by the sufferance of the rector. But it was a very different thing between a rector allowing these services to take place in his parish and the giving of power by an Act of Parliament, which would enable these services to be performed without the consent of the rector or vicar.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD said, he was in the hands of their Lordships, so far as the progress of the measure was concerned, but he had not yet heard any reasons to induce him to desist from persevering with the Bill, the opponents of which seemed, he must say, to view it with preternatural suspicion. He should call it trifling with their Lordships if he had not thoroughly considered much more than had been urged upon their Lordships. He was at a loss to understand what opposition there could be to the principle of the Bill, and really until he had read that day in a newspaper which represented the extreme views of the noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury), some of the views which the noble Earl had just expressed, he was ignorant of the intention to offer any opposition to the progress of the Bill. The objections taken by the noble Earl were purely matters of detail. Surely, every one of their Lordships would feel that the sort of preaching required by a common agricultural population was not that which would be suitable to their sons; the classes of hearers were entirely different, and their powers of comprehending what was said to them were altogether diverse; besides which there was a great advantage in bringing boys under the direct spiritual teaching of their masters. Those sermons of Dr. Arnold, which they all so much admired, would not have been delivered by him if he had been preaching to a mixed congregation. The kind of objections which had been urged showed the animus of the opposition, and it was evidently a previously formed conclusion that there must be some mischief in the Bill. As to the validity of the objection, that every parish minister might have somebody holding different views "thrust" upon him, this Bill applied only to incorporated schools, and he would ask how many of the 10,000 parishes of England had incorporated schools in them? Then, as to the pious zeal of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, who spoke of the "sensuous observances" that were to be performed in these chapels, he thought such an objection scarcely deserved an answer. Did not the noble and learned Lord know that these chapels must be licensed by the Bishop of the diocese? Surely that formed a sufficient answer to the complaint of the noble and learned Lord. The truth was that there was an evil to be remedied. They were positively told, indeed, that differences would be most likely to arise when these rights were regulated by Act of Parliament than at present. That was contrary to all the experience he had ever had of human nature. This was a simple measure for allowing that to be done with reference to chartered schools which the experience of all our great schools had shown to be essential to their well being and their good order. This Bill was calculated to bring peace and not war into every parish which it affected, and only those parishes were concerned which possessed chartered schools, and instead of being applicable to every school that called itself a college it would only be applicable to incorporated schools. It seemed to him that there was great force in the argument of the noble Earl (Earl Grey), that while you allowed ministers of every other denomination to minister in things spiritual to the children under their charges, you laid an embargo on priests of your own Church to do this under the direct licence of the Bishop. He could see no ground for consenting to delay, and he hoped their Lordships would not be deterred by the objections which had been stated, but would give the Bill a second reading.

EARL GRANVILLE said, that the Bill involved a large question, and he would rather that longer time were given for considering its provisions.

LORD CRANWORTH suggested that the Bill should be read a second time, and that a late day might be fixed for the Committee.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD said, he was quite ready to assent to that course. He thought the measure might be very properly considered at that stage of the Session, and that when the House was so full it was an appropriate occasion for their Lordships to give their assent to the principle of the Bill. Matters of detail might be considered in Committee.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY said, he was satisfied that nothing could be worse than to establish a kind of monastic system, which would have the effect of withdrawing the boys from the parish church. At the same time it was not only advisable, but absolutely necessary, that the boys should be for a certain time subject to the religious tuition of their masters. He still believed that, under the fifth clause, the Bishop of the diocese, with or without the consent of the incumbent, might license the master to occupy the pulpit of the parish church.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD said, he challenged the noble Earl to mention any portion of the Bill which would be open to such an interpretation. It was expressly stated in the words of the Bill, as it was the intention of the framer, that the master could only enter the pulpit of the parish church with the consent of the incumbent, received from time to time.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY said, that he believed, and others concurred in that belief, that the fifth clause was liable to that interpretation. He, therefore, thought the matter was one which required further consideration.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR was understood to say the consent of the rector was undoubtedly necessary, but it would be open to question whether the consent would not be binding after it had been once given.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD said, he proposed that it should be necessary to procure the consent of the incumbent from time to time.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday*, the *5th of July next.*

CATHEDRAL MINOR CORPORATIONS BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to substitute fixed instead of fluctuating Incomes for the Members of certain Minor Corporations in certain of the Cathedral Churches in England—Was *presented** by The LORD ARCHBISHOP of YORK; and read 1^a*. (No. 157.)

House adjourned at a Quarter past
Six o'clock, till To-morrow,
half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, June 23, 1864.

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Resolutions in Committee*—Harwich Harbour Act*.

Ordered—Inclosure (No. 2); Harwich Harbour Act.

First Reading — Public Schools* [Bill 168] (*Lords*); Mortgage Debentures* [Bill 169] (*Lords*); Inclosure (No. 2)* [Bill 170]; Harwich Harbour Act Amendment [Bill 171].

Second Reading—Weighing of Grain (Port of London) [Bill 119]; Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties)* [Bill 159].

Committee — Local Government Supplemental (No. 2)* [Bill 147]; Settled Estates Act Amendment* [Bill 142] (*Lords*).

Report—Local Government Supplemental (No. 2)* [Bill 147]; Settled Estates Act Amendment* [Bill 142] (*Lords*).

Considered as amended—Railways Construction Facilities* [Bill 111].

Third Reading— Accidents Compensation Act Amendment* [Bill 143], and *passed.*

ARMY—ENGINEER OFFICERS AT SOUTH KENSINGTON.

QUESTION.

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of

State for War, What is the number of Engineer Officers and Men employed at South Kensington, and what are the duties they perform?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON, in reply, said, that there were two Engineer Officers at present employed in the South Kensington Museum, and a third was about to enter on his duties there. There were also twelve Sappers and Miners usually employed in superintending the lighting and other arrangements, and in learning the arts of photography and drawing. These officers were not, however, borne upon the Estimates of the War Department, but were entirely connected with the Museum. For a detailed explanation of their duties he must refer the noble Lord to one of his right hon. Friends to whose Department they were attached.

ARMY—RIFLE PRACTICE NEAR THE NEW CROYDON RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he would beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been called to the situation of the Butt which has been erected for Rifle Practice near the New Croydon Railway, between the Streatham Common and the Thornton Heath Stations; and whether the War Office are satisfied that the Range can be used without danger to the public?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON replied that the Rifle Range in question had been examined, as all Ranges were, by an Officer, who reported satisfactorily on it, and stated it was safe. The Railway Company also were consulted as to the arrangement prepared for the safety of the trains, and no objection had been raised until within a very few days ago, when Mr. Richards called the attention of the War Department to the alleged danger to the railway in question. It was immediately arranged that one of the Assistant Inspectors of Volunteers should proceed to re-inspect the Range. He would have gone down that day, but Mr. Richards could not have met him, but he would go down to-morrow and meet Mr. Richards and several Volunteer Officers, and inspect the Butt.

ARMY—MARCHWOOD POWDER MAGAZINE.—QUESTION.

MR. ALDERMAN ROSE said, he would beg to ask the Under Secretary of State

Lord John Manners

for War, What is the actual quantity of Gunpowder stored at Marchwood Magazine; and if he has the opinion of competent Military Officers as to the safety of Southampton in the event of an explosion of this Magazine?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON, in reply, said, the quantity of gunpowder at present stored at Marchwood was 50,000 tons. It was not stored in one magazine, but in seven distinct magazines, and the greatest quantity in any one of them was 28,000 barrels. Before the hon. Member gave notice of this question, in consequence of some apprehension that existed in the minds of the people of Southampton, a Report was called for from Colonel Gordon, commanding the Engineers, the principal officer of artillery, and the storekeeper, with regard to the safety of the magazine, and they stated that they had examined it very minutely, and they were of opinion there was no place in which powder might be stored with greater safety than at Marchwood. It was a mile and a half from Southampton, in a district not very densely populated. There were no houses near it except those occupied by government officials. The most stringent regulations were in force; they were far more strict than those applying to private magazines; and from the position of the magazines and the excellent manner in which they were managed, he thought that there was no reason to apprehend any danger.

ARMY—FIELD ALLOWANCE TO TROOPS ON THE GOLD COAST.—QUESTION.

GENERAL PEEL said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, in reference to his statement that the Troops landed from the *Megæra*, in August, 1863, on the Gold Coast were not intended to wage war against the King of the Ashantees, Whether those Troops had not drawn field allowance before they sailed from Jamaica; and, if so, on what grounds it had been granted to them?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON, in reply, said, the Troops which landed from the *Megæra* on the Gold Coast from the West Indies had not the field allowance before they left Jamaica. Colonel Conran landed in August, and on the 7th September he acquainted the Home authorities, that as it was probable the troops he had landed under his command would have to take the field, he had sanctioned the issue of the allowance, and also permitted the men to draw it from the day of their embarkation. It was, perhaps, somewhat irregular to do so. There was some little doubt whether the antedating should be permitted, but under all the circumstances of the case it was permitted, and the allowance was drawn from the date of embarkation; and it was not till the 7th September that Colonel Conran informed the War Department that he had sanctioned it.

ARMY—REQUISITION FROM THE WAR OFFICE TO THE ADMIRALTY.

QUESTION.

GENERAL PEEL said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, The date and terms of any Requisition from the War Office to the Admiralty for transports to remove the Troops from the Gold Coast; and whether such Requisition was marked "pressing" and "immediate," and what was the answer to it?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON, in reply, said, it would be recollected that the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the 20th of May made a statement to the House respecting the arrangements made for the withdrawal of the Troops from the Gold Coast. On the following day all the arrangements respecting the withdrawal were made between his right hon. Friend (Mr. Cardwell) and the Secretary of State for War. On the same day letters were written from the War Office to the Admiralty and the Horse Guards informing them of the determination that had been come to. Both those letters were marked "pressing" and "immediate."

SIR HARRY VERNEY said, he wished to know whether the sanitary arrangements for Field Service laid down by the late Lord Herbert have been attended to?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Will my hon. Friend give notice of his Question?

GENERAL PEEL: The noble Lord has not answered the latter part of my Question. What was the answer from the Admiralty?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: The Admiralty replied immediately by letter through the Horse Guards, asking what number of Troops would have to be conveyed. The letter from the War Office stated that it had been determined to remove a considerable portion of the force from the Gold Coast, and requested that the requisite quantity of freight might be taken up for their removal.

INDIA—BANDA AND KIRWEE BOOTY.

QUESTION.

GENERAL PEEL said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, From what source the expense of the reference to the Admiralty Court in the case of Banda and Kirwee Booty is to be defrayed?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Sir, according to the general practice of the Court of Admiralty, the expense of any proceeding in regard to Prize Money is paid out of the general proceeds of the Prize Money, and is not charged to the individual officers except in cases in which, in the opinion of the Judge, the allegations of the parties have been improper, unfounded, or deserving to be visited by costs. A reference has been made by the Government, but there are several other claims besides those of the Banda claimants to which the attention of the Court of Admiralty is to be directed, and I cannot say whether the Court will be of opinion that they have been improperly brought forward or not.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Will the noble Lord lay on the table the terms of the reference to the Court of Admiralty?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Yes, if the hon. Gentleman will move for it.

THE ROYAL FORESTS.—QUESTION.

MR. COX said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether any steps have been taken to carry into effect the recommendation of the Select Committee on Royal Forests (Essex) presented on the 9th day of June, 1863, which recommendation was as follows:—

> "Your Committee report that a considerable extent of Ground has been enclosed without any consideration being paid for the Forestal Right of the Crown over them, which do not appear to have been either purchased or redeemed: and your Committee recommend that immediate steps be taken by the Crown to assert its right and to abate such enclosures."

MR. PEEL said, in reply, that the recommendation was only one of several made by the Committee. They also recommended that the forests should be enclosed, and the forestal rights of the Crown sold. Various reasons had prevented the recommendation from being carried out, but the general subject was receiving the attention of the Treasury.

UNCLAIMED WRECK.—QUESTION.

Mr. ROGERS said, he wished to ask the President of the Board of Trade, When a Return on the subject of Unclaimed Wreck, ordered on the 29th of April, will be laid upon the table?

Mr. HUTT said, in the absence of his right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade, he had to state that all the information was not yet obtained, but he believed it would be complete in a few days.

ANNUAL REPORT ON OUR COLONIAL POSSESSIONS.—QUESTION.

Mr. ROGERS said, he would also beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, When the Annual Report for 1863, on the state of our Colonial Possessions, presented on March 18th, will be in the hands of Members?

Mr. CARDWELL said, in reply, that the first part of the Report for 1863 was almost ready to be delivered, and the second part was in the hands of the printer.

NAVY—THE "RESEARCH."—QUESTION.

Sir JOHN HAY said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether the attention of Her Majesty's Government has been drawn to the Report of an action which took place last Sunday between the United States frigate *Kearsarge* and the Confederate ship *Alabama;* and whether they have considered the Report of the Commander-in-Chief at Devonport on the prepartion for battle of Her Majesty's ship *Research.* With the permission of the House he would read the Report of the Commander-in-Chief at Devonport. It was as follows:—

> "The space in the battery is so confined that the men have not room to work the guns with that facility that is required. 1. The battery is 33ft. in length by 32ft. in breadth inside; within this space are four heavy guns, upwards of 80 men, funnel, wheel, hatchway for supplying powder and shell. 2. There is a difficulty in traversing the guns from the broadside to the bow and quarter ports. 3. When the broadside guns were fired with extreme train, foremost ones to the left, after ones to the right, the captains of them could not stand to direct and fire them. These points being of great importance, I have considered it right to bring them before the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty."

He would also beg to ask, Whether, as the last named Report shows, that this class of ship cannot fight her guns with advantage, and the first named Report shows that she will easily be destroyed in action, Her Majesty's Government will continue to build ships which cannot be expected either to fight or swim; and he would further ask, as the advantage of guns of large calibre has been so clearly shown in the above named action, whether Her Majesty's Government will at once obtain a proper supply of large rifled guns for the service of the Navy?

Lord CLARENCE PAGET: In answer, Sir, to the Question of the hon. and gallant Member, I have to state that the Admiralty have considered, as I suppose everybody else has done, the report of the action which took place last Sunday between the *Kearsarge* and the *Alabama,* which, I may remark, however, has no reference whatever to the Question of the *Research.* The Admiralty have likewise considered the Report of the Commander-in-Chief at Devonport on the preparation for battle of Her Majesty's *Research.* That Report goes to the effect that there is not room enough to work the guns, in consequence of the wheel, funnel, and other matters being within the battery. We are taking steps to remove them. These, however, are matters of detail, and in other respects I have no reason to believe that there is any dissatisfaction with the *Research.* A few days ago I was on board that vessel, and I asked the captain —a young, active, and intelligent officer —whether he was satisfied with her fighting qualities. He replied that he was perfectly satisfied on that point. With respect to the comparison which the hon. and gallant Gentleman has drawn between the *Research* and the *Alabama,* perhaps he is not aware that the *Alabama* was a wooden ship of light scantling, whereas the *Research* is armour-plated. Therefore, there can be no comparison drawn between the two ships. With regard to the further Question, whether Her Majesty's Government will continue to build ships which cannot be expected either to fight or swim, I must state that Her Majesty's Government have no intention to build ships that can neither fight nor swim. These vessels are undergoing a fair trial, and I ask for them fair play. I ask likewise fair play for another experimental ship going out in a few days—the *Royal Sovereign,* designed by a talented officer of the Navy, Captain Coles. I shall be happy to make a frank statement in regard to these ships when they have undergone a fair trial. With respect to the third Question, about the guns, the hon. and gallant Member must be aware that the Government are taking steps to procure heavier rifled guns. The hon. and gallant Gentleman was present at the trials at Shoeburyness, when the average weight of shot was 167 lbs., the average charge of powder was 30 lbs., and the heaviest charge was as high as 50 lbs. The weight of the heaviest shot was 300 lbs. The Admiralty have ordered a considerable number of 10½-inch guns, throwing 150 lbs. shot, smooth bore, and they have likewise ordered a large number of 7-inch rifled 100 pounders. The *Prince Albert*, the *Royal Sovereign*, and the *Minotaur* will go to sea carrying 12-ton guns, throwing 10½-inch shot. I think this will show that the Government are alive to the importance of the subject.

NAVY—THE TRANSPORT "GLADIATOR." QUESTION.

Sir JOHN HAY said, he also wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, To lay upon the table of the House any Reports from Captain Shortt, of the *Gladiator*, on the subject of the convenience and capacity of that ship for the conveyance of troops during this Commission.

Lord CLARENCE PAGET stated, in reply, that it was very objectionable to lay on the table Reports of Officers to the heads of Departments. Therefore he could not agree to lay upon the table the Reports to which the hon. Baronet had referred; but if the hon. Baronet chose to move for them upon a future occasion, he (Lord C. Paget) would be ready to state his reasons for not agreeing to the Motion.

ARMY—TRIAL OF HEAVY RIFLED GUNS. QUESTION.

Mr. MONSELL said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, What is the cause of the delay in the competitive trial to be made by the Ordnance Select Committee of the heavy rifled guns on various systems now lying ready at Woolwich; and whether there is any reason for delaying this trial until the extended trial, by another Committee, of the Armstrong and Whitworth systems is brought to a conclusion?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON, in reply, said, the experimental establishment at Shoeburyness was almost entirely engaged in the trial of the Armstrong and Whitworth systems, and it was quite impossible that the Ordnance Select Committee, to whom was intrusted the trial of the other systems of rifling, could carry on their course of experiments at the same time. A proposal, however, had a short time ago been made, that the trial of the heavy rifled guns on various systems should be made at Woolwich at short range as far as it could be done without danger, and that proposal was now under consideration by the Horse Guards.

DOCKS AT MALTA.—QUESTION.

Captain TALBOT said, before putting the Question of which he had given notice, he wished, by way of explanation, to state he had lately received a letter, written by an eminent Member of Council. ["Order!" "Question!"] Well, his Question was, To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government have received a letter, dated the 10th of June, from the Chamber of Commerce of Malta to His Excellency the Governor of Malta, expressing their hopes "that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to direct the necessary steps to be taken in order to obtain from Her Majesty's Government the abandonment of the contemplated Dock at the Marsa, in view of the very serious inconvenience to which it will subject the Mercantile Marine after it shall have been extended from the French Creek;" whether he is aware that this letter was decided on in a very full meeting of the Chamber of Commerce, composed of the principal Merchants of Malta, and that the letter contains a request that it may be forwarded to the Home Government; and whether there will be any objection on the part of Her Majesty's Government to lay this letter upon the table of the House?

Mr. CARDWELL, in reply, said, he had not received the letter alluded to by the hon. and gallant Member, but as soon as it arrived he would be happy to lay it on the table.

Captain TALBOT said, he would now beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, whether the report is true that the works of the proposed new Dock at Malta are being carried on with great activity, although the Vote for that work has not yet been sanctioned by Parliament, and the question is now under the consideration of the Committee sitting upon Docks and Basins.

Lord CLARENCE PAGET replied that immediately after he announced in the House that the Vote for the proposed Dock at Malta would not be proceeded with, a telegram was sent to the Admiral on the station—namely, on the 5th of May last—to the effect that while the Question was under the consideration of the Select Committee, the works of the Marsa Dock were to be suspended.

UNITED STATES—CASE OF MR. JAMES M'HUGH.—QUESTION.

Mr. BUTT said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, When the papers relative to the case of Mr. James M'Hugh, moved for on the 14th of June, will be produced; and whether any Communication has been received from the Government of the United States holding out any expectation of an early release of Mr. M'Hugh?

Mr. LAYARD, in reply, said, he expected by every mail to hear of the release of Mr. M'Hugh, and he hoped he might be able to lay it on the table to-morrow.

ASHANTEE WAR—OFFICERS AT CAPE COAST CASTLE.—QUESTION.

Mr. LONGFIELD said, he rose to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, If the same consideration which is shown to the relatives of Officers who fall in battle will be extended to the relatives of those Officers who lost their lives in the late campaign on the Gold Coast; and if the purchase money for the Commission of the late Major Merrick will be returned to his representatives?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, in reply, that the Pension Warrant did not sanction the issue of the same pension to the relatives of Officers who had died of disease as to the relatives of those who had fallen in action. With reference to the latter part of the Question the relatives of Captain (not Major) Merrick would not receive the price of his commission, because the Warrant also laid it down that the purchase money should be returned in the case of Officers who had been killed in action, or had died of their wounds within six months; but, as he stated the other night, Captain Merrick landed from the *Megæra* in August, 1863, and died of fever at Cape Coast Castle in the following October, and had never taken part, as far as he was aware, in any expedition to the interior.

Captain Talbot

STAMP DUTIES—ORDERS ON BANKERS. QUESTION.

Mr. Alderman SALOMONS said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is true that an order addressed to bankers or other persons for any payment of money, whether as dividend or otherwise, and which hitherto has been exempt from Stamp Duty, as being neither a Letter nor a Power of Attorney, is, by a new construction put by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue on the Act of the present Session, to be made liable to the Duty of Five Shillings, or any other Duties charged on Letters or Powers of Attorney; and, if so, whether such new construction will not be a great hardship on individuals, and an interference with established usage?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, in reply, that his hon. Friend must have been misinformed—at least, the facts which had come within his (the Chancellor of the Exchequer's) knowledge were entirely different. The Act of the present Session had no bearing on this subject, except to reduce the Duties which were recited in it, and were not applicable to the instruments of which his hon. Friend had spoken. No new construction had been put on the law as it stood, and as it had stood before the Act of the present Session. What had taken place was this—some persons felt a doubt as to whether the orders to which his hon. Friend had referred were liable to Stamp Duty, as was the case with Powers of Attorney, and the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown was that they were so liable. But the date of that opinion was as old as the month of December, 1860, and he was not cognizant of any further proceedings having been taken since that time. It was not a question of penalty, no penalty being imposed for not using a stamp. It was purely a question of discretion in the parties as to the legality of the instrument they used, and the risk of being unable to enforce it in case it should be questioned in a court of justice.

Mr. Alderman SALOMONS said, the answer of the right hon. Gentleman was perfectly satisfactory.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—QUESTION.

Mr. HUNT said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he will fix some convenient time for the Consideration of The Lords' Amendments to the Penal Servitude Acts Amendment Bill?

SIR GEORGE GREY replied, that the Bill had been returned from the House of Lords only within the last five minutes. He proposed to have the Amendments printed, and then that a proper opportunity should be given for taking them into consideration.

NAVY—THE "GLADIATOR."

QUESTION.

LORD STANLEY said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether it is true that the *Gladiator* was lately required to carry troops, to the number of two hundred, to Dublin; that objection was made, on the ground of insufficient space, and that the number was accordingly reduced to one hundred and forty; and whether he will produce any Correspondence that may have passed on the subject?

LORD CLARENCE PAGET said, there was no objection, if the noble Lord wished to move for it, to produce the Correspondence; but if the House would allow him he would read a very short statement which would explain what had occurred—

> "The *Aurora*, *Gladiator*, and *Geyser* were ordered on the 21st of May to be in readiness to take a Battalion of the 60th Rifles to Dublin, and the distribution of officers and men was as follows:—*Aurora*, 12 officers, 300 men, 20 women, 24 children, 2 horses; *Gladiator*, 12 officers, 250 men, 26 women, 30 children, 2 horses; *Geyser*, 11 officers, 160 men, 20 women, 16 children, 1 horse. Subsequently a Report from the Commander-in-Chief, dated June 3, was received by the Admiralty suggesting another distribution of the troops to prevent the inconveniences that would be occasioned by the women and children to be embarked, and finally the embarkation as now stated was approved; *Aurora* to take 15 officers, 450 soldiers, 2 horses; the *Gladiator*, to take 10 officers, 194 soldiers, 1 horse; the *Geyser*, to take 10 officers, 66 soldiers, 2 horses, and 66 women (wives of the above men), and 70 children."

With regard to the capacity of vessels for carrying troops, as the House had been in some doubt in consequence of the statements and counter-statements which had been made, he would observe that the *Gladiator* was of 1,210 tons, and was reported as capable of carrying 400 troops for five days, while the *Devastation*, which was 200 tons less than the *Gladiator*, was reported by her captain to be able to take 1,000 men for five days. He had there a list of the capacity of several vessels for the transport of troops, and it varied very greatly, and it was for the Admiralty in each case to determine the number which the ships ought to carry. If the House would permit him, he would refer to a letter which had appeared in *The Times* of that day from the hon. and gallant Member for Portsmouth (Sir James Elphinstone) on the subject of the removal of these troops. It was usual, when they had debates in that House, that hon. Members should get up and speak what they had to say, rather than write letters to the newspapers. This was a matter in which the House had expressed great interest—namely, the conveyance of troops from the West Indies, and perhaps the House would permit him to read a letter which he had received from the Hydrographer of Her Majesty's Navy.

MR. DISRAELI: Sir, I rise to order. I am sure the House will give permission to the noble Lord to make any statement which he may think necessary for the advantage of the public service, or in vindication of his own conduct, but it can only be made on that understanding. The noble Lord is now taking a highly irregular course.

LORD CLARENCE PAGET: It is a personal explanation — not that my personal character is in the least involved in it.

MR. SPEAKER: If the noble Lord wishes to make a personal explanation I have no doubt the House will permit him to do so, but I rather understand from him that it is not a personal matter.

LORD CLARENCE PAGET: It is so far a personal explanation that I stated to the House the reasons which induced the Government to send troops from Cape Coast to the West Indies under particular circumstances, and I wish to refer to the way in which my statement was contradicted by the hon. and gallant Member—[*Cries of* "Order, order!" *in the midst of which the noble Lord resumed his seat.*]

DENMARK AND GERMANY.

THE CONFERENCE.—QUESTION.

MR. DISRAELI: Sir, I would take this opportunity of asking the noble Viscount the First Minister of the Crown, Whether he has any communication to make to the House with respect to the proceedings of the Conference yesterday?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Sir, the Question of the right hon. Gentleman is a very natural one, and I am quite aware that not only the anxiety of the House, but that of the public at large, upon the subject to which it relates, is entitled to some communication from Her Majesty's Government. The Conference met yesterday, in the afternoon, after the Levee, and it adjourned to Saturday, when it will meet at an earlier hour. The probability is that that meeting of Saturday will be the last and final meeting of the Conference; and it will be my duty on Monday to lay upon the table of this House all the papers connected with the proceedings of the Conference—I hope including the proceedings that may take place on Saturday. I shall also feel it my duty, and my noble Friend in the other House will also feel it to be his duty in his place, not only to lay the papers on the table of the House, but to make a statement connected with the transactions to which the papers relate.

MR. HUNT: Sir, I should like to ask the noble Lord, whether the Conference will meet on Saturday to deliberate, or simply to go through some formulary? I think this House is entitled to know whether the Conference has closed its deliberations or not, and whether it meets on Saturday to go through some matter of form?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: I stated my opinion that the meeting on Saturday will be the final meeting. It is impossible for me to say what will take place at a meeting not yet assembled. I say that on Monday I shall lay on the table a Report of all the proceedings of the Conferences, accompanied, I hope, by the proceedings of Saturday.

MR. DISRAELI: I conclude from what the noble Lord says, that the documents he proposes to lay upon the table will be in the hands of Members on Tuesday.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: They will be laid on the table on Monday, and I presume they will be distributed with the papers on the following morning.

WEIGHING OF CORN (PORT OF LONDON).

[BILL 119.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. CRAWFORD said, he rose to move the second reading of the Bill, and with a view of correcting some misapprehensions which prevailed on the subject, both in and out of the House, he would take the opportunity of briefly stating the objects of the measure. From time immemorial the corporation of the City of London possessed the right of measuring all corn that came into the port, and was entitled to all the profits and emoluments arising from the discharge of that duty. It was, in fact, an office of profit. It was not an office to which a simple duty was attached, but an office of profit in the strict sense of the term. The City claimed its right to the office from prescription, from a time to which legal memory did not go back. As far back as the time of King John the right was possessed by the City, and the right was then in dispute. It was disputed again in the reign of James I., and the dispute was finally settled by the grant of a charter confirming the City in the prescriptive right which they had enjoyed for so many centuries. That right was further recognized by the Royal Commission of 1853. By an Act of the current Session, introduced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Customs and Inland Revenue Act, it was provided that henceforth the duties on grain should be ascertained by weight and not by measurement. That Act was to come into force on the 1st of September, and if no further provision were made, the consequence would be that the Government would require the grain to be weighed, while the corporation would claim their right of having it measured. He (Mr. Crawford) had, therefore, moved the insertion of a proviso saving the right of the City; but he was advised to provide for the case by special legislation. Hence the present Bill. The gentlemen representing the corn trade had placed themselves in communication with the corporation. They were met by the City in a liberal spirit, and the terms come to were fair both to the public and to the trade. Those terms were embodied in the Bill. It commenced by reciting the rights of the City, in terms identical with those used in the Coal Act of 1861, the change which had taken place in the law during the Session in regard to levying duties on grain, and that it was necessary that various small duties now levied should be commuted. It then provided for the levying of a duty of three-eighths of a penny on every cwt. of grain brought into the port of London, the payment of a certain amount of compensation to the Lord Mayor and other officers, who had been in the habit of receiving emoluments out of the existing charges, and the payment of compensation to the small meters and other persons who might be affected by the Bill. Since it had been printed he had had the opportunity of further considering the matter, and the result had been a modification of the Bill, defining what articles should be considered grain, and providing that grain brought into the City by vessels which did not break bulk, should not be subjected to the duty. The Bill, which had been reprinted in its amended form, accordingly provided for a drawback on grain brought into the port of London and exported without being unloaded or broken in bulk. As the Bill stood, the duty was charged on all corn, pulse, and seeds. The corporation proposed to except seeds brought into the port in sacks or casks. These charges the City were willing to forego. But that was not all. When a cargo arrived a report had to be made at the Mansion House, and the charges arising from that process amounted to about £2,000. The City proposed to dispense with the Mansion House formalities, and to remit the charges connected with them. The City would give up £3,000 a year, which was the difference between the new rate per cwt. and the old rate per quarter, and would bear all the compensations to corn-meters and other persons affected by the Bill. By accepting this arrangement the public would be guaranteed against any excess in the charge for weighing above the rate fixed, on account of any rise in the cost of labour or other cause. On the whole, very little would be left to the City in the shape of revenue. In favour of the Bill there were, first, the corporation of the City of London, and next they had the great body of the corn trade. The Chairman of the Committee of the Corn Trade had written a letter to *The Times* pointing out the advantages which the corn trade would derive from the City performing the office of weighing as it had hitherto done that of measuring. There would be a saving in the charges, and the proper execution of the duty would be guaranteed. The writer added that the arrangement proposed was deemed satisfactory by the trade. Another correspondent of *The Times*, under the signature of "Civis," also bore testimony to the benefit which the corn trade would derive from the Bill. It had been stated in another letter in the same journal, that a Committee of the House of Commons had recommended the abolition of metage. In the year 1858 a Bill was brought in by the Home Secretary, the 53rd clause of which provided that metage should be abolished, and the 56th clause rendered the City liable for all the compensation to be given to those who might suffer under the operation of the measure. The corporation were heard against these provisions, which were, however, passed with this modification, that the metage should continue for ten years. Subsequently a Motion was made for the recommittal of the Bill, but the debate was cut short, and the Session came to a close without any further steps being taken, and since then nothing had been done. Besides the parties to whom he had referred as being favourable to the Bill, petitions in support of it had been presented from the small meters and the Fellowship Porters. The hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets had given notice of a Motion the effect of which was to treat the Bill as a Private Bill. Now the Bill was not promoted as a Private Bill. It was a supplement to the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill of the present Session, and had been rendered necessary not by any Act of the City, but by the force of legislation. In the next place, it concerned the trade of the metropolis, and the whole district between Staines and Erith, and therefore claimed to be treated as a Public Bill. It also concerned the collection of the public revenue and the rights of the City, which had been dealt with over and over again by Acts of Parliament, such as the corn and wine duties, and other Acts of a similar nature. Without offering any opinion as to the construction of the Standing Orders, he trusted the House would treat the Bill as a Public Bill and give it a second reading.

Mr. A. RUSSELL seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Crawford.*)

Mr. AYRTON, in rising to move the Amendment of which he had given notice, said, the Bill ought to be treated as a private measure because its object was to gain a private advantage for the corporation of London. In principle there was really no difference between the Bill before the House and a Bill promoted by the London and North Western Railway Company, or any other trading association. Let the House look at the manner in which it was introduced. Bills levying duties ought to be founded upon a Resolution previously passed in Committee of the whole House. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had brought in a Bill relative to the payment of certain duties by weight instead of by measure. It was preceded by a Resolution in Committee, stating the amount of duty to be proposed, and it could not be carried beyond the amount agreed to in Committee. Now, that method of proceeding had not been followed in the present instance, though when the Bill came to be examined in detail it would be seen that a private Member should, under no circumstances, be permitted to exercise a power of legislation which was not enjoyed by any responsible Minister of the Crown. But the hon. Member must not be let off from the other horn of the dilemma. The hon. Member had described the Bill as a Private Bill. Now, what were the rules of the House on that subject? They provided that all Bills of a private nature should be classified, and class No. 1 specified, amongst others, "Charters of Corporations, enlarging or altering powers of," one branch of which were Bills levying or altering tolls, rates, or duties. The Bill recited the right of the corporation to measure certain commodities, including grain, and to receive for their own use the wages, rewards, fees, and profits arising therefrom; and it then went on to enact that for every hundredweight of grain brought into the port of London there should be paid to the Mayor and commonalty a sum of three-eighths of a penny. That was the whole taxing power of the Bill, and that tax was to be paid whether any service was performed or not. It was true that other clauses provided that the grain should be weighed if people desired it, and that the work should be done by the fraternity called the Fellowship Porters, who were to be paid for what they did at the rate of ¾*d.* per cwt. for cargoes under 50 cwt., and ½*d.* per cwt. above. So that when they came to the working men the corporation knew well enough how to draw the Bill. The men were to be paid only when they did work, but the corporation were to receive the dues without doing anything for them. After that statement of the object and nature of the Bill, he thought there could be no doubt that it fell within the Standing Orders as to Private Bills. The hon. Member, in speaking of the corporate rights, had done well to say that they went back to a period to which the memory of man did not run, especially as the corporation had destroyed their records; at least, being the keepers of them, when it was inconvenient to produce them the corporation said that they could not be found. It unfortunately happened, however, that in the last century they came to Parliament for assistance; and, being required to show what was their actual pecuniary position, they made a statement which was upon the Journals of the House, and in which there was no mention of a single shilling of profit or revenue derived from those sources which the hon. Gentleman said that they had enjoyed from time immemorial. It was true that they claimed the right to appoint meters, but that was all.

MR. ALDERMAN SIDNEY asked the hon. Gentleman when he alleged that the corporation destroyed their records?

MR. AYRTON said, that it was at the time that the corporation appointed a Committee of Secrecy to raise money to pay their debts, which Committee forthwith embarked in transactions which led to the painful scene that occurred in that House when, some hon. Member having asked Mr. Speaker a question with respect to the corporation funds, he left the chair and never appeared again. From that time till 1834 the corporation did very much as they liked, for there were then no Members for the Tower Hamlets. The Royal Commission of 1854 mentioned this claim, as the hon. Member for the City had stated, but they expressed their opinion that the duty ought to cease; and in 1856 a Bill was introduced by the noble Lord (Lord Palmerston), the right hon. Baronet (Sir George Grey) and the then Attorney General, to abolish it. As the present Home Secretary said on one occasion, the obstructive dining power of the corporation was such that it was almost impossible to proceed with a Bill against them, and that measure was withdrawn. In 1858 another Bill was brought in, which also proposed to abolish this tax. That Bill was referred to a Select Committee. The corporation were heard by counsel before the Committee. [MR. CRAWFORD: Upon one clause only.] The corporation had an opportunity of putting anything before the Committee, which in the end declared that these duties should end in ten years or sooner. It was too late, however, to carry a Bill in that Session of Parliament. In the following year the subject was again brought before a Committee, of which the then Lord Mayor was a Member, and they reported that they saw no reason to doubt the correctness of the conclusions arrived at by the former Committee. He thought he had shown a large amount of authority against the continuance of the duty. It had been attempted to show that it was a legal duty, but although as a rule individuals could not afford to enter into litigation with a wealthy corporation, yet it did happen on one occasion that the magnitude of his interest induced a trader to resist the demand of the corporation, and he filed a Bill calling upon them to show their title to claim this duty. The corporation fought him at every stage, but when the matter got into the House of Lords they withdrew their own appeal, and thus practically admitted that they could not substantiate their claim. The hon. Gentleman, feeling the weakness of his case, asked the House to assent to the Bill because, as he said, it had the sanction of every one except the taxpayers. That, however, was not quite correct. The hon. Gentleman said the corn trade, as represented by the corn market, was in its favour. The truth was, the corporation had been receiving £13,000 a year from the duty without doing anything in return, and although they claimed for themselves the exclusive right of setting up markets in the City and within seven miles thereof, yet they had allowed a close monopoly to grow up which kept the corn market in the hands of a few people, who, for every £200 they had invested, had created by monopoly property worth £1,400. This Corn Exchange was a close body, which had grown upon the corporation like a fungus upon another corrupt body. Of course those people were in favour of the Bill. They were hand and glove with the corporation, and the hand and glove were worthy of each other, for both were unclean. But with all the monopoly they had not yet built themselves a corn market. The hon. Gentleman had also said that the meters had petitioned in favour of the Bill. The sworn meters, who claimed a right to measure grain, had petitioned against the Bill, and it was only the casual meters, who claimed no such right, who had petitioned in its favour. It was also said that the Fellowship Porters approved the Bill. He could only say that the Fellowship Porters had made many complaints to him of the cruel treatment they received from the corporation. In 1835, when Reform was rife, and when there was a probability that the duty upon grain would not endure much longer, the corporation introduced a clause into the document of admission given to Fellowship Porters whereby all vested rights were abandoned. Having thus got rid of all claims for compensation, they then persuaded the fellowship porters to intrust their interests to the care of the corporation, lest they should be ruined. The corporation next made a bargain with the Corn Exchange to reduce the duties, and undertook that the wages of the Fellowship Porters should also be reduced. The corporation, in return for an income of £5,000, or, as he believed, £10,000 a year, allowed the Corn Exchange to oppress these poor men by taking off one-third of their wages. They must never forget that in dealing with the corporation they were not dealing with a public body for public objects only. The claim of the corporation was, that they were entitled to appropriate these funds for their own purposes. They had seen the corporation already become shareholders in a railway, so completely did they consider the corporate funds as property with which they might do as they pleased. The corporation of London, who said they were protecting the Fellowship Porters, had for a long period compelled them to surrender 1*d.* on every 1*s.* of their earnings, and had kept up for them a Benefit Society, as compared with which the worst benefit society mentioned in the Chancellor of the Exchequer's late exposition of malversation and fraud was really a pattern of excellency and virtue ; for the Benefit Society of the Fellowship Porters was conducted in this wise, that it actually spent £500 a year in dispensing £250 for the benefit of the poor men whose wages were mulcted of 1*d.* in every 1*s.* He thought the House should pause before allowing its Standing Orders to be subverted in favour of a measure like that. He had presented petitions from the Dock Companies against the Bill, stating that by their Acts they were authorized to weigh everything in their docks, and they did not understand why they were to be deprived of that power. He had also presented petitions from the great dealers in corn, merchants, and others, who said they did not object to an arrangement for having grain weighed when it was needed, but did object to being compelled to pay a tax for weighing whether they required their grain weighed or not. An enactment of one clause would have been sufficient for the corporation, if their Bill were simply consequent upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer's legislation, but they had taken advantage of that opportunity to bring in a Bill to serve their own private ends alone. Let the City give a pledge that they wanted that Bill for public objects only, and let them limit it to all grain which it was necessary to weigh for revenue purposes and for delivery, and he would assist them to pass it. But if they would not give such a distinct and intelligible pledge, then the House would know that the measure was designed for sinister objects and private aims, for banquets to gratify themselves and their families, and for largess to be distributed among their friends and kindred. Trusting that the House would not permit any corporation, however influential, to subvert its rules and orders, he begged to move his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "inasmuch as the Bill seeks to enlarge and alter the powers of the Corporation of the City of London to levy a Rate or Duty, and to alter existing Rates and Duties, on Grain and Seeds imported into the Port of London for the use and benefit of the Corporation, this House is of opinion that the Bill ought not to be proceeded with until the Standing Orders relating to Private Bills be duly complied with,"—(*Mr. Ayrton,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, that as the Amendment of the hon. Member related entirely to the Standing Orders of the House, it was desirable that the discussion of the merits should be disentangled from the difficulty suggested, and that the House should decide whether the Bill was a public or private one. In the first instance, he (Colonel Patten) had been under the impression that the measure was a private one; but after looking at several other Bills which had passed the House, he confessed he entertained doubts upon the subject. He, therefore, would respectfully suggest that it would much simplify the discussion if the Speaker would favour them with his opinion on it.

Sir JOHN SHELLEY said, he would suggest, that before the right hon. Gentleman gave his opinion, that it was desirable they should be told what the difference was in respect to the Standing Orders between the Bill before the House and the City Police Bill, which was stopped by the corporation.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Question raised by the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets is one well worthy the consideration of the House, and has quite properly been brought under its notice by the hon. and learned Gentleman. This Bill has certainly many features which are characteristic of a Private Bill. But it has been the policy of late years to introduce Bills relating to the Metropolis as Public Bills, on account of the great extent and the general interests involved. In 1843, and again in 1846, and in 1851, Bills for the regulation of Coal Whippers were treated as Public Bills. In 1845 the Vend and Delivery of Coals in London and Westminster Bill was introduced as a Public Bill. In 1852 the Ballast Heavers (Port of London) Bill, and in 1861 the Annoyance Jurors (Westminster) Bill, were brought in as Public Bills; though if they had related to other towns, they would certainly have been regarded as Private Bills. The Coal and Wine Duties Continuance Bills of 1861 and 1863, which affected the rights of the City to its local dues and taxes, were brought in as Public Bills. The Bill now before the House relates to the port of London, which covers an extensive area, ranging, I believe, over a considerable part of four counties, and containing a population of nearly 3,000,000. It is introduced, not from any desire of the Corporation to disturb the existing state of things, but in consequence of an Act of the present Session, which enacts that the duty on foreign grain shall be levied by weight, instead of by measure. The Corporation propose to accommodate their system to the new law, and to change the system of measuring corn for that of weighing, which has now for the first time been adopted for the purposes of revenue. It appears that under the existing law the measurement of foreign grain by officers of the City, is accepted at the Custom House for charging the import duties; and by this Bill it is proposed that certificates of weight instead of measure shall be furnished to the Custom House for the collection of the public revenue. The Bill concerns the home and foreign trade of the port of London, and also the public revenue; and on these grounds it seems to me that it has been introduced not improperly as a Public Bill. At the same time, as there are allegations of fact in the preamble which are open to dispute, and which require to be established by evidence, I apprehend it will be the pleasure of the House to commit the Bill to a Select Committee, by whom these facts will be inquired into, and any local or private rights may be duly protected.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman would be of material assistance to the House, not only for its direct purpose in throwing light on the Motion of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets, but also in respect to the vote which they would, he supposed, ultimately have to give on the question, whether the Bill should or should not be read the second time. He assumed that the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets would no longer press his Motion on the point of form, but acquiesce in the opinion just delivered from the Chair; and he assumed also that he would not insist on the objection he had raised as to the want of a preliminary Resolution on the introduction of the Bill. Apart from the question, whether or not the Bill required a preliminary Resolution, as being a Bill affecting trade, it was pretty clear that as a Bill affecting taxation it would not require such a Resolution, if, at least, the revenue of the corporation of the City stood on the same footing as the public revenue of the country. Although it was the practice, for the convenience of the House, in moving the reduction of a duty, to do it in the form of a Resolution in Committee of Ways and Means, yet that practice was founded simply on the advantage of giving full information to the House of what the plans of the Government as to the finance of the year might be, and it was quite competent for any Member of the Government, or any independent Member of the House, to introduce any Bill for the reduction of a tax without a preliminary Resolution. The case had been ably stated on both sides. So far as his Parliamentary experience went, and it now extended over a very long period of time, he had never known the duties of a representative of the City of London more ably or satisfactorily discharged than they were by his hon. Friend (Mr. Crawford), who had brought forward the subject in a very clear and practical manner. Then, the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the Tower Hamlets set out a great deal of matter, he admitted, of much importance, one portion of it being connected with the subject of the reform of the corporation of the City of London. He took it that there were few who sat on those Benches that could look back with entire satisfaction to the part which Parliament had played, or rather had not played, in the reform of the corporation of the City; but it would not be fair or just to the corporation to allow any opinion they entertained on that subject, or any desire they might entertain for a general rearrangement of the local authorities of the metropolis, to influence them in their conduct upon that occasion. Another part of the speech of his hon. and learned Friend consisted of allegations, some of them relating to the title of the corporation to their dues, and to the arrangement proposed to be made for the Fellowship Porters, and to other parts of the Bill which appeared to him fair matter for a Select Committee. His hon. Friend who brought forward the measure had been the first to anticipate the suggestion of the Chair, that the Bill should undergo investigation before a Select Committee: the question before them therefore practically was, whether the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee; or, according to the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets, be summarily rejected. They should remember that the Bill had not grown out of the suit or petition of the corporation. The State had determined that for the public convenience the mode of levying the corn duty should be altered, and the corporation was placed under the necessity of doing one of two things—unless, indeed, it was prepared altogether to abandon what it presumed to be its rights, and that, he thought, no one could expect—either the corporation must come to the House for a Bill like the present, or insist on the intolerable injustice of the double process of weighing for the purpose of the corn duty and measuring for the municipal tax. The corporation, he thought, had taken the right course. So far as the Government were concerned, they had taken a strictly impartial course. They declined to pledge themselves to support the Bill until they heard the whole case; but they did undertake that the corporation should not be defeated in consequence of the period of the Session. It appeared to him on the equity of the case that the Bill ought not to be rejected on the second reading, but should be referred to a Select Committee. The fair presumption might be against that source of civic revenue; that presumption arose from the Report of the Committee: but if it was to be abolished, it should be done not accidentally by availing themselves of any difficulty in which the corporation was placed in consequence of measures adopted by Parliament for the public good, but in a straightforward manner, by a measure directed *ad hoc*, explicitly and expressly dealing with the question by legislation. He thought it would be a harsh and severe measure under the circumstances if they withheld their sanction from the second reading of the Bill. It would not be a worthy mode of dealing with the subject. He thought the arrangement proposed by the Bill was an equitable one. The corporation relieved the trade of a portion of the tax; it also gave considerable relief in point of time and trouble. He should certainly support the second reading, with the view of referring the Bill to a Select Committee.

MR. ALDERMAN ROSE said, he thought the right hon. Gentleman had very fairly stated the manner in which the Bill came before the House, and as the judgment from the Chair had disposed of the Amendment, he need not refer at any length to the manner in which the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets had unburdened himself of his peculiar notions with regard to the City of London. The hon. Member said that he represented the Docks and the Fellowship Porters. He ought to be aware that the Docks charged the public 3½ per cent more than the City of London charged. As to the Fellowship Porters, they came before the House last Session under the auspices of the hon. Member; but from the petition of an immense majority it appeared that the control of the funds of that body was in the hands of a few who wished to distribute them among themselves. The fact was that, the moment the question was raised, the corporation had called a meeting of the trade, those who were most competent to give an opinion as to the work to be done, the prices that should be charged for it, and what the trade were prepared to pay. The corporation deliberated upon it, and it was found the charge made in the Bill was fair and reasonable to have the work satisfactorily done. It was very easy to throw any quantity of dirt upon a public body, but he declared emphatically that the random assertions made by the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets on a former evening were totally unfounded.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY said, there was no one who had more zealously devoted himself to the interests of the metropolis at large, as distinguished from that small portion of it compromised within the City, than the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets. The views of that Gentleman might be peculiar in the eyes of a former Lord Mayor, but they were shared by a large body of inhabitants of the metropolis. The Corporation, paying its servants liberally, and always taking pains to secure the best available talent, was sure of having its work well done; and he believed its officers had wisely advised the Corporation to make that concession on which he congratulated the public, and which he believed was traceable directly to the opposition thrown in their way. The Government having cast their protecting influence over this Bill, he hoped would take pains to secure the appointment of an impartial Committee.

MR. HUBBARD said, he doubted the propriety of introducing into a Commutation Bill a preamble reciting the existence of a prerogative which had been much doubted, often disputed, and in many cases could not be enforced. He thought it a dangerous thing that the corporation should be enabled to claim as a debt due by the owners of a cargo so much per cwt., especially as a debt preceding the execution of the work which formed the consideration. As the measure stood, it would establish a monopoly and ignore the changes which mechanical facilities might hereafter provide for the execution of the work. He thought it highly undesirable to stereotype a rate of charge without reserving some power of competition.

MR. AYRTON said, that after the decision from the Chair, he had no option but to submit to the proposal of the Government, but he would suggest that the Bill should be committed *pro formâ* on the following day, so that the House might know the alterations intended to be made.

MR. CRAWFORD said, he would accede to the suggestion, but on Monday he should move that the Bill be referred to a Committee of ten Members, to be named by the Committee of Selection.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Main Question put, and *agreed to*.

Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *Tomorrow*.

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND).

RESOLUTION. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [14th June],

"That, in the opinion of this House, the Rules sanctioned by the Commissioners of National

Education in Ireland on the 21st day of November, 1863, are, so far as regards their operation on the aid afforded to Convent and Monastic Schools, at variance with the principles of the system of National Education." — (*Sir Hugh Cairns.*)

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

The O'CONOR DON said, he trusted it would be unnecessary for him to remind the House of the condition in which the Question stood. He regretted not to see the hon. and learned Member for Belfast (Sir Hugh Cairns) in his place, because having proposed a Question, he thought that he ought to have been present when it was called on. He (the O'Conor Don) did not propose to enter into the general subject of national education in Ireland. There was only one particular phase of the Question to which he would endeavour to confine his observations. At the outset he found a difficulty in understanding the object of the Resolution proposed by the hon. and learned Member. The Motion was—

> " That in the opinion of this House the rules sanctioned by the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland on the 21st day of November, 1863, are, so far as regards their operation on the aid afforded to convent and monastic schools, at variance with the principles of the system of National Education."

Meaning thereby of National Education as first established. But the House must bear in mind that the rules sanctioned by the Commissioners in November, 1863, were not any particular rules, but the general rules of the National Board. They comprised not only new rules, but all the rules that had at any time existed. But when he came to examine the speech of his hon. and learned Friend he found quite a different interpretation put upon the Resolution; and his hon. and learned Friend had assured the House that he had the support of several members of the National Board, such as Dr. Henry and the Bishop of Derry. But did his hon. and learned Friend mean to tell the House that he had the support of the Bishop of Derry in condemning all aid from the Board to convent and monastic schools? The Bishop of Derry said he became a Commissioner under the rules of 1855, but the Resolution before the House was equally condemnatory of the rules of 1855 as of the rules of 1863, and of all others. The hon. and learned Gentleman said it was contrary to the principle of National Education to grant aid to voluntary efforts. He maintained, on the contrary, that the system was expressly designed by the Earl of Derby to aid and assist the voluntary efforts of the country. The hon. and learned Member's Resolution appeared to condemn the appointment of monitors, except in State schools, and to be opposed to help of any kind being given to conventual or monastic institutions. He was at issue with the hon. and learned Gentleman on both these points. A discussion took place at the outset on the question, whether these convent schools would come under the rules laid down by the Earl of Derby equally with all other schools. The result was that they received the same amount of aid, and in the same way as the ordinary schools, on compliance with the usual conditions. Up to 1839 the grants were given by way of capitation on the number of pupils on the rolls. It was then thought desirable to alter the mode of allocation; but no alteration took place in the principle on which assistance was given. It was discovered that some of the school teachers were very incompetent, and it was determined that the teachers should be classified, and a higher amount paid according to the classification. There existed, however, some schools to which it was unnecessary to apply the classification. There was, he maintained, no essential principle altered in the alteration which had been made in 1839. If the Resolution of the hon. and learned Member applied to all aid given to convent and monastic schools, it was one which the House could not adopt. It was, however, perhaps to the conjunction of the establishment of monitors and of additional assistance being granted to those schools that he objected; but if that were so, he could not see how, when taken separately, neither one nor the other was contrary to the principles of the system, they could fairly be said to be so when united. And from whom, he would ask, did those complaints against the alteration in the rules, which the hon. and learned Gentleman had urged, come? From the Presbyterians of the North of Ireland, who had shown themselves to be the friends of the system established by the Earl of Derby, by refusing to join the National Board until alterations were made which were an essential departure from the principles which that noble Lord had at the outset laid down. Nothing was more clearly expressed in Lord Stanley's letter than that in every school there should be combined both secular and religious instruction; that, on a certain day in each week, and at a certain hour, time should be devoted to religious instruction; and that the pastors belonging to the faith of the minority should have the right to enter the schools in order to teach the children of their own flock. Yet these vital principles had been departed from by the clients of the hon. and learned Gentleman himself. The hon. and learned Gentleman was, in short, the spokesman of that very party which had brought the National system into that state of disrepute in which it was at present placed, and it seemed to him, he must confess, somewhat extraordinary that, having gained all the privileges which they had claimed for themselves, the Presbyterians of Ulster should come forward and object to any sort of additional aid being given to the schools of other denominations. Now, he was at once prepared to admit that if the convent schools were not satisfactorily conducted, any rule which had for its object to extend aid to them ought not to receive the sanction of the House. But the hon. and learned Gentleman himself had stated at the commencement of his speech that he was ready to acknowledge that these schools were conducted in a satisfactory manner in many instances, although that view did not appear to be quite consistent with that which he had enunciated before he sat down. Indeed, the hon. and learned Gentleman had devoted more than half of his speech to running down those establishments. He asked the House to believe that the teachers in them were inefficient, and that it would be a great error to extend to them any further assistance. Those statements the hon. and learned Gentleman based on the Report of one of the Inspectors—Mr. Sheridan; the only Report, so far as he (the O'Conor Don) could see, which he could find to bear out his views. The fact, however, was, that Mr. Sheridan passed his judgment on those schools before inspecting them; and what, he would ask, were the charges which he made? They were shortly as follows:—That the teachers did not possess a technical knowledge of the method of teaching; that through their over-impatience of competition they destroyed other schools in the districts in which they were established; that, in consequence, the population in those districts were to a certain extent inadequately supplied with the means of receiving education; and that, in consequence of the competition and the overcrowding of children in the schools, there was not sufficient teaching power in proportion to the number to be taught, and the education was of a very inferior description. Such were the three charges which were brought against the convent schools by Mr. Sheridan. It must be recollected that Mr. Sheridan had not inspected these schools himself. Now, with respect to the first charge, the want of a technical knowledge of the method of teaching, he should like to refer to the Report of Inspector Sheehy, of the Cork district, who said that success in teaching depended chiefly on practice and a thorough knowledge of the subject taught. If the teachers read well, wrote well, and spelt well, they would produce infinitely better scholars than those who, while possessing technical knowledge, were deficient in the higher qualities of teachers. Mr. Sheridan stated that the convent schools showed great impatience of competition, so that the ordinary schools were shut up, and the population left without adequate means of instruction, and he named Killarney as an instance. But, on referring to the Reports of the Killarney district Inspector himself, he found that that statement of Mr. Sheridan was far from being borne out. In fact, it appeared that the number of schools was quite adequate to the wants of the district. The third charge brought by Mr. Sheridan against the convent schools was, that the teaching was inefficient. But he found in the Reports that the Inspectors over and over again complained that reading, writing, and the other branches of education were taught badly in the ordinary schools, and whenever any particular school was pointed out as excellent, it was sure to be either a convent school, a model school, or one of the workhouse schools. Therefore, without going outside the four corners of the Report made by Inspector Sheridan, it could be shown that the charges which he brought were not borne out by the reports which he himself had received. A Report had been made by Inspector Mahony, in which he said that while in the ordinary schools the poorer classes had to pay at the rate of 2*s.* 9*d.* for each child, in the convent schools they had to pay only 11¼*d.* Mr. Mahony looked upon that relief to the poorer classes as a disadvantage, because he found that though at those convent schools the attendance of the children was 60 per cent as compared with 51 per cent at the ordinary schools, yet at some convent schools, where the payment was more regularly enforced, the attendance was 80 per cent. Now, as to the question of cost, the hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir Hugh Cairns) had made use of an argument which, if examined, would be found not to warrant the conclusion drawn from it. It appeared from the Report of the Commissioners that the total cost of the education of a child in the convent schools was something like 7*s*., whereas in the ordinary schools it was 14*s*. Inspector Sheridan stated that the great majority of the children in the convent schools never reached the higher classes, and therefore the hon. and learned Gentleman concluded that 4*s*. 6*d*., or, correcting his estimate as it should have been, 7*s*. a child was paid for half education. But, in order to prove his case, the hon. and learned Gentleman should have proved that a better education was obtained at the higher cost, or, he should have proved that the children in the ordinary schools were more than half educated. But, according to Inspector Sheridan, the State was paying 7*s*. a head for half education in the convent schools, and 14*s*. for something less than quarter education in the ordinary schools. That was exactly what resulted from the hon. and learned Gentleman's argument, because it appeared that only 18 or 19 per cent of the children in the ordinary schools reached the higher classes. And what was the remedy proposed by the hon. and learned Gentleman? He objected to the new rule on the ground that it would favour the convent as distinguished from the model or training schools. But what was the cost of educating children in the model schools? According to the Report of the Education Commissioners it was no less than £1 16*s*. 6*d*. per head, so that the hon. and learned Gentleman wanted to have the children educated in the higher class of schools at that enormous expense.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

The O'CONOR DON resumed: He would, therefore, ask the House, whether it was prepared to condemn schools which gave education at a cheap rate, and which the people of the country favoured from religious motives? The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin objected to the convent and monastic schools because they had a religious tendency, and were consequently in contradiction to the spirit of the system adopted by the Board. If so, then it must be admitted that the system of education established by the Board was an irreligious education. But Lord Stanley's letter laid it down that religious as well as secular instruction should be given in the schools. Under all these circumstances, he could not conceive what argument could be urged against the rules recognized in 1863, on the ground of the aid afforded to convent and monastic schools. The hon. Member for the King's County intended to move the omission from the Motion of the words referring to convent and monastic schools, so that the Motion would then declare that the rules sanctioned by the Commissioners on the 21st of November, 1863, were at variance with the principles of the system of National Education. He admitted that there were among the rules some, introduced at the instance of the Presbyterians of Ulster, which were contrary to the principle contained in Lord Stanley's letter; but he thought that a general Resolution, such as the hon. Member for the King's County desired, rather dangerous for the House to adopt, and it would have been better if the hon. Member had stated in his Amendment what were the particular rules which were objectionable. On various occasions he had stated his views respecting the general principle of education which he would wish to see adopted. The principle established by Lord Stanley's letter had failed to meet the views of all the parties in the country, and had in practice broken down, and he would be ready to support a system for Ireland similar to the one existing in England, if he saw the means of establishing it there. He could not, however, support the Resolution moved by the hon. and learned Member for Belfast, because it was opposed to the principle laid down by Lord Stanley's letter. He had no hesitation in voting against the hon. and learned Gentleman's Motion, and as to the Amendment of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite he should prefer before deciding to hear his explanation of it. He agreed with him that there had been departures from the rules, but he should like to hear at what departures his hon. and learned Friend pointed, for the hon. and learned Member for Belfast had the other evening mentioned departures from the rules which he believed could not be so characterized.

Mr. BLACK said, that in times past

there had been much discussion in Scotland on the subject of education, and they had arrived at the conclusion that the system of National Education which had been adopted in Ireland was infinitely better than that which existed in England. The English system was disliked in Scotland because it was sectarian, and they hailed Lord Stanley's scheme because it had a tendency to tone down religious animosities, and to bring up children of different sects together, so that they might learn to love and respect each other. It seemed, however, that for thirty years they had been under a delusion in thinking thus of Lord Stanley's system, for they were now told that the system in Ireland was in a great measure sectarian. Some blame had been thrown upon the Presbyterians, as though they were the first to try to break down the unsectarian system; and, if they had done so, he must say that they were wrong. All he asked was, that fair play should be given to Presbyterian and Roman Catholic alike, and that the spirit of Lord Stanley's proposals in that respect should be adhered to. It was obvious that one of the fundamental rules of that system —that no minister of religion or member of a religious order should be a teacher in one of those schools—had been departed from. We have been told that in the model schools the instruction was of the very best description, and that the pupils were there made effective teachers; but we have reason to believe that the priesthood in Ireland have denounced these model schools, and have done their best to prevent them being well attended. The percentage of Roman Catholics attending all the National schools in Ireland was eighty-one, whilst the percentage of Roman Catholics attending the model schools was only forty-three. It was plain, therefore, that some means must be used to discourage attendance at the model schools. He could easily conceive that in convent schools young ladies of earnest minds, who had renounced the world and devoted themselves to doing good to their fellow creatures, made zealous and kind teachers; but the question was not whether these ladies taught well or ill, but whether there had been a departure from the fundamental principle upon which the National schools were originally founded; and the hon. and learned Member for Belfast had proved this beyond a doubt. The system which the country wanted was that which had been established by the Earl of Derby when Lord Stanley; and that system could be carried out if those who had the management of it only acted honestly, and did not give any one sect an advantage over the others. The other schoolmistresses were required to have been trained in a model school or to have passed an examination; but these conditions were dispensed with in the case of the nuns. He did not object to this advantage being given to them because they were nuns. He should object to it equally if it were granted to Presbyterians. The rule laid down by Lord Stanley was a good one, which in Scotland they were anxious to see carried out. Under it all schools were to be on the same footing—there was to be a common literary and a separate religious education. The experiment had been tried successfully in Edinburgh, where both Protestants and Roman Catholics were taught in the same school receiving secular instruction, sitting together on the same benches, and receiving religious instruction, and reading the New Testament, under teachers of their own faith in separate rooms. So long as the system was carried out honestly it would succeed, but if either party attempted to secure advantages for itself the system would break down. They ought to take their stand on the rules, and not allow them to be broken through; but if pupil-teachers were to be trained under nuns they would have all the feelings of the "nunnery" about them, and would not act in training children upon the same principles, and with the same unbiassed sympathies, as the teachers brought up in model schools under persons not confined to one sect. Now, it was not because the deviation was allowed to Roman Catholics that he offered objections; he would lay down the same if Protestants sought it. If the Government has already yielded to pressure from without it ought to go no further in this direction, and for that reason he should support the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Belfast.

MR. HENNESSY said, that the hon. and learned Attorney General for Ireland told them the other evening that the present agitation was an attack on the system of National Education in Ireland. If so, by whom was it made? From the papers laid on the table he gathered that the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary was one of the leading promoters of the attack. [Sir Robert Peel: No!] The right hon. Gentleman in a letter dated the 30th of January, 1864, said—

> "The attention of the Irish Government has been drawn to certain contemplated changes in the fundamental rules of the system of National Education in Ireland, the effects of which will be seriously to imperil the principle upon which the system is based."

And the right hon. Gentleman added that the Bill had "no power to change any fundamental rule without the express permission of his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant." It was a remarkable fact that on the preceding day, the 29th of January, language almost identical was used by Dr. Henry, a member of the Board and President of Queen's College, Belfast, who expressed his opinion that "the recent changes of rule seriously interfere with one of the fundamental principles on which the system of National Education was founded," and desired that his solemn protest should be communicated to the Government. He presumed that the protest had been communicated, and the next day it was followed by the letter of the right hon. Gentleman. It also appeared that a deputation on the subject waited on the Lord Lieutenant, headed by the Protestant Bishop of Down and Connor; and among those who entered protests were the Bishop of Derry and Mr. Gibson, who was also a member of the Board. These were the gentlemen who promoted the attack, and every one of them, with the exception of the Chief Secretary, was a member of the Whig party. The two bishops were both stout Whigs, and Dr. Henry and Mr. Gibson were tried servants and consistent placemen of the same party. The present assault on the Government system was made, therefore, by the supporters of the Government in Ireland. It was not, however, the first time that the institution had been attacked in that Parliament. In 1859 the Roman Catholic Members raised an opposition to it, and in the same year the Roman Catholic Bishops published a pastoral against it, and recommended that the English system should be adopted in Ireland. Dr. Henry and Mr. Gibson, to whose protests he had referred, were leading members of the Presbyterian party, for whom the hon. and learned Member for Belfast (Sir Hugh Cairns) also spoke; and the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Whiteside), who might be regarded as the representative of the Established Church, had on more than one occasion attacked the system. Thus, then, the three denominations were arrayed against the institution of National Education in Ireland. In England the system which prevailed was satisfactory to the various religious parties. Why should the reverse be the case with the system in Ireland? It was because the principle adopted in England was different from that in Ireland. The recent attack on the Irish system was of great importance, because it disclosed among the opponents not merely adherents of the three denominations, but even members of the Board. The fact was that the Board was divided against itself, and one section was fighting the other. The Motion set forth that the rules sanctioned on the 21st of November, 1863, were, as far as regarded their operation on the aid afforded to convent and monastic schools, "at variance with the principles of the system of National Education." What was an Irish Catholic gentleman to say to that assertion? He was bound, on consideration, to say that he believed the rules were at variance with the principles of National Education. He was also of opinion that they were most unjustly oppressive to convent and monastic schools. The Attorney General said that those institutions received aid like other schools. That was not the fact.

Mr. O'HAGAN (The Attorney General for Ireland) denied that he had ever said anything of the sort. He distinctly explained the difference as to the subvention in the case of convent and other schools.

Mr. HENNESSY said, he did not refer to the subvention. The point to which he desired to draw attention was that, while the promoters of an ordinary National school might establish another in the same town, and receive aid for both, there was a rule of the Board which provided that one school only attached to any conventual community should receive aid. In England, if there were two schools connected with a convent both would receive aid. Thus, in Blandford Square, there was a community of nuns with two convent schools attached, both of which received aid. In Ireland, only one in connection with any single community would be assisted. Thus in Limerick the Sisters of Mercy had several well-conducted schools, but they only received a grant for one.

Mr. MONSELL said, that was a mistake, for aid was given by the National Board to several schools of the Sisters of Mercy at Limerick.

Mr. HENNESSY: Not of the same community.

Mr. MONSELL: Yes; of the Sisters of Mercy.

Mr. HENNESSY: The Report of the National Board did not corroborate what the right hon. Gentleman said. He did not, however, deny that such a rule was in existence.

Mr. MONSELL: I am aware of this particular rule, but it does happen that in Limerick the Sisters of the same community have several schools, and receive assistance.

Mr. HENNESSY: The rule told them one thing, the blue-book told them another thing, and the practice told them another thing. The practice of the Board was at variance with their own rules.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, he would beg leave to put the hon. Member right on that point.

Mr. HENNESSY said, he thought it would be better for the right hon. Gentleman to explain after he had concluded his remarks. The rule, he believed, existed, and if so, only one school in connection with one community could receive Government aid. That was the rule passed in 1855, and he thought it would be found to be as he had stated. But there were other rules which struck mainly at convent schools. One was that the children should not make the sign of the cross, and another rule was that no crucifixes, no religious pictures or emblems of religion, should be exhibited in the school in school hours. Was it possible that such rules should be enforced in a convent? Speaking as a Catholic, he said it was utterly impossible to do so, and it would be unwise for any Government to attempt to enforce them. At a late meeting in Dublin, presided over by the Lord Mayor, and attended, among others, by the Bishop of Saldes, the Rev. Mr. Kirby said that a certain individual had visited a school in Cork kept by the good Sisters of the Presentation Convent, but under the Board of National Education. The children had been taught to make the sign of the cross whenever the clock struck, but the nuns told the children not to make the sign while the visitor was present, he being an Inspector of the National Board. When the clock struck, however, the custom overcame the injunction, the tiny hand of every child in the school was raised, and the sacred sign was made, while the poor nuns were filled with trepidation. The fact was that ladies who devoted their lives to the service of God could not be tied down by such straight-laced rules. A French abbé, who, upon a recent visit to Ireland, noticed the rule of the Board, that no crucifixes or religious pictures should be exhibited, said—

> "However, in many of the schools I visited, these objects are kept in a little recess in the wall at the end of the room, and are hidden by a curtain."

Here were ladies bound by religious vows, and performing religious duties, and it was attempted to make them hypocrites. The fact was that the Board of Education, anxious to conciliate the multitude of its enemies in Ireland, was willing to make concessions to all parties, under a false impression that by doing so the Catholic party could be conciliated. Now, the one thing which would satisfy Catholics was the same justice that they received in England. He agreed that there was not a mixed but a separate education in the convent schools, and he did not expect that a zealous Protestant or Presbyterian would consent to send his children to those schools. On the other hand, assuming a convent school and a common National school to be not far from each other, a Catholic would prefer to send his children to a convent school. But if it were true that the aid given to convent schools was opposed to the whole system of mixed education, why, it might be asked, should he not agree to the Resolution? He sought, however, by his Amendment, to make the Resolution a general one. He would declare the opinion of the House to be that the rules sanctioned by the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland on the 21st day of November, 1863, were at variance with the principles of the system of National Education, instead of saying that these rules were only at variance "so far as regards their operation on the aid afforded to convent and monastic schools," He, and those who thought with him, desired to mark their sense of the fact, that owing to the changes which had taken place in the system of National Education in Ireland, all its vital principles had altered. In 1840, one of these changes attracted the attention of the Catholic Bishops in Ireland, and was commented upon in another place by Lord Derby so lately as 1858. In 1834, a rule was issued, securing to the clergy liberty to assemble the children in the schoolroom, if they saw fit, for purposes of religious instruction. That rule was acted upon for many years, the Board providing that one day in the week should be given for religious instruction, and various parish priests regularly assembled their children in the schoolroom. In 1840, however, a serious change was made by the adoption of a rule to the effect, that the patron of a school might prevent any clergyman from giving religious instruction in the schoolroom—a rule which drew from the Earl of Derby an expression of regret that in the great bulk of the schools, contrary to the intention of those who had proposed the National system, there was not only no religious education given, but no facilities were afforded for separate religious instruction by the ministers of different persuasions out of school hours. According to the evidence of the Rev. Mr. Carlisle before the Commons' Committee of 1837, the Board itself had no power to alter the original rule, and yet three years afterwards it was changed, he presumed with the sanction of the Government of the day. The Rev. Mr. Trench explained how the alteration was introduced. He stated that his sole objection to joining the Board was the rule which allowed Roman Catholic priests to go into the schools to teach error, but he added that when that point was conceded to the Presbyterians in 1840, and the rule altered, the Board saying they would be satisfied if children were permitted to go to their respective teachers elsewhere, his objection to the system was at once removed. In 1847, the Roman Catholic Bishops met, and passed the following Resolution:—

> "That notwithstanding the explanations so kindly given, we are still of opinion that the changes introduced in the National System of Education are most serious and dangerous, and incompatible with the safety of the religious principles of our Catholic children."

It thus appeared that two important rules had been altered, and that the present system was different from that established by the Earl of Derby. There was a third variation to which he would ask the attention of the Government. When the system was first established, the Earl of Derby said it was of vital importance that it should command the confidence of the Roman Catholic bishops and priests, and that it should exclude even the shadow of proselytism. Accordingly, it was provided that when a clergyman of any denomination chose to give religious instruction, he should tell the children of other denominations to retire from the school, unless their parents had specially directed them to attend. The Presbyterians, however, declined to be guilty of what they thought the sin of driving Roman Catholic children from the school when they were about to teach the Word of God, and they would not join the Board till the rule was altered. At that time, however—1833—the Board was firm, and the Rev. Mr. Love, a Presbyterian minister, was informed that the Holy Scriptures might be read in his school, provided that such children only as were directed by their parents to attend were allowed to continue in the school. Before the Committee of 1837, the Rev. Mr. Carlisle and Mr. Blake, both members of the Board, gave important evidence on that point. The latter said he considered it particularly necessary that the rules should require the approbation of the parents, for otherwise tricks might be played, perhaps on both sides; and he added that he should not regard the absence of dissent on the part of the parents as a sufficient justification for allowing their children to receive religious instruction from the clergyman of another denomination. Nevertheless, in 1855, the following rule was published by the Board:—

> "Patrons, managers, and teachers, are not required to exclude any children from any religious instruction given in the school; but all children are to have full power to absent themselves, or to withdraw from it."

It would thus be seen that while the old rule compelled children of other denominations to leave the school when religious instruction was about to be given by a Protestant or Roman Catholic clergyman, as the case might be, the new rule merely provided that they should not be forced to remain. Archdeacon Stopford, when examined before the Lords' Committee in 1854, frankly stated that the rule was altered to meet the views of his party, those views being that it would devolve on the parent to withdraw his child, and that he would not claim the right of having the child told by others to leave the school. Mr. M'Creedy, one of the head Inspectors at the time, told the same Committee that the modification of the rule had generally satisfied the Protestants, at whose instance it was made; but that he did not think it was perfectly satisfactory to some Roman Catholics. The effect of the change was stated by Archdeacon Stopford, when he said that all the children in his National schools, of whatever religious persuasion they might be, attended the religious instruction as they did any other lesson. Dr. Henry a member of the Board, stated that in many parts of the North of Ireland, the Roman Catholic children read the Scriptures with the Protestants and Presbyterians; and, in fact, at the present moment, there were great numbers of Roman Catholic children receiving a Protestant education in National schools. He might be told by the Chief Secretary, that a notice was given to parents before their children were taught by a clergyman of a different denomination, but that notice, according to the words of Inspector Keenan, an able officer of the National Board, was a sham, and had no effect whatever. One would have thought that the National Board would have been satisfied with what had been done. They had destroyed their system in the case of convent schools. They had destroyed their system in order to obtain the support of the Presbyterian party. The Commissioners, however, had granted a concession at the instance of the Presbyterians, and had allowed their fourteen class books to be interwoven with religious teaching. Mr. Carlisle, a Presbyterian member of the Board, in a letter which he was injudicious enough to write to *The Times* in 1854, said upon that subject—

> "This concession considerably altered the original proposed system. It rendered it, instead of being a rigid system of exclusion of all religion from the common education of the people, an experiment how far Roman Catholics and Protestants could proceed together with perfect unanimity in introducing Scriptural light among the population generally, an experiment the most interesting and important, but the most delicate and difficult ever intrusted to any Commission."

Now, of the fourteen literary books used by the children by the direction of the Board, he believed thirteen to have been written by English or Scotch Protestants, and one only by an Irishman, who was also a Protestant. These books were imbued, he did not say it offensively, because he thought it was but natural under the circumstances, with a strong anti-Catholic, and, he might also add, with an anti-Irish spirit. As an instance of the latter fact, he might mention the circumstance that Irish children were called upon to sing a hymn, one of the lines of which ran—

> "And thus I am a happy English child."

That was a sentiment that Irish children did not approve, and they ought not to be called upon to sing it. They might say with much more reason—

> "We are unhappy Irish children."

He believed that there occurred in the same hymn a delicate reference to the fact that—

> "We do not worship stocks and stones."

The fact was, of course, true enough, but every one was aware of the meaning which the phrase was intended to convey. He would contrast the practice pursued by the National Board with that followed by the Committee of Council in England. The National Board had refused to sanction the use of the schoolbooks written by the Christian Brothers in Ireland, a number of Irish Catholics who had devoted themselves to the education of the people, and who in furtherance of that object had written some excellent educational works. The House would find, however, that every one of these publications were in use in England, not only in the Catholic schools, but that they were also largely ordered for use in the English Wesleyan schools. And yet these books, written by Irishmen and largely used in England, were excluded from the list of school works in Ireland by the National Board. He anticipated that when the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland rose that evening he would be prepared to withdraw his letter of January, 1864. [*Cries of* No, no!] It must strike English Members with surprise to find that so much of the public money was lavishly expended every year upon education in Ireland, when the system adopted had met with so much opposition in that country. The rules had been attacked by the Catholic party, and the Church and the Presbyterian parties had alike denounced them. He appealed to the House whether it were politic or just to force upon the people of Ireland a system of education, which the three great denominations in the country disapproved. Did the House deem it prudent to expend hundreds of thousands a year for the benefit of Ireland in a manner opposed to the wishes of the people themselves? The practice in this country was to educate the people in accordance with the wishes of the various denominations to which they belonged, and that was precisely the principle which Ireland had demanded, and which she had been refused. The time, however, was approaching when that demand would be granted. Although the right hon. Gentleman the Attorney General for

Ireland defended the system, it was only the other night that he dealt it a deadly blow. Baron Deasy, who formerly filled the same office as the right hon. Gentleman, spoke of the system as one of united education; but the right hon. Gentleman said that, however loudly agitators might talk of a united education, no such thing practically existed in Ireland. He would therefore conclude by moving, as an Amendment, the omission of the words which confined the expression of opinion upon the rules to their operation on the aid afforded to convent and monastic schools.

Mr. BLAKE, in seconding the Motion of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for the King's County, fully concurred in everything that had fallen from him, except the latter portion of his speech, where he expressed fears that the Chief Secretary for Ireland would withdraw the opinion contained in his letter to the Education Commissioners. However he differed in many things from the right hon. Baronet, he had a better opinion of him than to apprehend he would do anything of the kind, because whatever his faults were—and he had not then the least intention of charging him with any retractation of what he avowed, or playing the hypocrite to his opinions, whether right or wrong — the habit of retractation could not be included amongst them. He congratulated his hon. and learned Friend for the bold and straightforward course he had adopted in moving the Amendment. It was better that the truth should be admitted, and that every man should declare his opinions and the course he would take on this most important question. He was prepared to do both, and would lay in plain terms before the House what he believed to be the real facts of the case, and his own reasons for his change of opinions, and the course which he had taken, and would adhere to, on the Education question. He was for denominational grants and for combined religious and secular education, which necessarily involved the separate system, which he sincerely believed was best to insure sound moral training, which was a consideration of the greatest importance; and he had no doubt pupils would acquire worldly knowledge all the better for the combination, and in order to accomplish what sincere religionists on both sides rightly desired—the power to educate their youth in the manner they deemed best calculated to promote their temporal and eternal welfare—he thought it better that the truth should be neither concealed nor evaded; and he, for one, declared his belief, notwithstanding all the logic and eloquence of the Attorney General in attempting to prove the contrary, that the separate system was really in operation in nearly every successful school under the Board, excepting of course the model schools, which were not successful; and he made this avowal in order that the House might see the utter uselessness of expecting that any other system would succeed, and assist to compel the Government to do that which they must do sooner or later—sanction the denominational system in all its integrity, and thus put an end to subterfuge and dissension. Theoretically, National Education in Ireland was on the mixed system, but practically it was denominational, and if it were not so the Commissioners would have very slender returns to show as to the number of their pupils. Attending the schools were upwards of three hundred thousand Roman Catholics, sixty-four thousand Presbyterians, and about thirty-nine thousand Protestants. Now, he dared to assert that if the National system was carried out in its full integrity as originally established by Lord Stanley, there would not be one quarter of any of these religious denominations attending the schools. ["No, no!"] Well, he would give them the best proof of it, but would first define the main principle which Lord Stanley laid down as the one which was to guide the administration of the system, and that was, that the religious element should be entirely eliminated from the instruction and conduct of the schools, and that a secular instruction, bare of religion, was to be rigorously pursued. Now, could the Attorney General for Ireland honestly say that such a system was everywhere carried out in its integrity? He was quite sure the right hon. Gentleman could not. Wherever there was a Catholic patron of a school, and they were usually the Catholic clergy, they, of course, appointed the most zealous Roman Catholics they could get, provided they were otherwise competent; and, no doubt, the Protestant clergymen or landlords provided staunch Protestant masters in their schools. Now, amongst the other duties imposed by the patrons on the teachers they appointed was to give their pupils religious instruction at the times allowed, and very faithfully they performed that task. He had often visited schools, and found the masters and mistresses explaining the sacred Scriptures, teaching catechism, or engaged in prayers with the children, and a very edifying and gratifying sight it was. Now, he asked hon. Gentlemen, was it rational to suppose that the teachers who thus gave religious instruction at one period of the day could so completely dissever themselves at another from their religious bias and feelings as not to tincture their secular instruction with it more or less? He believed such to be a moral impossibility; and the sooner the fruitless attempt at restraining them from obeying their natural and legitimate impulse to give a religious colour to their teachings the better. Some of the Commissioners had tried their hands at writing books of instruction for the pupils which should not trench on their religious belief or prejudices. He would not deny but that they had intended to discharge their task honestly; but the strong and just complaints which the Catholic bishops and clergy made against many of these books, proved it was impossible for any man having a religious belief to write on even the most ordinary topics in a strictly neutral spirit. When such was the fact, would it not be infinitely better not to attempt to place a curb on the introduction into the educational system, without which it was necessarily poor and imperfect; and instead of the system of repression, evasion, subterfuge, and angry recrimination which was perpetually going on, would it not be infinitely better for the sake of peace, as well as the interests of the pupils, to leave to each denomination their own people in conformity with their religious views, the Government reserving to itself sufficient control to insure secular instruction being properly carried out? He could bring forward no better proof of the fact of the denominational system being practically in existence than the failure to carry out the mixed system in its full integrity in the model schools. There were, he believed, upwards of twenty of these schools in operation. It would be tedious to give an account of each of these schools; but he would adopt the one he was best acquainted with, that at the city he represented—Waterford — which would afford a very good illustration of the entire. Nevertheless, the fact was that this school had failed, because it was not denominational, and was carried out on the mixed principle, and no doubt consistently with that, had been honestly and impartially conducted. There were many favourable circumstances about the school calculated to make it a success. Excellent masters and mistresses had been appointed; there was every appliance for instruction, which was of the best kind for the class for whom it was intended; and no attempt, so far as he had heard, had ever been made at proselytism. But the greater portion of the Catholic and Protestant clergy were opposed to it, not being allowed to have any voice in its management. The Roman Catholic Bishop, a most learned and zealous prelate, discountenanced it, as he felt he could not give his approval to an institution in which he was precluded from exercising any control over the appointment of the teachers, the selection of the books, and the course of instruction; and he therefore forbade his flock from sending their children, which behest was almost universally obeyed. The right rev. Dr. Daly, the Protestant Bishop of Cashel, equally earnest in his own way, discountenanced the school because the Scriptures were not allowed to be read there. So that, owing to the opposition coming from honest and zealous men, (though entertaining very opposite views on religion,) this school, in point of obtaining the number of pupils contemplated, had undoubtedly failed. Elsewhere the Catholic prelates had discountenanced the model schools in their dioceses, and with the same result as at Waterford; and latterly, he believed, they directed their clergy not to appoint masters to the schools in their parishes who had been trained in them. The Catholic bishops unquestionably had it in their power to prevent the mixed system being extended to those over whom they had ecclesiastical control, and it was equally manifest that they were resolved to exercise that power, believing, as they did, that they were bound to do so. And the Protestant clergy, on the other hand, were equally determined, unless the Protestant version of the Scriptures were read in the schools, to discountenance them. Each side, if they believed themselves right, ought to act on their convictions. For his own part, he sided with those who were for having religion as far as was practicable and judicious interwoven with nearly every kind of instruction. The bishops and clergy of the Catholic Church in Ireland had taken their stand on the question of the denominational system against the mixed system, and would undoubtedly have their flocks with them—for one, he certainly would take the side of the hierarchy of his Church in a matter which they were best entitled and qualified to pronounce. The great majority of the Protestants and Presbyterians also wished to educate their co-religionists their own way. It was, therefore, difficult to understand why the Government resisted what was manifestly the desire of the great majority of the Irish people of every denomination. When separate grants were not only given in England, but that subsidy would not be given to a mixed school, and that it was absolutely necessary for a school to belong exclusively to some known religious denomination before it could obtain assistance from the State, it was incomprehensible why the very opposite practice should be pursued in Ireland, where religious feeling on the part of Catholics was much stronger, and where, unhappily, no religious animosities were much more bitter. It would probably be urged, that if the denominational system was sanctioned by law that many poor children would be left without education, as in many districts of the North of Ireland the population were almost wholly Presbyterian, and in the county Derry Protestants, and that there would not be numbers enough for exclusively Catholic schools, so that Catholic children should go to the Protestant or Presbyterian denominational schools, or remain uneducated; whilst, on the other hand, Protestants would be subject to the same inconvenience in the southern and western provinces, where they were thinly scattered about. It must be freely admitted that such inconveniences would occur, and that some Catholic and Protestant children would be placed at a disadvantage; but the numbers who would thus suffer would be very few indeed in comparison to the thousands upon thousands who would be benefited by having a sound religious education combined with the secular one; and in this, as in all other cases, it was the advantage of the vast majority which should be looked to. Besides, he thought arrangements might be made by which Protestant or Catholic children might receive secular instruction from the master or monitor where they were too few to have a distinct school of their own. In conclusion, he repeated his belief that not only had the fundamental principles on which the National system was founded been violated in favour of Catholics, Protestants, and Presbyterians, but that if it had not been done, the Commissioners might shut up their schools. In order to keep up the number on their rolls, they had to make concessions to all parties in violation of the principles laid down by Lord Stanley. Wherever that principle was sought to be maintained the schools had failed. When, therefore, everyone knows that monastic and convent schools, and also those having Catholic and Protestant patrons in connection with the Board, were virtually denominational, why, in the name of candour and common sense, not let them become to all intents and purposes so? For all parties concerned it would be the best course. As things stood now, the Board of Education, patrons of schools, and the officers connected with them, were all in a false position. The whole affair bore a sort of half fish half flesh character, that was not pleasant; and certainly the angry debates which it provoked in that House were neither agreeable nor creditable, and no good purpose could be served by recriminations and charges and counter charges as to concessions made to convents or Presbyterian schools. No one knew better than the Chief Secretary for Ireland that the fundamental rules of the Board had been violated, or he would not have written the following very remarkable letter:—

"Dublin Castle, 30th Jan. 1864.

"Sir,—The attention of the Irish Government has been drawn to certain contemplated changes in the fundamental rules of the system of National Education in Ireland, the effects of which will be seriously to imperil the principle upon which the system is based; and I am to remind you, as Resident Commissioner, that the Board of Commissioners, as incorporated by Royal Charter, has no power to change any fundamental rule without the express permission of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant.

"I am, &c.

(Signed) "Robert Peel.

"Right Hon. Alex. Macdonnell, &c. &c. &c."

Now to withdraw from the statement which, as a Minister of the Crown, he could not have made without reflection, he hoped, for his consistency sake, he would not attempt to do, but would follow it up by voting in the same division with him on the Amendment which he had seconded. He hoped all parties who felt with him (Mr. Blake) in this matter would continue to press on Government the necessity of conceding to the wishes of the great bulk of the Irish people in the matter, and allow every denomination to educate their youth in the manner which would make good Christians, at the same time that they acquired scholastic knowledge under a right system. Both ought to go hand in hand together. He earnestly trusted, as one anxious for the advancement of his country and willing to concede to every other creed what he claimed for his own, that whether under this or another Ministry, a system of education for the poorer classes in Ireland would obtain the sanction of Parliament, more acceptable to the wishes of the people and more suited to the peculiar circumstances and wants of the country.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out the words "so far as regards their operation on the aid afforded to Convent and Monastic Schools." —(*Mr. Hennessy.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR ROBERT PEEL: After the direct appeal that has been made to me, it is necessary that I should address a few remarks to the House, and I think before I conclude I shall be able to convince the two hon. Gentlemen who have last addressed us, that the letter which has been so frequently referred to was not altogether unjustifiable. Before going to that particular subject, I am anxious to allude to one or two remarks which fell from the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Hennessy). I have often heard him make good speeches in this House, but I do not think his speech on this occasion was worthy of him. The National system during its existence has had many difficulties to encounter and many fiery trials to go through. It has had antagonists from all quarters; but I rejoice to think that it still works for good, when I know that there are more than 6,000 schools in operation, with an average number of children on the rolls for the year of more than half a million. Therefore, I think that no one will be inclined to give his assent to the sentiment of the hon. and learned Gentleman, when he almost rejoiced that the National system was, as he said, upon its last legs. That is not the belief I entertain. It is true that since 1831, when the Whigs of that day to their immortal credit established the system which now prevails—no doubt since then, many changes have been made in the rules and regulations of this National institution, but deliberately in every instance with the approval of the Government of the day. But, referring immediately to the question before us, I must, in the first instance, notice the remarkable speech of my right hon. Colleague the Attorney General for Ireland. But if I am desirous of supplementing the remarks which he then made, it is not for the purpose of being hypocritical—as the hon. Gentleman said I would not be—in regard to the opinions I entertain, but to show that my right hon. Friend and myself hold identically the same views on this subject. The principal reason then why I wish to address the House is first of all to show that the letter which I, as Chief Secretary for Ireland, sent to the Resident Commissioner, does not imply that there is that very great difference of opinion which some have inferred, and in the next place to express again in this House, as I have done on former occasions when the system has been here attacked, my firm and abiding approval of the National system as established in Ireland, and which I now do after three years of close observation and experience of its working. Therefore, whatever minor, whatever partial differences of opinion may exist, or may be supposed by some to exist, as regards the rules and regulations of that great National institution, for my own part, speaking candidly and honestly, I say that if I have called in question anything connected with that institution, it has been solely from a desire to see it maintained in its integrity, and on the basis which its founders laid for the social regeneration of the country. I think the hon. Member for Roscommon (the O'Conor Don) in his able speech rather misinterpreted, in common with some others, what fell from the hon. and learned Member for Belfast, thinking that the hon. and learned Member had attacked both the Commissioners as also the whole system of the convent schools. I listened attentively to the hon. and learned Member for Belfast's speech, and I did not understand him to cast any imputations upon the Commissioners. He spoke of them with praise, and, if I caught his meaning correctly, he did not impugn the motives which influenced them in the conduct they had pursued. Again, as regards the convent schools, he did not, as far as I can recollect, attack the convent schools which are prepared to abide by the rules; and therefore the hon. Member for Roscommon went too far in saying that he did.

THE O'CONOR DON: I never meant to imply that the hon. and learned Member for Belfast meant to attack convent schools, except so far as Mr. Sheridan's Report was concerned. I, however, hold that his Resolution in effect attacks all convent schools.

SIR ROBERT PEEL: The hon. and

learned Gentleman said that the fundamental alterations in the rules which were contemplated would strike at the root of the system and tend to raise a serious antagonism to it. The hon. and learned Member is not the only person in Ireland who has expressed the same opinion. First of all a very remarkable article in a London paper, the *Daily News*, attracted my attention. The writer, evidently a very able man, felt that the contemplated changes would affect the fundamental principle of the system. I do not, of course, wish to quote the whole article, but its aim was to show that encroachments are being made in the National system in favour of schools which offer gratuitous education to the poor, but which, as schools of a particular character, ought not to receive exclusive aid, because children of only one denomination attend them. That article was copied into a great many of the Irish papers, and previous to its appearance there had been strong protests against the contemplated changes from various denominations in Ireland, and from parties entitled to the greatest consideration. The hon. Gentleman has sneered at the Presbyterian body, a body which, at all events, has been conspicuous for moderation and for its loyalty, and which has certainly been instrumental in bringing about an improved state of things generally in the North of Ireland. It was therefore, I think, hardly worthy of the hon. Gentleman, whatever may be his own religious opinions, to sneer at and cast a slur upon that body. But while these regulations were in course of consideration, I, as Chief Secretary, received communications from certain of the members of the Board who dissented. I have in my hand a letter from one of those Commissioners —I mention this as a justification of the step I took as Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant in drawing the attention of the Resident Commissioner to what I believed was a source of dissent in the counsels of the National Board. The Bishop of Derry, one of the members of that Board, in a communication which I received from him, I may almost say officially, wrote—

> "I deprecate the introduction of rules eminently calculated to sow the seeds of discord, and to subvert one of the noblest institutions of our land."

I received the protests of four distinguished men, including Dr. Henry and the other gentlemen mentioned by the hon. and learned Member for Belfast, and, under the circumstances, I think I was bound, without expressing any opinion of my own, to direct the attention of the Resident Commissioner to the opinions of important individuals and bodies in Ireland. I am quite satisfied the course I adopted had the approval of my right hon. Colleague in the Irish Government, and certainly it was not disapproved by the Lord Lieutenant. Well, that letter was written on that account, and on that account only. There is no hypocrisy in it, no variance of opinion with others; it was written because I felt that important bodies, the Presbyterians and others, were objecting to the contemplated changes, as being, in their view, fundamental alterations of the system. The Presbytery of Derry passed a resolution to that effect, and a similar resolution came from the Presbytery of Belfast. The latter body also petitioned Parliament on the subject, distinctly alleging that they viewed with alarm the proposed change in the rules and regulations, as calculated to place the training of the future teachers of the Irish people in the hands of the religious orders of the Church of Rome. At a meeting of the Ulster National Education Association, the Bishop of Down and Connor also said he looked on the new rules as tending to effect a fundamental change in the system. In the face of all that, it was difficult for me to follow any other course than I did; and I think every impartial man in this House will see that I expressed no dissent from the opinions of my right hon. Colleague in writing that letter, but that as Chief Secretary I felt it my duty to lay before the Resident Commissioner the views entertained by the authorities I have mentioned.

A great deal has been said about the administration of the Board, and the hon. Member seemed to imply that it has been the root of much mischief in Ireland. When first established it was intended to take the place of the Kildare Place Society, which, no doubt, did an immense amount of good, and had 1,100 schools connected with it when it ceased to receive grants. But that society would not adopt the principle of combined secular education with religious instruction, and then the celebrated letter of Mr. Stanley appeared, which inaugurated a system that has, I must say, conferred great and substantial blessings upon Ireland. During the first twelve years of its existence that system received the sanction, not only of five successive Cabinets, but passed through the ordeal of three Select Committees of Parliament, one in 1835, and two in 1837. In the constitution of the Board, Mr. Stanley and the Government of that day endeavoured to embrace men of different denominations, men of high personal character and exalted station in the Church, but professing different religious principles. Dr. Whately, the late Archbishop of Dublin, acted upon it in perfect harmony with Dr. Murray, a distinguished Roman Catholic prelate. But it is wrong to imply with regard to the constitution of this Board that it cannot be changed. It has been changed. First of all it consisted of seven, then ten, then fifteen, and ultimately it was in 1860 increased to twenty members. But that increase to twenty did not, I admit, satisfy every one. The *Cork Examiner*, which ought to understand the feelings of the Roman Catholics, and represents the views of the Member for Dungarvan, candidly admits that it is not satisfied with a Board of twenty members, adding, however, that National schools are only tolerated because, under Roman Catholic patrons, the principles of the system are not carried out.

> "In three provinces" says that journal, "it is very well known the system of mixed education does not exist; in nearly all the schools the Roman Catholic clergy have almost unlimited discretion as regards religious instruction; were it otherwise, the National system would be intolerable; it lives, in fact, upon the false pretence of being what it is not."

And Dr. Cullen distinctly stated last year that he would not be satisfied unless there were seventeen Roman Catholics and only three Protestants—five to one — on the Board. That shows there is still a great difference of opinion on the subject. Recently it has heen said that a Board of three or five paid Commissioners would be better. That is not a new idea. I was myself very much impressed with the advantages of a paid Commission. When the Earl of Derby appointed the Board, he admitted the difficulty of calling upon its members to give their full attention to the business, and therefore he appointed one paid Commissioner, the Rev. J. Carlisle. Even Archbishop Whately, when a member of the Board, was in favour of that system. So was Mr. Cross, the secretary of the Board. Lord Eglinton also before a Committee of the Lords in 1854 advocated the payment of four paid Commissioners, who should be laymen and responsible to the Lord Lieutenant. All this shows that the idea of changing the constitution of the Board is not a novel one, and that those who advocate it do not imply blame on those distinguished persons who constitute it.

I have already remarked that the Board has had to encounter a great deal of opposition. Almost all the Protestant bishops in times gone by have attacked the system. Petitions were also presented against it signed by both clergy and laity; the Presbyterian body also, the Synod of Ulster, decidedly opposed the National system. In spite of all that, the system has worked well. The difficulties against which it has had to contend have been of no ordinary character, and I am sorry to think that even now, after the acknowledged benefits it has conferred, it is open to question. The principal charge against it now arises from the money that is given to these conventual establishments — that by these additional grants you are interfering with the model school system. No doubt you are. It must be admitted, however, the convent schools have, for the most part, done their work well. Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, members of the Established Church, all have been appointed to examine into the constitution of these schools, and I am bound to say frankly and fairly that the great majority of the Reports which will be laid on the table on Monday or Tuesday next, in accordance with the Motion of the hon. Member for Limerick, are most favourable to these convent schools. But then I say they are of a denominational character, and I should be sorry to see a strictly denominational policy pursued as regards these grants. I think if that course were adopted it would strike at the very root of the system. No doubt when the National system was introduced, in 1831, the Government of the day had to consider whether convent and monastic schools should be associated with the Board; and although they were unfavourably reported on in 1832 and 1833, it was decided that but for that they should be established in union with the Board. But certain exceptions were made. What I fear is that the grants now about to be given may affect the model school system, which is certainly wrapped up in the National system. From the 4th and 7th Reports you can see what advantages were expected to attend the working of model schools. Wherever there is a model school there you find the schools in immediate contiguity conducted on a very excellent system. Now, if you destroy the model schools you will give immense extension to the conventual system. I think there is a limit here beyond which you ought not to go. When the Board was established there were 42 convent and monk schools in connection with it. Their numbers have very considerably and rapidly increased of late. I believe there are as many as 145 attached to the Board at present. Last year the number was 133; the year before, 128. Now, although each convent establishment can only have one school in connection with this Board, there is, from the figures I have just given, a very considerable extension to the conventual system in connection with the Board which I think ought to be checked. I do not think it good for the country that an extension of that kind should take place, particularly if you affect the model schools. Now, a model school is for the purpose of preparing teachers and giving an example to the surrounding country of what a good teacher should be. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Edinburgh observed that these model schools have been the subject of very serious attack on the part of the Roman Catholic Church. We must all regret that in Clonmel, Galway, and Limerick, in consequence of attacks on these establishments, Roman Catholic children have left the schools. That cannot be for the general good of the system, and I do hope, the times of strong religious animosity having passed away, these attacks on the National system will cease. We have heard to-night what takes place in Edinburgh, where there are schools in which Roman Catholic and Protestant children can meet together and in harmony learn the simple Scripture lessons they are taught, and why should not this be the case also in Ireland?

It is of the greatest possible importance that teachers should be educated on some fixed system—that they should have practical elementary instruction. Now if these convent schools send out a great number of pupil-teachers to become teachers of National schools, what I fear is that they may affect the teaching of the National schools. No doubt the instruction given by the nuns is of the kindest and most considerate description; the affection with which they treat the members of their community is fully acknowledged; but if you throw too much the education of teachers of the National schools into the hands of the conventual schools you will lower the standard of their teaching, and ultimately inflict a blow on the National system. What I hope to see carried out is a system of education such as exists in Bavaria and in Prussia, where the children of different denominations meet together, the Roman Catholic and Protestant ecclesiastics act in harmony, and no sectarian feelings are evolved. I speak in this way because I am a firm friend of united secular education. It has worked immense good in Ireland, and we ought, therefore, to be careful how we listen to attacks against the Board which has carried into execution the designs of the framers of so great a work. You must recollect that the Commissioners have a very difficult task to perform. Some persons say that they are ambitious, prone to make changes, and impatient of control and Government interference. I do not believe that. I am one of those who think that the Commissioners are not likely to make changes which will prejudicially affect the working of the system; and I think that it is but fair that the voices of those persons who approve the system should be raised in this House in praise of the ability and character of the members of the Board. We ought to recollect that they render gratuitous service. There is only one paid Commissioner, Mr. Macdonnell, who has been connected with the Board, I think, since 1837. My right hon. Friend the Attorney General spoke of that gentleman as a colleague at the Board and a personal friend. I have had three years' experience of this system in Ireland, and I wish to speak of him, as a public servant, in the sincerity of my mind and without any varnish whatever. Mr. Macdonnell, in managing this system, has an immense task to perform. He has the direct superintendence of more than 6,000 schools, which have over half a million of children on the rolls. He must always be at his office; he must never be absent from his duty, and he is almost overwhelmed by the responsibility which weighs upon him in the discharge of his duty. [An hon. MEMBER: Not a bit of it.] The hon. Gentleman says "Not a bit of it," but I venture to say that no one who knows that gentleman, and knows the zeal and spirit with which he discharges his duties, will deny that he is entitled to the gratitude of the country for what he has done. Then do not let us fall into any error as to the benefits and blessings which this system has produced in Ireland. I do not know that any higher eulogy can be pronounced upon the men who founded it than that they have by means of these 6,000 schools sown broadcast in Ireland opportunities of education which were before denied to the people, opportunities of obtaining instruction which they certainly had not before, and opportunities of sharpening that natural quickness of intellect which is so remarkable and which is so conspicuously displayed under the influence of this system. If that is what the National system has done in Ireland, I hope that the House will not agree to the Motion of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Belfast, because I believe that convent schools are a part of that system. They have been connected with it since the year 1835, and now contain 20,000 children. [Mr. MAGUIRE: 40,000.] 40,000! That makes the case stronger. There are then 40,000 children in daily attendance in those schools, and I think that it would be a very serious thing if we were to attempt to separate them from the National system. [Sir HUGH CAIRNS: I do not want to do it.] The hon. Gentleman says that he does not want to do it, but he says that the aid afforded to convent schools is at variance with the principles of the National system.

> "The rules sanctioned by the Commissioners of National Education, so far as regards the operation of the aid afforded to convent or monastic schools, are at variance with the principles of the Board of National Education."

That I deny, and I believe that the House will agree with me. I hope that the House will not adopt either the Motion or the Amendment; because I am sure that this is an insidious attack upon the National system; and if you adopt this Resolution, and approve a censure upon a charge involving no sacrifice of principle, Parliament will be lending itself to an attack upon the Commissioners which will seriously affect a system which, so far from being, as the hon. Member for the King's County asserted, contrary to, is working in entire harmony with the wants, the wishes, and the feelings of the great bulk of the people of Ireland.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, that he was sorry that an English Member interposing in an Irish debate should be thought out of place. ["No, no!"] He should not detain the House long, but he thought it right to reply at once to the speech of the right hon. Baronet, the conclusion of which was so entirely inconsistent with its commencement. The right hon. Baronet had told the House that the convent schools were essentially denominational, and he ended by saying that they contained 40,000 children, and therefore fell within the purview of the National system and ought to be kept within it. There were other denominational schools which had more than 40,000 children in them. Was the right hon. Baronet prepared to admit them too? [Sir ROBERT PEEL: The convent schools were recognized so far back as 1835.] No one had in that debate found fault either with the convent schools or with the ladies who managed them so admirably. The point was, these ladies having entered upon a religious life, and being surrounded by emblems of denominational character, the children in these schools were as much brought up under a denominational system as if the schools were maintained specially as denominational schools. That had been recognized and condoned by Parliament, because it had gone on voting grants for education since the existence of these schools was brought to its knowledge in 1854. But the Commissioners were now introducing something which was entirely new, and which was giving rise to great dissatisfaction. Not only were the children to be educated in these convent schools, but teachers also, who were to go out and teach children in other schools; and the right hon. Baronet had admitted that the effect of that would be to destroy the district model schools, which were an essential feature of the system, and in which alone united education was carried out to any extent. The right hon. Gentleman said he wrote his letter before he knew what were the rules which the Commissioners proposed; and he received from the Commissioners a reply which was most insulting to him, which pooh-poohed him as a person who had no influence or power to affect anything which they did. They referred him, as a servant might be referred to his master, to the Lord Lieutenant, in terms which he should have thought might have kindled some little indignation in his mind. [Sir ROBERT PEEL: Will you read them?] He was speaking of the tone of the letter, but as the right hon. Baronet wished him to read the Correspondence he would do so. In the letter which the right hon. Baronet wrote before he knew what the rules were, he said—

> "The attention of the Irish Government has been drawn to certain contemplated changes in the fundamental rules of the system of National

Education in Ireland, the effects of which will be"—[not "I am told"]—"will be seriously to imperil the principle upon which the system is based."

That was what the right hon. Gentleman wrote to the Commissioners, and now he told the House that when he wrote it he did not know what the rules were. [Sir Robert Peel: I entirely deny that assertion.] He did not wish to imitate irregularities, but he should like to ask the right hon. Baronet whether he had seen the rules when he wrote his letter?

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, that he had not seen the written rules, but he had received verbal information from the Bishop of Derry, Dr. Henry, and other Commissioners as to the changes which were contemplated.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: Four Commissioners told the right hon. Gentleman they had done so or were about to do so—[Sir Hugh Cairns: Had done, three months before]—and informed the right hon. Gentleman against what points these protests were levelled. The right hon. Gentleman thereupon wrote to the resident Commissioners, and from the Commissioners received a reply denying that a change in any fundamental principle of the system would be affected by the new rule, should it be carried into operation, or could have been contemplated by the Commissioners when they framed the proposed regulation. Until that evening it had always been supposed that the right hon. Gentleman objected, in the spirit of his letter, to the mode in which the rules had been dealt with; but now he found fault with the hon. Member for the King's County for having, as he said, blamed the Commissioners. Why, who began the blame? The right hon. Gentleman himself. Of the Commissioners some had protested against the acts of their colleagues; the Bishop of Derry—according to the right hon. Gentleman, one of the oldest friends of the system—declared that the fundamental rules had been altered. The right hon. Gentleman himself showed that the schools had been changed practically into denominational schools, and therefore it was idle to say that the system had not been departed from. It was the inevitable tendency of systems of education to fall into the hands of persons zealous as to religious matters. Except in the model schools they had always found great difficulty in carrying out the joint system. From the beginning there had been comparatively few schools under joint management. Rules had been made from time to time which were intended to check denominational education, but there had been a steady advance in that direction. After all the system of denominational education was that which had been the most successful. When they came to the question of educating the teachers they found themselves involved in something more material than the mere education of the children. As had been said by a great authority on this question of mixed education in Ireland—

> "One of these religious persons in giving instruction will not only give it after secular education has been supplied, but will give it in conjunction with literary instruction."

It seemed to him a most remarkable thing that the Chief Secretary for Ireland should have sat down without intimating in any way the remedies which ought to be applied to cases that he admitted. Taking a great interest in the subject of education both in England and Ireland, he had read nearly all the Parliamentary papers issued on the subject, and thought it abundantly clear that the system originally established by Mr. Stanley had been departed from in many particulars. An atmosphere existed in the convent schools which must make them essentially places of religious instruction, and the same observation applied to Presbyterian schools. For the Presbyterian clergy in their evidence given before the Committee of 1854, admitted that when they gave religious instruction, although children might absent themselves if they thought proper, they would never desire them to leave, and everyone knew that, except acting under express direction, children in such matters were altogether helpless. The question for the House to determine was, whether the system of combined secular and separate religious education had been carried out as originally intended; had children of all denominations been brought together—in short, had the system succeeded or failed? The right hon. Gentleman held that it had succeeded, but seemed to stand nearly alone in that opinion. In fact, it was natural that persons, where they got a pretty good school, conducted according to their own principles, should prefer sending their children there than to a mixed school. In one small place, Castlecomer, he had heard of as many as eight schools being founded to accommodate the peculiar views of the parents, when one would have sufficed to do the work. In Ireland thirty scholars seemed to be considered sufficient to found a school, whereas in England small rural schools of less than one hundred were discouraged, it being one of the recommendations of the Committee of Council that small schools should as much as possible be combined with a view to getting better teaching. He had not spoken of any denomination with disrespect; his wish was that all should have fair play, and that education of the people should be made the paramount object, and not the advancement of any single denomination. But if it turned out that the working of the system was unsatisfactory, if nominally united it was practically a denominational system, then he thought that inquiry should take place, not, perhaps, by a Parliamentary Committee, but by an independent Commission. It might then be seen how much of the results complained of were attributable to the constitution of the Board, and whether twenty men living in different parts of Ireland, who could not be brought together with certainty at any one time, but some who might sit one day to reverse the decisions of their colleagues the day before, was not a system tending to throw too much power into the hands of a resident Commissioner. Of that gentleman he should speak with the highest possible respect; but he thought the charge devolving upon him was too great for a single mind, weighed down as he was in addition by the distracted counsels of a dissentient Board. The rule now introduced was essentially new, though it appeared from official documents that the payments it was intended to sanction had been made in past years without the sanction of any rule. Wherever a convent school was established, there, according to Mr. Sheridan's Reports, a secular school was put down; and under all the circumstances it appeared to him that inquiry must take place before the system could be put upon a basis satisfactory to Ireland, intelligible to that House, and worthy of the money voted by Parliament.

Mr. MAGUIRE said, that as a Roman Catholic Member he might be supposed to know something of the class of schools that had been attacked by the Motion of the hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir Hugh Cairns). He would do that hon. and learned Gentleman the justice to say that he dealt with every question in the spirit of a gentleman, with great calmness, courtesy, power of logic, and arrangement of his subject. But the hon. and learned Member for Belfast was in that instance the representative and organ of a body which had been the most bitter assailants of the National system, so long as that system was carried out on terms that were acceptable to the Roman Catholic people of Ireland. ["Oh!"] If he wanted to know the object of the Resolution he had only to listen to the speech of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin. He regretted that the right hon. Gentleman had been carried away by his excitement to use expressions that were not creditable either to his good sense or his political tact. He did not say it to the disparagement of the National Board, which had been of late very much improved, but he would assert that practically the mixed system in Ireland was a mockery and a sham, and the House must come to the same conclusion. To show that he did not indulge in mere claptrap, he would refer to the latest Report of the Commissioners. That Report, which came up to January 1, 1864, showed that the so-called mixed system never had, and had not now, any practical operation in Ireland. He was in favour of the existing machinery—of the central authority—of the assistance of the State in aid of local efforts—and of a system of inspection which would justify the State in giving that assistance; but he believed that the mixed system had practically failed. The opposition manifested between the Chief Secretary and the Attorney General for Ireland and the divisions in the Board showed that the machine was not working well, and that if Parliament did not change the machinery it must change the essential spirit of the system. He would prove his point by a few figures. Leaving out Ulster, he would take the three provinces of Leinster, Munster, and Connaught. In the last quarter of 1863 there were, within a fraction, 400,000 children on the rolls of the National schools in those three provinces. In county Clare there were 20,043 on the rolls, but only 144 Protestants and 7 Presbyterians. The rest, 19,892, were Roman Catholics. In the county of Kerry there were 24,367 on the rolls, and only 337 Protestants and 5 Presbyterians. In Carlow there were 6,006 on the rolls, of whom 86 were Protestants, and only one a Presbyterian. In Kilkenny there were 15,984 on the rolls, and only 293 Protestants and 8 Presbyterians. The total number on the rolls in those three provinces was 397,000. In the entire province of Munster there were only 2,827 Protestants on the rolls, and 262 Presbyterians. In Leinster there were 4,448 Protestants and 576 Presbyterians. In Connaught there were 3,164 Protestants and 485 Presbyterians. The total number of Protestants on the rolls in those three provinces was 10,639; of Presbyterians 1,323. After that statement would any one tell him that the mixed system was not a sham. He believed the time was coming when the advocates of the denominational system in Ireland would triumph. That system existed in England, and no Minister of the Crown would change it. The scheme of Lord Stanley was conceived in the most admirable spirit, and for years faith was kept with the Catholics of Ireland. But why were the Catholic prelates and people alarmed ? In consequence of the increasing attacks that were being made, some of them by insidious foes, others by open and aggressive enemies. The hon. Member for Roscommon had admitted that many of the safeguards of Lord Stanley's system had been broken down, to the injury of the Irish Catholics. He maintained that it was the duty of the Commissioners to do as they had done, and that it befitted the wisdom of the House to sustain them in what they had done. He had been astonished to hear the right hon. Gentleman the representative of the University charge the Commissioners with having lent themselves to further the machinations, ends, and objects of the monastic institutions. The right hon. Gentleman became animated by a most extraordinary frenzy when he spoke of nuns, monks, friars, and Jesuits. His hon. Friend (Mr. Hennessy) made a remarkable statement, on the best authority as he conceived. It appeared in a report of a meeting held in Dublin a few days ago, when the Rev. Mr. Kirby, one of the fathers, made a statement which had been answered and refuted by the Roman Catholic Dean of Cork. The story was that when the Inspector of the Board visited the Presentation Convent at Cork the children received instructions not to make the sign of the cross. When the hour struck, however, the instinct of the children was too strong to be repressed, and they made the sacred sign, the nun being in a state of trepidation, and afraid that the school would lose the grant. The answer of the Dean of Cork was, that there was but one Presentation Convent in Cork, of which he was the ecclesiastical superior, and he denied in the most explicit manner the statement that the Catholic children had at any time been directed not to make the sign of the cross, or that the nuns made use of any such words as had been attributed to them; nor did he believe that there were any nuns in Ireland capable of conduct which would have been a combination of meanness, deception, and dishonesty, and he regretted that Father Kirby should have been deceived by such a falsehood. Now, the attack which had been made on the convent schools—for everybody in Ireland believed that it was an attack—had been justified by quotations from the report of Mr. Sheridan. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Whiteside) no doubt read the *Mail*, and, if so, he might have seen a letter from Mr. Sheridan explaining his report, and denying the inferences which were sought to be drawn from it. He had the letter of Mr. Sheridan in his hand, it was dated the 2nd of May, 1864, and in it Mr. Sheridan said, that so far from being dissatisfied with the extension of the convent schools he viewed it with the greatest satisfaction, and he hoped to live to see the day when such schools would be found among the mass of every Catholic population in Ireland, because he knew that it was only by means of those schools that the blessings of a sound literary and religious education could be given to those whom the National schools could never reach — namely, the homeless, outcast children who were sought out by the good men and women who conducted those schools. That was the deliberately recorded opinion of one of the head Inspectors of the Government, vindicating his Report from the interpretation sought to be put upon it by hon. Gentlemen. It was true that Mr. Sheridan had said that there was not sufficient teaching power in the convent schools. But that was in 1860, and since then there had been a great change, and the monitorial system, which had risen and expanded against the will of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House, had given that teaching power, so that the fault found by Mr. Sheridan in 1860 no longer existed. There were convent schools in his own city which educated from 3,000 to 4,000 children, and which were admitted by the Protestants of Cork to be a blessing to the community, for this reason, that they gave a good literary as well as sound moral education. They taught cleanliness, industry, honesty; nor was the solicitude of the nuns confined to the school, but it followed the scholars into the world, watching over, directing, and advising them. At Kinsale there was a school of 800 girls, at the head of which was Mrs. Bridgman, who had followed Miss Nightingale to the Crimea, and with her band of sisters had been among the most successful of the nurses of our soldiers. That school had cost £2,200 in its erection; it was large, spacious, and commodious as any of the model schools which had been built at such vast expense to the State. In Middleton there was a school which contained 800 children, and which cost £1,300 or £1,400 in building. Some of the best teachers came out of those schools, and they were even the means of supporting families by the industry which they taught the pupils. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University had laid great stress on an unhappy phrase which had been used by Mr. Sheridan, who happened to say that the nuns were intolerant; but Mr. Sheridan's explanation was that he ought not to have used that word, because it was objectionable in itself and was liable to misinterpretation. He went on to say that he used the word intolerance, as was obvious in the context, simply to imply impatience of competition, and that he never meant it to signify religious intolerance, apologizing at the same time for employing a term capable of so offensive an interpretation. After that explanation, the charge of intolerance would, he hoped, never again be brought against the nuns of Ireland. It appeared, he might add, from what had been stated by the Commissioners, that so far from any favour having been extended to the convent schools, the very contrary was the fact. So far as pupil-teachers were concerned, any large and efficient school might have them as well as those which were attached to a convent, while the nuns, the Commissioners said, now received only one-third of the average sum paid to teachers of all classes. After an authoritative statement of that kind there ought, he thought, to be no alarm on the part of the Presbyterians of Ireland, whose memorial for an increase of the Regium Donum he had not long since signed on the principle of religious freedom. The Roman Catholics, he might add, asked for no assistance from the State for their Church or their clergy, and when men came from Ireland and sought for aid in the way in which the Presbyterians had done from Irish Roman Catholic Members, it was, he thought, scarcely right of them to urge two distinguished Members of that House to come forward to make an attack on institutions which were dear to the Roman Catholic people of that country. Seeing, he would further observe, the difficulties which existed in reference to the question of education in Ireland, the time must, in his opinion, come when the denominational system must be substituted for the mixed. The Archbishop of Canterbury was in favour of the denominational system, and Archbishop Cullen did not go one bit further in Ireland than the right rev. Prelate did in England. They were, he contended, both right, and Earl Russell was right in the view which he took on the subject. The Roman Catholic Church had made great efforts and sacrifices in the cause of education. All she asked was fair play and equal justice, and if that could not exist under a mixed system, it must be sought under that which solved all difficulties—the denominational system.

MR. BUTT said, he thought it unfortunate that they had been carried away into a general discussion of education in Ireland. He must confess that there never had been so much agitation raised about so small a change. In the month of November last the Commissioners republished their rules, and in one respect did they make a material alteration, which the hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir Hugh Cairns) invited them to declare was at variance with the principles of National Education, and thus practically asked the House to pass a Vote of Censure on the Commissioners. Now, in 1831, immediately on the establishment of the system, the question arose whether the convent schools should receive aid; and it was found that the Kildare Place Society, which the system was intended to supersede, did give a large number of these schools assistance. The lending of support to them, therefore, was no new thing, nor could he understand how any person anxious to bring education and civilization to the lower classes in Ireland, could deliberately reject the services of those ladies who were so well calculated to effect those objects. The whole ground of the Vote of Censure which the House was asked to give was this, that the Commissioners had agreed to give in some schools of greater efficiency a little higher salary to first class monitors; and it was supposed that many of these would be convent schools. Had it been alleged that the convent schools had in any case injured the Presbyterian population? Yes; one solitary case had been raked up, but so far from establishing anything against the convent schools, it did quite the reverse. It appeared that at a school in Youghal two Protestant children remained there after the prescribed hours, and while certain prayers were pronounced. A great deal of correspondence took place, a special Inspector was sent down, and a Committee of the House of Lords was occupied in investigating the case. The consequence was, that the school at Youghal was separated from the National Board, and was afterwards supported by the people without National aid. That was the one solitary instance of anything like an approach to interference with the religion of Protestant pupils, and it showed that such a vigilance was exercised that any attempt to interfere with the religion of Protestant children in Catholic schools was almost impossible. It was objected that teachers would be educated in these, but that was not a departure from the principles of the National Board, for one of the first rules of the Board was, that patrons were to be at liberty to select their own teachers without government interference, if no special objection, arising from want of educational ability, were advanced. There was no reason why war should be made on these schools. The convent schools were not antagonistic to the educational system. If a denominational school meant the preponderance of any particular religious feeling, there was an end of the educational system; but the educational system did not contemplate that contingency. Peace and harmony would not be promoted by declaring that Catholic parents should send their children to schools presided over by a Presbyterian schoolmaster, or *vice versâ.* With regard to the Question before the House, he trusted that in common honesty the Amendment would find no support. He believed the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Belfast to be very mischievous, and that it would be understood in Ireland in a sense the hon. Member did not mean—as representing, not his own views, but the bigotry which had forced the proceeding upon him. With regard to the Amendment, he asked whether the hon. Member for the King's County joined in the attack on convent schools, and upon priests, friars, and Jesuits, for whom the House had been told the money of the State was voted. He believed that the hon. Member rather tried to get rid of that special attack, by involving the House in a general discussion, and converting the Resolution into an attack on the system of National education. But was that a fair way of dealing with the question? A distinct issue had been raised by the hon. and learned Member for Belfast—namely, whether the House should sanction a trifling concession to convent schools, and it was not fair to the House to attempt to evade that issue. He trusted that the Amendment would be rejected, and that a distinct decision would be come to on the issue raised by the hon. and learned Member for Belfast, so that the people of Ireland might have the satisfaction of perceiving that the unworthy feeling of bigotry of those who had induced that hon. and learned Member to bring forward the Motion could not find many supporters in that House.

Mr. LEFROY said, he regretted that the hon. and learned Gentleman had introduced into the debate a tone which hitherto had been entirely strange to it. He did not think that his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Belfast (Sir Hugh Cairns), in the able and powerful speech which he made on the question, ever intended to make the attack attributed to him by the hon. and learned Gentleman who had just spoken. The argument of the hon. Member for the King's County in support of his Amendment was, that the rules of the Board had been changed to meet the views of the Presbyterians, although their schools remained in connection with the Board. The foundation upon which his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Belfast rested his Motion was that the rules relating to convent schools had been a breaking in upon the original system of National Education. The concession to convent schools showed how much the original system had been changed. His objection was that the system was thus made denominational, and that the change tended to give convent schools the command of the education of the country. He (Mr. Lefroy) honestly avowed that he felt considerable difficulty in refusing to support the general Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for King's County, while he was prepared to support the particular Motion of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Belfast; but his hon. and learned Friend had supported his case by such plain and urgent reasoning, and facts, that on the whole he did not see why his support should be diverted from the Motion by a general Amendment. In giving his support to the Motion he stood in a different position from his hon. and learned Friend, who was a supporter of the National system. He himself never had been a supporter of that system, and in supporting the Motion he did so not so much from a desire to bring that system back to its original plan, as from a disinclination to see a denominational system established in Ireland. It was a hard thing for the clergy of the Established Church in Ireland that while, by changes in the rules, the Presbyterians and the Roman Catholics had been enabled to avail themselves of the benefit of the system, they were the only body who had been deprived of its advantages. However unjustly he might be attacked for avowing it, he believed the clergy of the Established Church had done themselves great credit by the consistency and firmness with which they had stood aloof from a system which did not allow them to teach the children the simple Word of God.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I do not think there is any one who has listened to the speech of my hon. Friend (Mr. Lefroy) who will complain of its temper or tone, nor can any one charge him with disingenuousness in regard to the motives which govern his conduct in this matter; but I must confess I cannot understand the difficulty he feels in rejecting the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for King's County for the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Belfast. It appears to me that the Motion and the Amendment are ostensibly in diametrical opposition to each other. In fact, the Amendment is hardly within the limits of Parliamentary Amendments; it is a complete inversion of the Motion, and it is such an extension of its scope as entirely to change the character of the debate. The hon. and learned Member for Belfast, assuming the language of the straitest sect of those who support the National Board, complains of an undue deviation from the original system; and the hon. and learned Member for King's County picks out of his Motion the very words on which its pith depends, and substitutes for it a Motion of a totally different character, assailing the very institution which the hon. and learned Member for Belfast professes to uphold. It is another question whether we may not find that there is a latent sympathy and concurrence in the object of the Motion and the Amendment; but on the surface they are like two valorous knights tilting against each other in mortal combat. I begin by declining to discuss the Amendment of the hon. and learned Gentleman, whose abilities will always entitle him to the attention of the House, provided his Motion is made in the manner usually required by the rules of our proceedings. The question of the vital principle of the National system is of such vast importance to the internal condition, that if it is discussed it should be in a substantive Motion, and not by the introduction of an Amendment at a late period of a debate which seems to contemplate quite a different object. The system of National Education was devised in a spirit of political benevolence, and also of no small practical wisdom, and the very last object of its founders was either to wound religious feelings or to impair the efficiency of religious education. If we take the system in its principle, it is one of united literary and separate religious education; but we find from the first moment it was launched that it was, to a certain extent, out of harmony with the feelings of the country. It was thus far out of harmony with the feelings of the country that a series of adaptations were required to be introduced, beginning with the first establishment of the system, and coming down to the present time, none of which tended to subvert the essential principle of the scheme, but all of which have been departures from the abstract rigour of the theory. In the first place, the different Administrations of this country were most desirous to promote the principle of united education in Ireland. It appears, too, that in a large proportion of the schools there has been an admixture of pupils of different religious denominations; and I do not know, therefore, that we have any reason to suppose the effect of that admixture has been any other than what was contemplated by those who founded the system. The principle is one of united literary education; but, on the other hand, respect had to be paid to a fixed, and, with those who entertained it, a sacred feeling prevailing in Ireland, by separating, in regard to religious education, the creeds into which the people of that country are divided. My hon. and learned Friend fairly said that the mass of the clergy of the Established Church have not found it consistent with their religious feelings to avail themselves of the Government aid by accepting the National system. Well, whatever one may think of the abstract merits of the opinion held by those rev. gentlemen, no one can deny that the fact to which I have just referred bears evidence of their highmindedness. One may regret their decision, but all must admit that the fact of their willingness to suffer the loss of the contributions of the State is evidence of the highmindedness of the body. This is, however, certain, that the members of that body—I do not mean to say all, but the mass of them—represented in this discussion by my hon. and learned Friend, have put themselves in conflict with the principle of the National system by insisting on instruction from the Holy Scriptures being given in the schools, irrespectively of the desire of the children and their parents. Therefore, as far as regards those who are outside the limitations of the system, my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Belfast in bringing forward and supporting this Motion does not want to have that system made more strictly in keeping with the original intentions of the founders, because he has disapproved it—disapproves it and will continue to disapprove it as long as the system lasts. Heretofore the administration of the system has been characterized by successive modifications. But has there been any inequality in these modifications? If there has been a departure from the strict theory, has not that departure been in favour of all? Can it be said that exceptional favour has been shown to those conventual schools? I apprehend that cannot be said. I think it appears from the Returns that the amount of pecuniary support—which may be taken as the measure of the favour of the State—is less in the case of the convent schools, regard being had to the amount of work done by them than in that of other schools. It is true they enjoy an exemption, inasmuch as the teachers are not required to be examined or qualified in a model school; but in escaping from the ordinary regulations on that head they have lost a privilege much greater than that which they have accepted, because they lose the increased remuneration. Now, when we look at the Motion of the hon. and learned Member, what is it? He complains of a certain regulation of a certain date. And what is this regulation? Why, really those who do not look below the surface would find it difficult to understand why this regulation should be made the ground for an attack on the system. What is there suspicious in permitting schools of a larger and more important class to have monitors of a more advanced age than those who are admitted in other schools? For nearly twenty years we have been engaged in developing and encouraging the monitorial system of education by means of subsidies from the State; and to retain the services of monitors who are not considered sufficiently advanced in age to become teachers, you have decided that in a more important class of schools monitors may be retained and trained for two years longer. Is there anything unjust and improper in that? It is found that convent schools obtain a considerable share of the advantage arising from that relaxation of the rule. And why is this the case? Because those schools are large, which testifies to the confidence which the people have in them; and because they are efficient, which is proved by the fact that they receive the benefit of this new arrangement. It is not because they are Roman Catholic; it is not because they are conventual, but because, on the grounds to which they have just referred, they become entitled to the favour of the State. If the hon. and learned Member for Belfast holds that the new rule deviates from rigid impartiality in favour of the conventual schools, that is no reason for attacking a plan which aims at giving perfection to the monitorial system. If any conventual school deviates from the rules of the Board, by all means visit it with corrective measures. It is stated that not long ago a conventual school at Carrick-on-Shannon was struck off the list because the use of the sign of the cross was practised during the hours of united education; but I think the scope and object of the Motion of my hon. and learned Friend are a great deal wider than its words. Why object to having three classes of monitors if you do not object to having two classes? Why is it right to train them up to eighteen years of age, when in the opinion of many persons they are not fit to take charge of schools, and wrong to train them up to the age of twenty, when they are fit to do so? The real scope and animus of the Motion seem to be to break up the original rule which let those convent schools in, for I find in a pamphlet put forward by the Ulster National Educational Association this statement—"Those conventual schools are institutions which, by their very nature, are of a sectarian character." Well, if by their nature they are of a sectarian character, why did the Earl of Derby admit them to receive aid from a non-sectarian system? They were admitted by him, for in 1836 the Commissioners, alluding to an attack made in a pamphlet, stated that they had been in communication with Lord Stanley, and that he thought it desirable that those schools should be brought under the National system. In my opinion the Earl of Derby would have committed a gross error if he had taken any other course. How was it possible to take any other course when those schools had received aid from the Kildare Place Society? How was it possible to take any other course when those schools had on their side the dearest religious feelings of the country? The Commissioners were right to grant them aid, though they could not expect men to be free from a strong religious and even ecclesiastical feeling. All that could be expected from them was, that they would conform to the rules of the Board; and it has been shown that any of them which do not conform to those rules and afford protection to the creed of the minority will not continue to receive the assistance of the State. Then see what was done after the admission of these schools. Are they the only ones which have got the benefit of the rule? I grant that the clergy of the Established Church have not extensively availed themselves of it, but the Presbyterian body have obtained the benefit of it. The Commissioners held that schools in connection with Presbyterian meeting-houses stood in the same position as those connected with communities of the Roman Catholic persuasion, and have, with impartial justice, granted to Presbyterians the privileges already given to Roman Catholics, on the ground that the special definite religious character of a school ought not to exclude it from the aid of the State, provided there is conformity with the rules of the Board. That is a broad, intelligible, rational principle, and having been announced, it ought to be acted upon fairly. It has been said that the effect of the regulation would be extremely injurious to the model schools, and that, in fact, the source and secret of it is hostility to these establishments. It seems to be held by some, that these model schools have a sort of exclusive claim to provide all the schools in Ireland with teachers. Now, from a very early period in the history of the system, when a distinction was introduced between vested and non-vested schools, it was resolved to allow very large scope to the discretion of local patrons and promoters. If that scope is to be allowed, if you expect the local patrons to give that vital aid to the schools which no mere money grant can supply, and to animate them with a spirit of religion and order, you must leave to them considerable latitude in the selection of masters, and must not confine them exclusively in their choice to those trained in institutions under the control of the Government. My desire would certainly be in dealing with such a question, as far as the difference of the circumstances permit, to apply the same principle of equity and consideration to the feelings of our fellow-subjects in Ireland as in England. Well, has the Government in England ever dreamt of monopolizing the supply of teachers for the primary schools? On the contrary, the first attempt of the Government in this country to establish an institution for the preparation of teachers was regarded with jealousy, and although it was conducted with judgment, although no charge was ever made against the training school at Knellerhall, yet it has been deemed a better and wiser course to allow the primary schools to depend upon voluntary agency, as far as the provision of teachers is concerned. Nay, more; the Government, while liberally furnishing the training colleges with funds, has left to the managers an almost absolute discretion as to the mode of administration. When such consideration has been shown in England to the feelings of the clergy, not merely of the Established Church, but of all religious denominations, is it wise or just, is it even decent, to go to Ireland and say, "Here is so much money for your schools, but we insist on your coming to the shop of the Government and no other, in order to obtain the commodity of a teacher?" I am very friendly to the principle of competition. I will not now discuss the question of the Government model schools in England; but I say that very considerable advantage would arise in Ireland from healthy competition between different nurseries and training grounds, under different auspices, for the preparation of teachers for primary schools. The Irish model schools, moreover, are not capable of turning out a sufficient number of teachers to meet the demand. ["Oh!"] Some men take their own opinions to be facts; but the fact is, I believe, as I have stated. At any rate, I will not contest the matter any further. But if that point be conceded, I do not scruple to say that it is not desirable to exclude that class of teachers who receive their education in schools which possess the undivided confidence of the great religious persuasions of the country. I see an hon. Friend opposite looking rather startled at that declaration ; but, if the schools were all those of the Church of England, or of the Established Church in Ireland, would he be equally astonished ? He would then, no doubt, take another view of the reasonability of giving free scope to the religious feelings of the managers of these institutions. It is only right and proper that the patrons of schools, as long as they adhere to the rules of the Board, should be at liberty to seek for teachers trained in establishments in which they themselves repose the fullest confidence. Allusions have been made to the approaching downfall of the National system, and a Board of three paid Commissioners has been proposed as a substitute for the present Board. I regard that proposition not as Chancellor of the Exchequer, considering the salaries involved, but on far higher and broader grounds ; and I say that it inspires me with serious apprehensions. The existing Board is by its constitution and numbers something like a fair relative representation, and is, therefore, better calculated to maintain the system in the confidence of the people of Ireland than any scheme devised in a bureau for intrusting the distribution to three paid Commissioners. We know what the result would be—one would be claimed by the Presbyterians, another by the Established Church, and the third by the Roman Catholics. [SIR HUGH CAIRNS : I did not propose such a scheme.] I did not attribute any detailed scheme to the hon. and learned Gentleman. With a Board of three Commissioners there could not be nearly so fair a distribution of influence as with the existing Board. It seems to me that the very narrow scope of the hon. and learned Gentleman's Motion is a reason for supposing that he has some larger object in view. On what ground does he object to this third class of monitors ? Why does he seek to disparage the rule of the Commissioners, and to deprive them of any discretion in this matter ? In terms the Motion is narrow ; in spirit it is broad. Whatever may be the motive with which it has been brought forward, its tendency would certainly not be very different from that of the proposal of the hon. and learned Member for the King's County—to undermine and overturn a system which, upon the whole, has been accepted by the people of Ireland as a benefit and as a proof of confidence and kindly feeling on the part of this country, and which, if it continue to be administered as hitherto, in the same liberal spirit in which it was conceived, will not lend itself, under whatever pretext, to any considerations or proposals less broad and comprehensive than those upon which it was originally based.

SIR HUGH CAIRNS : Sir, I think the House has reason to congratulate itself both as to the substance and the tone of the greater part of the debate upon this subject. If I might take leave to refer to one particular speech, I would say, with the permission of the hon. Member for Roscommon (the O'Conor Don), that I never heard a question of this importance argued with greater fairness, ability, and point than by the hon. Gentleman, though I do not agree with his argument. If I might make an exception, I would say that I think the hon. and learned Member for Youghal (Mr. Butt), in his speech, brought into the debate an asperity and an acrimony which I hope he did not intend to evoke, and from which, fortunately, up to that time, the debate had been free. Finally, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had obviously heard extremely little of the debate, and still more obviously had studied very little of the question, has made it necessary that I should set right some misrepresentations which he has — of course, unintentionally—made. It has been said that the form of the Motion which I have submitted to the House is really an attack upon convent schools, and a demand that convent schools shall be deprived of any aid from the Education Board. Now, I thought that in opening the discussion I had prevented any such apprehension. But I now repeat that not only would I not advocate any proposition for depriving convent schools, educating as they do some 40,000 or 50,000 children, of aid from a Board which calls itself National, but I would go further, and say that a Board of National Education would not be worthy of the name unless it applied itself to the question of how schools which educate such a body of children should be brought within its reach and supplied with aid by its means. I say now, as I have said in this House before, that in like manner the Board has to some extent deprived itself of the right to the name it bears, because, with regard to another large denomination in Ireland, educating a very large number of children, it has not in my judgment made all the exertions it might have made to bring them within the reach of its operations. Well, then, it was said I had expressed an opinion which must be considered a reprobation of convent schools as regards their mode of teaching and their general conduct. Sir, I expressed no opinion upon the merits of convent schools but one — namely, that, so far as I had heard, I believed the ladies presiding over those schools deserved every praise; that the industrial training of the children was excellent, and that the literary education was in many respects extremely good, though it was subject to some observations which I afterwards particularized. I say further, that it is impossible not to echo what has been said to-night in praise of the devotedness, the single-mindedness, the charity and benevolence of the ladies who conduct, and to a great extent support, these schools. All these matters are foreign to the question before the House—a question which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has not fully apprehended. We do not desire to deprive convent schools of any Parliamentary aid, or to cast any reflection upon the conduct of them. I read the Report of Mr. Sheridan, the head Inspector of the Board, and I founded upon it a charge against the Board, because I say that if the Board had performed its duty properly, that Report would have been upon the table of the House, in order that we might see what Mr. Sheridan's opinions were, and might have controverted them if they appeared to be untrue, or acted upon them if they were well founded. I have not heard any justification for what the Board did in withholding the Report. And now that I am on the subject of the Board let me make another observation. With many members of the Board I have the pleasure of being acquainted; among them there are some valued friends of mine, and none more so than the resident Commissioner. But I must say that if the Board expect to command our confidence in this matter of reports they must not act upon their present system. With regard to Mr. Sheridan's Report, they concealed it from the House — I can use no other term. Perhaps they did not consider the matter as they ought to have done. Then, after this question had arisen at the Board between the Commissioners themselves as to the mode in which convent schools should be dealt with, and after the majority of the Board had announced their opinion upon the point, they next, as soon as Mr. Sheridan's Report finds its way to the light, call for new Reports from their various Inspectors. We have heard from the right hon. Secretary for Ireland that in a few days these Reports will be in the hands of Members. But this morning there came into the hands of hon. Members a circular or instructions to Inspectors as to the mode in which they are to make these Reports. I should like to call the attention of English Members to this point. A general form is given, twenty or thirty queries are put, and appended to them are four circular letters of instruction, issued in hot haste, one after the other, within a week. The first says—

> "The Commissioners of National Education have directed us to call upon you to make a special inspection of and report on each convent or monastic school in your district. We are, therefore, to instruct you to suspend at once the discharge of every other duty, no matter what its character, in order to carry out the wishes of the Board on this important business. We have, accordingly, to request that you will spend a day or so in the study of the queries and headings contained in the special form, on which you are to make your report on each school, and we cannot possibly doubt that, after an inspection based upon an intelligent apprehension of these queries, you will be able to give such an honest, thoroughly impartial, and comprehensive report of each convent or monastic school in your charge as will assist in the elucidation of truth in respect to a controversy which you can scarcely have failed to observe is going on in reference to convent schools."

That is, a controversy one party to which were the Commissioners themselves. They had pronounced in the most solemn way their positive and distinct opinion upon every one of those points on which they were asking for a Report; and, I ask, is it right after that to send out a circular telling the Inspectors that the object of the information they are to supply is to prove which of two parties is right in a particular controversy, the Board themselves being one of the parties? Two days' reflection leads the Board to think that a little more instruction was necessary, and what do they tell the Inspectors?—

> "That suggestions, technical details, &c., appropriate in ordinary reports, are accordingly to be avoided. Should the consideration of this Report suggest any points of an important nature for the improvement of these schools as to organization, &c., such points can be made the subject of a special communication to the Board at some future period."

So the Inspectors are told—"Go and examine the schools; answer the queries put to you; if, however, you see anything in the schools which requires improvement, do not tell us of it in this Report, which is to go before Parliament in order to settle the controversy, but supply the Board with private information on the subject at some future periods." Now, I see opposite to me one of the Commissioners, and I ask, was he a party to the settling of those instructions, or, if not, does he approve them? I feel satisfied as to what his answer must be. Far be it from me to suggest that there is any ground for an attack upon the convent schools as regards their mode of teaching; but I do say, if anything could lead the public to believe that there was such a ground, it is the issue of such a circular, with such special directions. The Chancellor of the Exchequer says, the true explanation is that from the very beginning the rigid theory of the system had to be adopted from time to time in order to make it suit the various strong religious feelings and sentiments which were found in the country; and the first instance of this, he says, is when the Earl of Derby, as Chief Secretary for Ireland, approved the introduction into the system of convent schools, they being sectarian schools; and he adds that my Motion is a covert disapproval of that step. Now, I have had the honour of a seat in this House for a number of years, and although during that time we have had many discussions on National Education in Ireland, I do not remember that we were ever before favoured with one sentence from the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I spoke on it before you came into the House.

SIR HUGH CAIRNS: Well, for ten or twelve years, although there have been many debates, I have never heard him open his mouth before upon this subject. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has no right to say, I having on scores of occasions expressed my opinion in favour of the Board generally, that under cover of this Motion I am seeking to undermine it; but let us see whether the Board has always shown itself so very anxious to conciliate persons of religious feelings in Ireland by softening the rigid theory of the system as it originally stood. I could mention several cases, but let me take the most recent one. In 1860 the clergy of the diocese of Derry, who were desirous of putting their schools under the Board, said they were willing to allow any child whose parents objected to leave the school-room during religious instruction, but they did not like to appear as if they were driving children away when religious instruction was about to be given. They accordingly asked to be allowed to make a slight alteration in the notice to be put up, so that they might not appear to be urging children of other denominations to go away, but rather to be encouraging them to stay. A proposal to that effect was made to the Board, but that body, so anxious to soften the rigid asperity of the original system, flatly and even rudely refused the request preferred to them, and in a curt answer declined to sanction any alteration whatever. Again, the Chancellor of the Exchequer told us that a large alteration has been made in the rules, to meet the views of the Presbyterians; but the truth is there never was any printed or published rule altered on behalf of that body. I admit that a degree of facility was given to schools taught and conducted as the Presbyterian schools were which led to their placing their schools under the Board; but nothing whatever was done with respect to the Presbyterians or their schools which was not freely offered at that time and since to all denominations in Ireland. The modification in question was not made exclusively on behalf of the Presbyterian body, but embraced all schools under the guardianship of the Commissioners—a fact which marks the difference between the case of the Presbyterians and such a case as the Motion before us would deal with. But to come to the precise point of my Resolution, the Chancellor of the Exchequer asks what objection we can possibly have to a third class of monitors, there being two classes in existence already. The right hon. Gentleman is evidently not aware that, so far as the printed and published rules went, up to November, 1863, it was not lawful for convent schools to have any kind of monitors, either senior or junior, not to speak of that class now invented for the first time, and to be called first-class monitors or pupil-teachers. In the original letter of Mr. Stanley, it was laid down as one of the essential principles of the Board, that the teachers should be trained in a model school under the sanction of the Commissioners. Every one knows that the model schools are at this moment, and have been for some time, the objects of special enmity and attack by a certain body of great numbers and influence, whose aim is to have teachers who shall be trained, not in the model schools, but in schools under the direction and exclusive government of themselves. The Board has established rules by which, under the name of monitors, teachers can be trained in those exclusive schools, and the consequence must be that the teachers so trained will be selected for all the schools of the same denomination throughout Ireland. It seems the Chancellor of the Exchequer likes a healthy competition, and he wants to see such a rivalry between the teachers trained in the model schools and those trained in the convent schools; but the fact is the competition will be confined to the Government themselves. They have built model schools for the purpose mainly of training teachers, and upon those schools they spend a very large sum yearly, and now we see them encouraging a system which is to withdraw all the children from the model schools in the first place, and, in the next, to put an end to all the demand for teachers from institutions founded and maintained at such great expense, because, of course, the teachers trained in the exclusive convent schools will be chosen by the Roman Catholic body for their general schools throughout the country. The Chancellor of the Exchequer talks of my hostility to the Board, and yet in the same breath he rings the knell of the model schools, which, I venture to say, cannot survive the system inaugurated and approved by the Government for the space of two years. One word with respect to the speech of the Chief Secretary and I have done. I was under a delusion during almost the whole of that speech. I thought the right hon. Baronet was supporting my Motion with great vigour and effect. He said it was a mistake to suppose that my Motion was intended to cut off the convent schools from the Board, or was meant to cast any imputation upon the teaching of the convent schools. No person could deny, he added, that the convent schools were in direct competition with the model schools, which he thought must be seriously damaged; and he said, moreover, that it was necessary the convent schools should be checked. He also told us that the teachers should not be trained by those who, like the ladies in convent schools, were not able to train them upon fixed and scientific principles; but he concluded by assuring the House that the Attorney General for Ireland and himself were quite "synonymous"—I think that was the word he used—quite synonymous in their views. Not only does the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary hold these opinions, but they are those also of the right hon. Gentleman the Attorney General, for their opinions are "synonymous." I fully expected, after hearing those opinions, that the right hon. Gentleman was prepared to support my Resolution; but, on the contrary, he has told us that he intends to vote against it, and that he believes such a course to be perfectly inconsistent with his letter of the 30th of January, 1864. Now, what was the opinion that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary then held, and which he holds still? He said that when he wrote the letter he had not seen the rules of November, 1863. He said, however, that he had received remonstrances from the Presbytery of Derry and the Presbytery of Belfast. Both those bodies had seen the rules, and not only adverted to them, but stated their opinion and argued upon them. Does the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary mean to say that at the time he wrote the clear and definite letter of the 30th of January he had no distinct knowledge of the nature of the rules?

SIR ROBERT PEEL: I had not seen the rules myself; but, as I have already stated, I had been told by four Commissioners what they were.

SIR HUGH CAIRNS: The House will, no doubt, be glad to hear if the business of the Government is always conducted in the same manner at Dublin. Would the right hon. Baronet be content, on the strength of a simple assurance, and without examination, to write, "The attention of the Irish Government has been drawn to certain contemplated changes in the fundamental rules of the system of National Education in Ireland, the effects of which will be seriously to imperil the principle upon which the system is based?" But the matter does not rest upon that. He had those two remonstrances in addition to what he might have been told by the four Commissioners, and it is impossible to avoid seeing that the Chief Secretary believed them to be, as he affirmed, "fundamental rules of the system of National Education in Ireland." The right hon. Baronet said that the convent schools were in direct competition with the model schools, and that they ought therefore to be checked.

SIR ROBERT PEEL: What I did say was, and I gave it as my opinion only, that the convent schools had increased so much of late years that they would soon destroy the model schools altogether, and that they ought therefore to be checked.

Sir HUGH CAIRNS: The right hon. Baronet has repeated in stronger terms still the very expression which I endeavoured to put down in writing. He says that it is his opinion, but it is something more. It is the opinion of the Attorney General, for they are "synonymous." And then the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer says that in England you have separate training for teachers —why not, therefore, adopt the same practice for Ireland? The right hon. Gentleman's theory appears to be that the system is to be defended in one country because it exists in another.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I said no such thing. I said that, so far as circumstances would admit, the same principles would be applied to the two countries.

Sir HUGH CAIRNS: It is the Chancellor of the Exchequer who has pronounced the doom, if that doom has been pronounced, of the Irish system of National Education. To him and the Chief Secretary and the Attorney General belong the honour, if honour it may be, of destroying a system which, if carried out in the spirit in which it was originally designed, without the alterations introduced since, has bestowed, and is still bestowing, inestimable benefits upon the people of Ireland.

Mr. O'HAGAN (The Attorney General for Ireland) said, he could not but complain of the unfounded insinuation which the hon. Member for Belfast had urged against the Commissioners—that they had perverted the truth. The extract from the instructions to the Inspectors, which had been quoted by the hon. Member, ought not to be read alone, but ought to be accompanied by the two previous clauses. The Commissioners desired to receive every information and suggestion about the schools which could possibly be of any advantage; but as those statements were too long and wearisome for the public generally, another form had to be filled up, confining the Report to the bare statement of facts. He would only say further, in reference to some humorous observations which were made by the hon. and learned Gentleman, that many things might be said in the course of debate by one Member, which another Member could not approve; but, as far as his own opinions were concerned, they had been stated perhaps at too great length, and possibly with too great elaboration, on a former occasion, but he was quite willing to stand by his own opinions and by nothing else.

Mr. WHITESIDE said, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had asked why the clergy of the Church of Ireland did not avail themselves of the advantages offered by the Board, and he declared that a man of his great understanding could not comprehend why they did not. He would tell him why. Because they belonged to the Church of England, which the right hon. Gentleman was supposed to represent, and he referred him to a petition signed by 5,000 of the clergy of the Church of England to that House, in which they said they approved that decision. They were the founders of the Kildare Place Society, and he spoke truly when he said that that society did give aid to convent schools, but they did so upon the condition that, in the schools receiving aid, the Scriptures should be read. He thought Lord Stanley was right in directing that aid should be given to those convent schools, and he also thought the convent school of Youghal should receive aid, but not under false pretences. The point for the House to consider was, whether there was any solution but one—to let the religious element free, and to provide a good secular education available for all classes. He knew no other solution but that. The hon. and learned Member for Youghal had declared that the Motion proceeded from bigotry of gentlemen in the North of Ireland. Was the House aware that the promoters were strong supporters of the Government, that Mr. Gibson, who was returned for Belfast by the Catholics and Presbyterians, had signed the protest? If the Attorney General for Ireland had read the names of the eminent merchants of Belfast who were strong supporters of Roman Catholic emancipation, he would find those names amongst those who were now protesting against these changes; and it was, therefore, unwise of the hon. and learned Member for Youghal to attack some of the most acute and intelligent men to be found in all Ireland.

Mr. HENNESSY said, he would not press his Amendment if the hon. and learned Gentleman would withdraw his Resolution.

Sir GEORGE GREY said, the Government would vote against the Amendment, and then the division would be taken upon the original Resolution.

Question put.

The House *divided* :—Ayes 112 ; Noes 8 : Majority 104.

Main Question put.

The House *divided* ;

Notice being taken that Sir George Bowyer, the Member for Dundalk, having given his voice with the Ayes, had voted with the Noes, Sir George Bowyer was called to the Table by Mr. Speaker, and stated that he had given his voice with the Noes, but had called out "The Ayes have it," in order to force a Division ; whereupon Mr. Speaker directed his Vote to be recorded with the Ayes.

Ayes 59 ; Noes 91 : Majority 32.

INCLOSURE (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Baring, Bill to authorize the Inclosure of certain lands in pursuance of a Special Report of the Inclosure Commissioners, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Baring and Sir George Grey.

Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 170].

HARWICH HARBOUR ACT BILL.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, That leave be given to bring in a Bill for amending the Harwich Harbour Act, 1863.

Resolution *reported*.

Bill *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Milner Gibson and Mr. Hutt.

Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 171.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, *June* 24, 1864.

MINUTES.]—*Sat First in Parliament*—The Marquess Townshend, after the Death of his Father.

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Accidents Compensation Act Amendment* (No. 158).

Second Reading — Army Prize (Shares of Deceased)* (No. 106) ; Countess of Elgin and Kincardine's Annuity* (No. 149).

Committee—Beer Houses (Ireland)* (No. 134).

Report—Beer Houses (Ireland)* (No. 134).

Third Reading—Vacating of Seats (House of Commons)* (No. 105) ; Banking Copartnerships* (No. 113), and *passed*.

THE ST. BERNARD'S REFORMATORY.

OBSERVATIONS.

Lord BERNERS said, he desired to call attention to two passages in the letter of Mr. Sydney Turner, read to the House on the previous evening by the noble Earl the Lord President of the Council ; the one being, "I had a full private conference with the superintendent of the Ashby division of police," and the other, "I should be glad if the inaccuracy of the charge made by Lord Berners against my inquiry could be brought out." [The noble Lord proceeded to read several letters on which he had grounded the charges he had made against the management of the institute.]

THE ROYAL ACADEMY.

OBSERVATIONS. QUESTION.

Earl STANHOPE, in rising to call the attention of the House to the present position of the Royal Academy, and to ask what further steps respecting it are in contemplation by Her Majesty's Government, said, that it would be in the recollection of their Lordships that a Royal Commission had recently inquired into the state of the Royal Academy. That Commission had presented an unanimous Report, and a large blue-book of evidence. Since then there had been an answer from the Royal Academy, a proposal by the Government, and a decision, on one point, by the House of Commons. Under these circumstances, their Lordships would probably not think it out of place in him, having been the Chairman of that Commission, to address some inquiries to the Government on the matter, and to invite a discussion in their Lordships' House. There were two principal questions involved in the case of the Royal Academy ; the first, the provision for better accommodation and more adequate space ; and the next, the new rules by which the Academy was to be governed. At first sight these two questions might seem to be entirely separate from each other ; but, in fact, they would be found to some extent connected. It would be found, too, that many of the defects of management imputed to the Royal Academy resolved themselves into a want of space. For example, complaints were justly made that the schools were closed to the pupils when they were most wanted—namely, in the spring and summer ; but the reason of that great defect was merely this, that the apartments in which the teaching took place were then required for the exhibition of pictures, and there remained only a small chamber in the roof, where some few of the pupils still pursued their studies. Again, many artists complained of the manner in which their pictures were hung, in gloomy nooks, or almost on the top of the walls, where they could be but indistinctly seen. The position of these pictures reminded him of the saying of an artist described in a German play, who is boasting of the great skill with which he had represented the miraculous darkness of the land of Egypt. "So well have I pourtrayed it," said he, "that I defy any one of you to discover hand or foot in any part of my painting." This was very much the case with many of the pictures exhibited at the Royal Academy. Similar to this was the position of the sculpture, which, until lately, was consigned to a kind of cellar—for by no other name could he call it—where none of its merits could be discerned. All this was solely attributable to want of space. The Commission had examined Mr. Frith, who was at that time the head of the "hanging Committee"—an ominous name—and who told them that they were conscious of often doing great injustice to artists, but it was beyond their power to avoid it—many excellent pictures were inevitably hung in unfavourable positions. Besides, there were many excellent works which could not be exhibited at all. These were faults for which the Royal Academy were not responsible. It was the fault of want of space. The Commission had consequently found it impossible to disjoin the consideration of this question from the question of the National Gallery. There, also, was not space enough to accommodate the yearly accession of pictures, partly arising from purchase, and partly from bequests; and the Commission had therefore to consider the two questions together. In their Report the Commissioners state two plans by which this deficiency might be remedied. The first was that the National Gallery should be removed to a building to be erected in connection with Burlington House, and that the whole of the building in Trafalgar Square should be handed over to the Royal Academy. The other plan was that the Academy should receive from the Crown a site at Burlington House, on which to erect a building for themselves. Both these schemes were explained in the Report, but the Commissioners expressed no opinion as to the relative merits of either. It has subsequently seemed, however, that the Government preferred the former. They had proposed the plan of a new National Gallery, at a cost of £150,000, and the space at Trafalgar Square to be appropriated to the Royal Academy. Mr. Cowper, as First Commissioner of Works, brought forward an estimate, and asked for a Vote on account to carry out that object; but the opinion of the House of Commons was adverse to the proposition, and it was defeated by a majority of 174 to 122. He should refrain from saying a single word on the merits of that decision, for he held it to be a good rule in their Lordships' House, that what they could not interfere with they ought not to comment on. The House of Commons exercised its own discretion, and he did not deny that there were very strong reasons for the conclusion to which it came. But that decision being taken, the question now was, what plan ought to be adopted, and it was on this point he asked information from Her Majesty's Government. There was still open to them the second scheme which he had mentioned. It was the same which had been come to under the Government of his noble Friend near him (the Earl of Derby), under which the Academy undertook to construct at their own charge a new edifice in Burlington Gardens. It was much to be regretted that that arrangement, which was on the very point of its completion when Lord Derby retired from office, had not been confirmed by the present Government. The site, which was one of those which had been selected by the Commission, was of the value of £60,000, and by the grant of so valuable a property the Crown would have retained a very important power—the power to give weight and influence to its opinions as to the right management of the Academy.

He now came to the second question—the recommendations of the Commissioners in regard to the management of the Academy. The Royal Academy as a body was nominally composed of forty Academicians. There were two additional Academicians who filled rather an anomalous position, the nature of which he had never been able to understand. The only certain thing about it was, that it was not greatly relished by themselves. Practically, however, and apart from names, there were forty-two members. The Commissioners proposed that the number should be increased to fifty; and to that recommendation the Academy had declared they were willing to accede. But the Commissioners further proposed that to the fifty artists there should be added ten laymen, and they had not determined to make that recommendation without some important testimony having been given in its favour. Of all the witnesses examined who were not themselves artists, there was no person whose evidence the Commissioners valued more, or on which they laid greater stress, than that of his noble Friend whom he saw opposite (Lord Taunton), and what did he say?—

> "I think very highly of the liberality of sentiment of the Royal Academicians generally speaking, and the manner in which they have discharged their duties; at the same time, in every institution of the kind, there is a certain narrowness which is always apt to produce an influence; and I think, as one might have expected, there are some points on which it may be said that some such feeling is not unjustly suspected by the public. Therefore, I think the infusion of the lay element would have a tendency in conciliating the confidence of the general public, and it might have some practical effect in improving the working of the system."—p. 421.

So far Lord Taunton. That was also the view of the Commission. Then, as among artists, Baron Marochetti warmly approved the lay element. He said, from his knowledge of foreign academies, that in those the lay members "were always considered as more liberal than the others;" and being asked by Lord Hardinge—

> "Would you willingly yourself accept a judgment upon your works of sculpture from a person who was not a sculptor and had not studied?"

He answered—

> "With the greatest pleasure; it always comes to that."

Mr. Watts, in like manner, said—

> "I have heard it suggested that there should be certain lay members in the Academy, and I think that this would be very advantageous, as representing the opinion from without."

Then Mr. Watts was asked—

> "Do you not think that it might be distasteful to the artists themselves?"

He answered—

> "I do not see why it should be; I do not think that any artist paints his pictures for his brother artists only; they are to be judged of by men of intellect."

It was quite true—and he did not wish for a moment to conceal it—that several artists of great weight expressed an opposite opinion. But besides the direct advantage of lay members in the government of the Academy, the Commissioners thought that some gentlemen of taste and talent, not being themselves artists, would, in conjunction with the professional members, be of great value as a council of reference in matters of art. It had been a common complaint, and certainly not in all cases an unfounded one, that there was an utter want of taste in the designs from which many of the public buildings of London had, for many years past, been constructed; and it had also been remarked that, owing to the changes of the executive Government, there were fluctuations in respect of such designs which led to very unfavourable results in respect to public works. If there was a council of reference such as that to which he had just referred, its opinion must prevail with the First Commissioner, and a gentleman filling Mr. Cowper's official position would feel himself supported by the opinion of the Council of the Academy. At present, if Mr. Cowper stated an opinion, any other Member of Parliament was free to spring up and give his own opinion as in his view equivalent to Mr. Cowper's. That would not be the case, however, if Mr. Cowper were able on such occasions to speak in the name of the Academy, and not solely in his own. But the Academy looked with apprehension on the admission of laymen. The Academicians, he was afraid, thought that the lay members would be exactly like the connoisseurs described in the days of Goldsmith, and when, as Goldsmith said, only two things were essential to the character—the first thing was always to say—what certainly no man could contradict—that the picture then under judgment would have been still better if the artist had taken more pains, and the second was on all occasions to praise the works of Pietro Perugino. The Commissioners proposed that the lay members should be elected for only five years, with eligibility for re-election, and that the choice should be left—to whom? To the Crown? To Parliament? To any extraneous body? No; the proposal was that the choice of such lay members to sit in the Royal Academy should be left to the Royal Academy itself. His own opinion was, that it would be difficult to imagine a more innocuous or less aggressive proposal. The Academicians said—

> "The artist element was wanting in the Commission, and we confess we do not see how it could have been easily supplied; yet we cannot refrain from remarking that the Commissioners who have come to the conclusion, justly or not, that a very moderate addition of the lay element might assist the judgment of artists, seem to have overlooked the tendency of their argument in an opposite sense, having apparently felt no want of professional judgment in their private and final decisions. Their views are, after all, those of unprofessional men."

Now, the Commissioners certainly thought they had obtained these artistic opinions to the fullest extent by the large number of distinguished artists whom they examined. But how strangely inconsistent was that mode of reasoning on the part of the Academy! The Academy blamed the Commission as consisting solely of laymen without any admixture of the artistic element, and yet they were thoroughly satisfied with their own position as consisting solely of artists without any admixture of laymen. Their argument, then, when it came to be examined, was directly in the teeth of their own conclusion. Under all the circumstances the question was one with which the Government would have to deal, and with them the final decision must rest. With regard to the Associates, they were at present twenty in number, and had no share in the government of the Academy. The Commissioners proposed to increase the number from twenty to fifty, and to give them a share in the management. The Academy was willing that there should be an increase in the numbers, but they did not state what number they were willing to approve. The Commissioners also recommended that the Academicians should each be entitled to send four pictures for exhibition, and they had further suggested that the Associates should not, as of right, send any. Upon this point the greatest interest was felt by artists; a memorial had been recently sent to him signed by several distinguished names; and having consulted his colleagues, with the exception of Mr. Stirling, who was unfortunately absent from town on account of illness, they, the late Commissioners, had re-considered their former opinion on this particular point. He was enabled to say that they now concurred with him in thinking that if the Academicians were entitled to send four pictures, the right to send two should be extended to the Associates. There remained a very important point—namely, whether the Associates should or should not have any vote in the government of the Academy and in the election of Academicians. That they should have votes was a point which was pressed in the Report of the Commissioners, and he looked upon this as a point of vital importance. On the other hand, the Academicians proposed that the Associates should have no votes, but that they should exercise a certain right of nomination. What was proposed in the paper of "Observations" by the Academy was this—that in case of any vacancy in their ranks every Associate should have the power to nominate a candidate; but that the entire right of election, without the smallest necessary reference to such nominations, should be vested in the Academicians only; and the Academicians went on to make this very extraordinary observation—

> "The right of nomination which we propose, as distinguished from personal voting in elections, is an important privilege as such, but its great utility would be to put the Academicians in possession of opinions which might sometimes differ from their own."

Was there ever a more extraordinary statement than that it should be considered a great privilege in persons not having votes to nominate a candidate, without the least right of electing him? Suppose the same principle were extended to Parliamentary reform, and it was proposed that the right of voting should be left with the £10 householders, but that those below them should be allowed to nominate a candidate, there not being the least obligation on the part of the £10 householders to elect this person! To the plan of the Academicians the artists, he believed, entertained the strongest possible objection, and thought they ought to have the votes which the Commissioners said should be given to them. If the Academicians had been determined still to regard the Association as inferiors, and to treat them as dependents, it would have been far better to reject the proposal of the Commissioners altogether. He should be glad to learn from the noble Earl (Earl Granville) some declaration of the opinion of the Government on these points; but whatever was his opinion respecting them, no site should be given for the Royal Academy, and no new building provided, until there was some understanding as to the reformation of the rules; and Parliament, he thought, had a right to require that no new rules should be finally ratified until they had been laid on the table of both Houses. On this point he hoped to obtain a special assurance. He had not made these remarks as an enemy of the Academy; on the contrary, he had always endeavoured to show himself one of its supporters. He thought that he showed himself its supporter now in urging these improvements, which he looked upon as most desirable for its own well-being. As to the advantage of an Academy, as such, he had no doubt at all. He did not know whether there were any in the House, but he knew there were some out of doors, who had formed a very prejudiced opinion upon the subject. Many appeared to think that the Academy was being supported solely for the sake of the Academicians, and Art for the sake of the artists. He maintained that such was not the case. They desired to support the Academy because, as an order of merit among artists, as combining in harmonious action the divers branches of painting and sculpture, of architecture and engraving, and as a great school of art, both by its example and its teaching, it was capable of rendering most important services. They supported art not for the sake of artists, but for the sake of the whole people, because the extension of art always tended to elevate and refine the people among whom its influences were at work. He would ask their Lordships to look at the increased feeling for art which had been displayed in this country during the last thirty or forty years. Of the progress of that feeling during the last period, he could give one proof, which might be deemed trifling by many, but which, to his mind, was most significant. He referred to the different result of admission to show-places thirty or forty years ago and at the present time. It was forty years ago the common complaint of gentlemen who admitted the public to their gardens that all their best flowers were plucked, or their young shrubs pulled to pieces. If a gentleman admitted the public to view his galleries or saloons, he would find his panels soiled, or, what was still worse, scrawled over with a host of insignificant names. But was that the case now? Many of their Lordships were in the habit of opening their pleasure grounds to the public for one or two afternoons in every week, and he appealed to them whether it was not true that it seldom or never happened that they had any damage to complain of. Then, as to the behaviour of the people in the public buildings, there could be no stronger case than that of the National Portrait Gallery. Last year they admitted large crowds during the Easter week, while from the confined space there could be nothing like any efficient supervision. Yet the Secretary said, in his report to him, "Many young lads and factory boys were among the visitors, and I am happy to add that from first to last every one was quiet and well-behaved." He maintained, then, that in England the feeling for art was extending more and more. He believed that the question of art and of the Academy as an appointed means for promoting art might at any time without presumption be brought before their Lordships. It was a question which on all occasions might claim their sympathy, and which they might be certain would reward their care. He would now ask his noble Friend the Lord President of the Council, what further steps respecting the National Gallery are in contemplation by her Majesty's Government?

Lord ST. LEONARDS said, that he had read some time since the very able Report of the Royal Commission, and he had also seen the answer of the Royal Academy, and he was bound to say that, able as the Report was, the answer was also an able paper, and remarkable for the good taste and feeling which pervaded it. He believed, however, that his noble Friend (Earl Stanhope) was mistaken in the conclusions which he had drawn from the observations contained in the answer in reference to the introduction of the lay element into their government. He believed that the answer was urged more as a *tu quoque* argument. The Academicians argued that if the Commissioners, who were all laymen, without a single artist among their number, were competent to decide questions involving the interest of art, the Academicians, who were all artists, might not unreasonably be allowed to exercise their judgment without the interference of laymen. The introduction of the lay element would, he believed, give rise to great dissension. Undoubtedly, all art, and, therefore, all artists, must bend to the influence of public opinion, and therefore laymen would eventually decide upon the merits of the highest artists; but, at the same time, it was better that that influence should be felt from without than that it should obtain admittance within the walls of the Academy. He would remind his noble Friend that the Royal Academy had deservedly earned the confidence of the public, for it was an institution to which the country was greatly indebted. He was afraid, however, that his noble Friend had taken the Academy by surprise by the course he had taken in bringing forward the present Motion. The question between the Associates and the Academy was one requiring great consideration, and one upon which it was impossible for the House to give an opinion. The site was also a most important matter. After the decision of the House of Commons he believed they must consider the retention of the National Gallery in its present position as a settled point. Nobody would dispute that the Royal Academy must have a proper site, and it was no less certain that it could not remain in its present situation. Nothing would be left for the Royal Academy but to go to Burlington House, and a gallery fit for the reception of the national pictures could then be formed at Trafalgar Square. The Royal Academy had accumulated from the profits of their annual exhibitions a sum of £80,000, which they were prepared to expend as might best suit the Government, either at Burlington Gardens or at Trafalgar Square. He trusted the Government would consider well before it sought to impose terms upon the Royal Academy which that body was not inclined to accept. The Royal Academy was entitled to expect, and he had no doubt it would receive, liberal treatment from the Government, such as was worthy of a body representing the artists of the country.

Earl STANHOPE explained that he had not taken the Royal Academy by surprise, as a week ago he had given private notice to the President of his intention to make a statement upon the subject.

Lord TAUNTON said, that no doubt the great question for consideration was the selecting a proper site and providing a suitable building for the national collection. He cared little whether that were done by transferring the old Gallery to Burlington House, or by retaining the old Gallery upon its present site, to transfer the Royal Academy to Burlington House. For himself he would prefer the first arrangement; but the House of Commons had not thought fit to sanction that arrangement. At present, all the operations of the Royal Academy were crippled, and undeserved blame was cast upon them, because the question of future site was left in uncertainty. It really was lamentable to find that many Members of the House of Commons were disposed to quarrel with every proposition that was made upon this subject. There appeared to be in that House great antipathies, and it seemed incapable of agreeing to any consistent plan. At present, the operations of the Academy were greatly crippled, and they were blamed because they did not make sufficient provision for the instruction of pupils and other objects; but he believed that the blame was undeserved, and that it was not in their power to do so. In his opinion, the only boon that Government could grant them was a site on which they could conduct their operations. He confessed that he was jealous of any interference on the part of the Government with the detailed management of artistic institutions; and he had no desire to see the Royal Academy made a branch of the public service, or submitted to the control of any Minister of the Crown, or the superintendence of any *dilettanti* connoisseurs whatever. Art, like every other form of our national life, ought to rest mainly on a feeling of independence. That was the feeling which would be most congenial to English artists, because they were educated English gentlemen. He certainly valued highly, and he believed the members of the Academy valued highly, the connection between them and the Crown which had existed since its foundation by George III. It was graceful to the Crown, and it afforded a most useful stimulus and encouragement to artists. But he did not think it was desirable that any more direct connection should exist between them and the State. He would strongly deprecate any Ministerial interference in the matter, and he hoped that his noble Friend the President of the Council would not give his sanction to any system of enforcing a series of minute regulations upon the Royal Academy. The Commission over which his noble Friend had presided so ably had made some very valuable suggestions, and those suggestions had been received in a fair spirit by the Royal Academy. For his own part, he thought that an infusion of the lay element into the governing body would be useful, as tending to counteract that narrow spirit into which all men, of whatever profession, if left entirely to themselves, were apt to fall, and it would also give confidence to the public. If, however, he found on the part of artists or of the Academicians a very strong repugnance to the introduction of the lay element, he would rather forego the probable advantages than force upon them an unwelcome change. The Royal Academy had now existed for nearly 100 years, and no one could deny that during that time the names of very few of our greatest artists had been omitted from its roll, showing that upon the whole their selections had not been unsatisfactory. He trusted that while the Government suggested to the Academy such improvements as they might think desirable, they would deal with them in a large and liberal spirit, and that they would not attempt to force upon them any conditions which would interfere with their independence. But if the Royal Academy was to be subject to some kind of Government authority, and if its affairs were to be continually interfered with by Parliament, because it happened to receive indirectly some contribution of public money, he thought the Academy would act wisely, and for the interest of the art which it represented, if it were to decline to receive such public assistance, and to fall back upon its own resources, retaining only that personal connection with the Crown which he trusted would never be terminated.

LORD HOUGHTON said, he shared in the regret which had been expressed at the temper in which this subject was usually discussed in the other House. It was quite unintelligible to him why the Royal Academy, which he believed had done its duty to the country for the hundred years of its existence, should be regarded by that assembly with a feeling which seemed almost to amount to dislike. The country in his opinion owed a deep debt to the Academy, and never was censure less deserved than the censures which had been passed upon it. He had seen with great satisfaction the temper with which the Royal Commission had been conducted, and he believed any difference of opinion that might exist with respect to the Royal Academy was very slight indeed. From the tone of this debate it was evident what they all wished was that the Royal Academy should exist in dignity and independence. He agreed with his noble Friend who had just sat down, that it would be most inconvenient and unwise if the Government should approach the Royal Academy in any tone of patronage, and he did not expect that they had any inclination to do so. The Academy felt no doubt that they were in a position of great independence, in which they could, if they chose, separate themselves from the Government, and even have no exhibition at all. This was not, therefore, a moment when hard conditions should be imposed on them. On the question of the introduction of the lay element into the governing body, he owned he thought the Royal Academy had been strangely forgetful of their own origin and history. The Royal Academy sprang from a society of persons of rank — many of them Peers — patrons of art some hundred years ago — called the Dilettanti Society, some of whose members went to Italy and brought over many treasures of art, many of which now adorned their Lordships' mansions. In early times a body of painters were associated with the society; it was agreed that from the members of the Dilettanti Society the President of the Royal Academy should always be taken. There then was a purely lay element; it did, therefore, seem strange that the Royal Academy should forget the fact, and he hoped they would not be unwilling to reconsider their decision in that respect. He was convinced the Royal Academy would derive great advantage from the admission of the lay element. He might be allowed to quote the reply given by Mr. Herbert, whose works they all so much admired, to one or two questions put to him by the Royal Commission with reference to this point. He is asked by the Chairman—

> "I am to understand that you wish those eight gentlemen to be in your senate, some gentlemen being added who were not artists ?—I think it would not be a bad thing at all. Do you imagine the artists and the non-artists would act cordially together ?—I should think educated gentlemen who had a love for art would act well with the artists in such a body. Would not artists feel a little disinclined to see questions relating to art decided by those who had not the same advantage as themselves as regards artistic education ?—I do not think so. I should like it rather than otherwise, for my own part. What is called art education I believe often shuts off from the free sight of nature, and is frequently in the artist's way of fixing upon the fit and appropriate thing to be done."—p. 517.

It was the same with men of letters and men of public business — their association was most advantageous to all parties. The British Museum, whatever might be its defects, was on the whole well conducted by a number of gentlemen who were not professional men of letters, but *dilettanti.* In the interests, therefore, of the Royal Academy itself, he would urge upon the Academicians the reconsideration of their opinions in this matter. With respect to that other question — namely, whether equal authority should be given to Associates with Royal Academicians, he thought the Royal Academy was entirely in the right. If there was to be anything like a hierarchy in the Royal Academy, there must be some distinction of authority and power between the Associate and the Academician; and if it was desirable to hold out some continuing object of ambition to a rising artist, it was well that some material distinction should exist between the two ranks. If anything, he thought the Royal Academy was too large ; he did not wish to increase its numbers ; and the object of ambition held out to the young and ardent of admission to its ranks should not be too easily attained. He expressed his great admiration of the general conduct of the Royal Academy, and they well deserved everything that could be bestowed on them by the favour of their Lordships and the beneficence of the Crown.

The Duke of RUTLAND wished to make one or two remarks, particularly after the decision which had been come to elsewhere with regard to the question of site for a National Gallery. A national collection of pictures offered two objects of inspection to the public, the works of the Old Masters and those of the moderns. Now the public were much better able to appreciate the pictures in the Royal Academy than those in the National Gallery. They could understand the ordinary incidents of daily life which the painters of the present time set before their view; but the paintings of the Old Masters reflected the incidents of past ages which the ordinary public could not appreciate. On this account he highly approved of the recommendation of the Commissioners, that the Academy should be thrown open to the public one day in every week—Saturday—free of charge. Another object of a national collection of pictures which he thought in the late discussion had been lost sight of, was for the purposes of study by artists themselves. They were the parties most interested in the ancient pictures, and it was of the greatest possible importance that, whatever site was fixed, it should be one where artists could study quietly the great works of the ancient Masters. Whether the paintings in the National Gallery were to remain where they now are, or were to be sent to Burlington House, they ought to have more room given to them; for at present the pictures were crowded together in such a manner that they could not be seen. He hoped the Government would take good counsel with respect to the architectural requirements of the new building. When a manufacturer erected a building, if it were not a handsome structure, he might say that it answered very well for the business purposes for which he built it. But it was a very different case with a department of Science and Art, which might fairly be expected to have some regard to the architectural effect of the buildings it erected.

Viscount HARDINGE said, as a member of the Commission that had reported on the subject, he desired to express his obligation to the noble Earl who had called the attention of the House to this subject. It was one of great importance, and he hoped that the Lord President would be in a position to say that at any rate negotiations were about to be opened with the Royal Academy with a view to their removal from Trafalgar Square to the site of Burlington House. The works of the Old Masters in the national collection were now so huddled together that they could scarcely be seen, and some of the pictures were hung close to the ceiling. The same was the case with the Turner Gallery. The students, also, in the life school were packed together in a pepper box, in such a manner that it was impossible they could study to any profit. There was no doubt that the Royal Academy had a moral if not a legal claim to some accommodation at the public expense; while, on the other hand, it was right that the State should exact some conditions from them in return. The noble and learned Lord (Lord St. Leonards) said that the Royal Academy had put forth very strong arguments on the question as to the introduction of the lay element among them; but he had looked through the evidence on that point and had found, he would not say the preponderance of the artist evidence, but the preponderance of the general evidence to be in favour of the lay element. He thought that between the new Associates and the members of the Royal Academy there would be the most harmonious working, and that the admission of the Associates to a status in the senate of the Academy would remove the stigma which was supposed to attach more or less to a close corporation, and would take away the reproach which the enemies of the institution always threw in its teeth. It was, therefore, in his opinion, rather shortsighted in the Council of the Royal Academy not to have adopted that portion of the Royal Commissioners' Report. Besides the question of the lay element and the enlargement of the constitution of that body, there were several other important points that deserved the serious attention of the Government. The Government could not separate itself altogether from the Royal Academy, for it could hardly be suggested that it should agree to give them accommodation at the public expense, and yet retain no control over them.

Lord OVERSTONE said, that the less the Government intermeddled with the

Academy, with the view of forcing the lay element into the constitution of that body, the better; otherwise the result must be to bring about the state of things which would answer to the poet's description of chaos—

> ". . . . Corpore in uno,
> Frigida pugnabant calidis, humentia siccis,
> Mollia cum duris, sine pondere habentia pondus."

He could bear testimony to the valuable services of Sir Charles Eastlake, in the formation of our present National Gallery. He had succeeded in obtaining a valuable and useful collection of pictures—not yet complete as a public collection, but selected with great discrimination and judgment—but they could not be appreciated till they were placed in a proper site. With respect to the removal of the National Gallery to Burlington House, he could only say that having felt it to be his duty, as one of the trustees of that institution, carefully to examine the plans for carrying out that scheme, he had come to the conclusion that, so far as space and light and the facility of providing for the public convenience were concerned, as well as other considerations of great importance, a gallery might be erected on that site with which no existing gallery in Europe could enter into competition. By a most unfortunate vote of the House of Commons, however, that scheme was rejected, and what course would now be adopted he was unable to say. He hoped, however, that the Government would, during the approaching recess, take up the matter energetically, and that they would give the country a building worthy of the collection of pictures which the nation now possesses.

Earl GRANVILLE said, he thought it impossible to have listened to the discussion without being convinced that the subject was one which might with advantage be discussed in their Lordships' House. The proceedings of the Royal Academy were, very properly, influenced by public opinion, and for the purpose of forming that opinion it was quite right that the noble Earl opposite (Earl Stanhope) should have made the observations which he had done, characterized as they were by the utmost kindliness of feeling towards that institution. It was impossible, he might add, not to be aware that the Royal Academy, numbering as it did among its members so many eminent artists, held a very important position in this country, and exercised a great influence on art. That being so, the Government had deemed it advisable to issue the Commission of which the noble Earl was Chairman, and which made a very able Report last year. That Report was referred by the Secretary for the Home Department to the Royal Academy, that they might make on it any observations which they thought proper; and the Academy, availing itself of an undoubted privilege, had addressed, through their President, a personal communication to the Queen on the subject. Her Majesty, feeling as strongly as she always had done with regard to the privileges of the Academy, was glad to receive that letter, to which she deemed it right to return an answer through her responsible Ministers; and both the Report of the Commission and the observations made upon it by the Academy were under the consideration of the Government. The noble Earl, he might add, had put to him two questions, one being with respect to the plan which the Government might adopt for giving additional space to the Royal Academy; and in answer to that question he might say that everybody seemed to concur in the opinion that the Academy required more space. With the view of providing it, a scheme, which had been spoken of in different terms that evening, but which would undoubtedly give greater space not only to the Royal Academy but to the National Gallery, was proposed; but it was rejected by the other House of Parliament. It had been said that if the late Government had continued in office their plan would have been carried, but when he took into account that there was a majority rather of antipathies than of sympathies on questions of art, he could not help thinking that that plan would have shared a similar fate. Be that, however, as it might, the Government felt bound to submit to the decision of the House of Commons, and to endeavour to form another plan which would afford that accommodation which they had been precluded from affording in the way they desired. In reply to the second question of the noble Earl, as to whether, upon granting any new site to the Royal Academy, the Government would be prepared to insist on certain changes being made in the rules of the Academy, and whether they would pledge themselves that those rules should be submitted to the decision of both Houses of Parliament, he would observe that he believed the Royal Academy did not admit that the Government possessed any power with reference to the alteration of their rules. He had gone over the Report, in which there were a great many suggestions made by the Commissioners, some of a nature so obvious as to be readily adopted by the Academy, others of an important character which had been rejected, and some which were more for the consideration of the governing body of the Academy than for the decision of the House of Commons. He entirely concurred with his noble Friend behind him (Lord Overstone) as to the inexpediency of the Government mixing itself up with the Academy; but there were, nevertheless, certain recommendations made by the Royal Commission which ought not, he thought, to be dismissed without consideration. If the Government gave additional facilities to the Academy, they ought, in his opinion, on grounds of public interest, to endeavour to render the governing body satisfactory, not only to the public at large, but to the artists themselves; and it was perhaps desirable, by means of negotiation between the Government and the Academy, to seek to secure a more popular representation of the artists in that institution. That having been done, he thought all other matters should be left to the governing body for their decision. But still, he repeated, the Government ought to reserve to themselves the power of influencing the Royal Academy in the first instance. With regard to the pledge to which the noble Earl had adverted, he could only say that he preferred giving no pledge on the subject; but he had no hesitation in assuring him that it would receive the careful consideration of the Government.

ALKALI WORKS REGULATION BILL.

QUESTION.

LORD RAVENSWORTH, in putting the Question with regard to the operation of the Alkali Works Regulation Act, of which he had given notice, said, that two years ago a Select Committee was appointed at the instance of the noble Earl below him (the Earl of Derby) for the purpose of inquiring into the injuries occasioned by noxious vapours evolved in certain processes of manufacture. The inquiry had been conducted with great ability, and an Act dealing with the subject to a limited extent was passed. One main reason for his bringing the subject to the attention of their Lordships was, that when he was last at Newcastle he had observed with no small dismay that the tall chimneys in the neighbourhood of that large town were vomiting out volumes of smoke as dense as ever, and he began to doubt whether the Act really was operative. That Act enjoined that 95 per cent of the noxious gases should be disposed of by condensation before being passed into the air, and it also provided for the appointment of Inspectors and sub-Inspectors to see that its provisions were carried into effect. He had applied to a gentleman well qualified to give him information on the subject, who was a witness before their Lordships' Committee a year or two ago, and his Report was that the result of his inquiries showed a general concurrence of opinion that the alkali makers had been more careful, and that the Act had been certainly productive of great improvement. He was therefore willing to believe that the great volumes of smoke which he had seen issuing from the chimneys had been deprived of the noxious qualities; and with a view to ascertain how the Act was being carried out in other parts of the country, he wished to ask the Postmaster General, If he had received any information through the Board of Trade of the success of the recent Act of Parliament for mitigating the nuisance occasioned by noxious vapours from chemical manufactories?

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY was afraid that he could not give the noble Lord much information, as the Act had only been passed so recently, and the Inspectors were only appointed on the 1st of January last. He was able, however, to confirm what the noble Lord had stated as to the operation of the Act in the neighbourhood of Newcastle, and in many cases he was told not merely 95 per cent, but actually 100 per cent of the noxious gases was extracted. He was glad to say, too, that the manufacturers had shown a cordial desire to co-operate with Inspectors, and he had little doubt that before the end of the year all the manufacturers would have adopted the machinery of the Act.

THE EARL OF DERBY hoped that the success of the Act would so far remove the apprehensions expressed by the noble Lord last year as to the serious effect it would have on the manufacturers, that he would be ready to go on and extend it to other trades which, though equally noxious, were not so prominently offensive as these alkali works.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY said, that his apprehensions were confined to the extension of the Act to other manufactures. He had felt no apprehensions as to the alkali works, because there there was a machinery existing which the manufacturers were ready to use.

The Earl of DERBY suggested that, as the noble Lord had now purified the air, he might now go on to purify the water.

Lord RAVENSWORTH said, he was informed that the discharge of noxious matter into the river at Newcastle was enormous.

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, June 24, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee*—Committee—r.p.

Public Bills — *First Reading* — Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland)* [Bill 174].

Second Reading—Cranbourne Street* [Bill 154]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) [Bill 100].

Referred to Select Committee—Weighing of Grain (Port of London)* [Bill 119] (*List of Committee.*)

Committee — Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties) [Bill 159]; Chimney Sweepers Regulation* [Bill 148] (*Lords*); Weighing of Grain (Port of London)* [Bill 119]; Court of Chancery (Ireland) [Bill 78], *Debate adjourned;* Railways (Ireland) Act Amendment* [Bill 99].

Report—Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties) [Bill 159]; Chimney Sweepers Regulation* [Bill 148] (*Lords*); Weighing of Grain (Port of London)* [Bill 119], and *re-committed* to a Select Committee; Railways (Ireland) Act Amendment* [Bill 99].

POLICE IN THE PARKS.

QUESTION.

Mr. J. HARDY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is the fact that the Police are not employed in Saint James's Park as they were in the Green Park and other Parks; and, if so, why that is the case; and whether frequent complaints have been made to the Home Office of the proceedings which take place from want of police supervision in Saint James's Park?

Sir GEORGE GREY said, in reply, that since 1840 the ordinary police had not been employed in the enclosed part of St. James's Park (which he believed was the part the hon. Member referred to) as distinguished from the road, the Mall, and Birdcage Walk; and the reason was that the enclosed part was on the same footing as Kensington Gardens, and was under the charge of the First Commissioner of Works. The park keepers, however, were sworn in as constables, and had the same powers and responsibilities as the ordinary police. He was not aware that any complaints had been made to the Home Office, but he should inquire.

UNITED STATES—THE "KEARSARGE."

QUESTION.

Mr. CORRY said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether the Admiralty would object to send a competent officer to Cherbourg to examine and report on the mode adopted to strengthen the sides of the *Kearsarge* against shot and shell, as described by Captain Semmes in his Letter which appeared in yesterday's *Times?*

Lord CLARENCE PAGET, in reply, said, his right hon. Friend forgot that the *Kearsarge* had been in dock in this country, and they had the information desired. If his right hon. Friend wished, he would show it to him.

NAVY—THE COURSE OF THE "GLADIATOR."—QUESTION.

Mr. DALGLISH said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether it is true that the Transport which conveys the troops from Cape Coast Castle to the West Indies is likely to pass through a belt of 600 miles, in which only calms and light winds may be expected; and if the mean limit of the north-east trade wind in August is now considered to be in the 13th degree of north latitude?

Lord CLARENCE PAGET, in reply, said, he was obliged to his hon. Friend for having put the Question, and he would state on what grounds the Admiralty had given their orders for the transport to proceed in the way she was about to do. Captain Richards, hydrographer to the Admiralty, in a paper dated the 21st of June, 1864, says with regard to the passage from Cape Coast to the West Indies—

> "The middle-passage is simply the passage across the ocean from continent to continent, and, of course, any ship crossing from Cape Coast to the West Indies must make it. Either a sailing vessel, or a vessel towed by a steamer, or a steamer alone, leaving Cape Coast in July or Au-

gust, bound for Barbadoes would steer to the southward for 300 or 400 miles, until she got into the south-east trade and out of the Guinea current, which sets along the coast of Africa to the eastward, at the rate of thirty miles a day. She would, if towed, get into the south-east trade in two or three days, and the equatorial current would then set her at the rate of thirty or forty miles a day to the westward. The south-east trade reaches to the northward of the equator in July, and she would make her westing with that wind, hauling to the north-west when she got into the meridian of 30 degrees W. (having run from 1,200 to 1,500 miles), by which course she might expect to pass through but a narrow belt of variable winds, and reach the north-east trade in 7 degrees or 8 degrees N., perhaps with no greater detention than one or two days. The distance between Cape Coast and Barbadoes is about 4,000 miles, and probably either a sailing vessel or a steamer would take a month to make it. A sailing ship like the transport employed should certainly make the passage as quickly as a paddle steamer. She would get into the south-east trade in three days from leaving Capt Coast, and once into that wind experience has always shown that sickness contracted on the Coast of Africa speedily disappears."

And he says likewise—

"In the days of Horsburgh ships crossed the belt of variable winds too far to the eastward, and, consequently, were much delayed. Modern experience has shown that by crossing the line well to the westward no such delays are experienced."

THE HIGHWAYS DISTRICT ACT.

QUESTION.

Mr. DODSON said, he would beg to ask, Whether, under the Highways District Act of 1862, the towns not subject to the jurisdiction of the Board, but adjoining or surrounded by highway districts, are legal places for the meeting of the Board ?

Sir GEORGE GREY : Under the Highway Act of 1862 some doubts existed on this point, but by an Amendment to the Local Government Act made last Session towns adjoining or surrounded by highway districts were constituted legal places for the meeting of the Highway District Boards.

ENSIGN FOR THE NAVAL RESERVE.

QUESTION.

Mr. THOMSON HANKEY said, in the absence of his hon. Friend (Mr. Crawford), he would beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether any steps have been taken towards granting the privilege of bearing the "Blue Ensign" to Merchant Vessels commanded and partly manned by Officers and Men of the Royal Naval Reserve ?

Lord CLARENCE PAGET, in reply, said, he had the pleasure to state, that Her Majesty had sanctioned the granting of the Blue Ensign to ships commanded and partly manned by men belonging to the Royal Naval Reserve, and that henceforth the White Ensign would be the ensign of Her Majesty's fleet. The Blue would be the ensign of ships of the Royal Naval Reserve, and the Red the ensign for the Merchant Service.

Mr. CORRY said, he wished to know whether the flag list was to be no longer divided into the three squadrons of Red, White, and Blue ?

Lord CLARENCE PAGET said, the three distinctive flags were done away with, and there would be now only Rear Admirals, Vice Admirals, and Admirals.

ARMY—SANITARY REGULATIONS FOR FIELD SERVICE.—QUESTION.

Sir HARRY VERNEY said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether the Sanitary Regulations for Field Service issued by the Secretary of State, were obeyed before the Army took the field for the Ashantee War ?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON replied, that the sanitary regulations referred to were included in the book of Medical Regulations which were directed to be, and he believed were, in the hands of every surgeon in the Army. It was specially laid down in these regulations, that the senior medical officer should be responsible for seeing that the sanitary regulations were carried out, and he had not received any Report to the effect that those regulations had not been carried out.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

THE DUTY ON MALT.—RESOLUTION.

Mr. MORRITT said, the Motion he had to bring forward was one perfectly devoid of party considerations. It was,

"That in case of any modification of the indirect Taxation of this Country the Excise on Malt requires consideration."

He hought he should be able to prove to every Member of that House, that the proposition was reasonable, just, and equitable. All he required and asked was, that every hon. Member of that House, be he of whatever party he might, would do him the kindness to listen to what he had to say, and see if what he said was not borne out by facts, and then, after listening, to say if he could conscientiously vote against his Motion. That seemed to be taking rather high ground; but he stood on the justice of his cause. He was not going into statistics, nor would he weary the House by reading lengthy papers, but he would rely entirely on the justice of his cause. Now, he thought no man would deny that of analogous taxes the excise upon malt stood alone in one respect, inasmuch as it was almost the only tax that had not been modified or in some way altered. Whilst analogous taxes had been dealt with in some way the malt tax had not been touched. That singularity of position was one reason for considering the subject. But the malt tax had another peculiarity, and it was this—that it was a tax levied on the soil of England, upon an article which we produced or manufactured, and that which we within ourselves consumed. It was a tax that no one would deny fell heavily on the poor man who drunk a glass of beer. It was a tax that fell extremely heavy in that respect on the poor. The rich people who drank wine had been relieved to a certain degree by the remission to some extent of the tax on wine, but the poor man was still taxed heavily through his beer. No one would deny the next assertion, which was this, that the malt tax hung like a millstone round the farmer's neck. It checked him in his industry; it prevented the due course through which he would cultivate his land, and it prevented him from furnishing to his poor labourer that which would be a luxury to him. These were simple facts that were well known; but he would draw them together, and exhibit them to the mind of every impartial person, and ask him if he did not consider that such a tax was not worthy of consideration. One or two remarks had been made on the malt tax, on which he wished to make some observations. It had been said that the malt tax should not be interfered with, because it fell on the class of persons who were the least heavily taxed, and paid the least for the public benefit. He denied that, for it fell most heavily on a class of people who paid most to the general benefit of the State — he meant the agriculturists. Who paid the poor rate? Who paid the highway rate? Who paid the county rate? And who paid the church rate? These rates were all paid by the land. No doubt there were large manufacturers who paid considerably to the revenue, but look at their profits. Considering the profits of various classes, the agriculturist paid more than any other person to the revenue. There had been another observation made by persons high in authority. It had been his good fortune to receive a piece of friendly advice from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who advised him to consider that in any modification of the tax on malt the benefit would be greater to England than to Ireland or Scotland. That suggestion was made with a view, he presumed, to induce him to forego his Motion, but he was not disposed to do so, for certain reasons; and although that observation came from a gentleman whose every observation, from his experience and talent, would command respect, he did not think it was worthy of him. If the observation that they would be doing an injustice to Ireland or Scotland by granting a boon to England were worth anything, it must have been based upon the assumption that all the malt which was made in England was brewed in England, and that the beer was drunk in the same country. But the fact was that there was hardly a public-house in Ireland or Scotland in which you did not get English beer, and not many public-houses in England in which you did not get Irish and Scotch whisky. He believed that there was much more reciprocity of drink than was generally supposed. Even, however, if all the malt which was made in England was consumed in this country, the argument of the right hon. Gentleman was not a statesmanlike one. The tax, then, was levied on the poor, it was a burden on the agriculturist, it stood entirely alone, and it was levied on the producer and the consumer. He would say that if the exigencies of the State required that the tax should be maintained at its full extent—and if England had for the last few years a difficulty to make both ends meet—if the exigencies of the country had rendered this tax necessary, he would not for a moment have proposed a modification of it; but for the last two or three years they had been reducing the taxation, and that had been so done as to secure an increasing revenue, and as the surplus accrued it had been applied to the relief of various classes in the country; but the agriculturists had not yet had their share. What relief did the abolition of the paper duty give to the agriculturists? It gave relief to manufacturers in large towns, with whom it was no doubt a good thing to stand well at the elections; but fair play was a jewel, and he was anxious that if there was a surplus the agricultural interest should have a chance with the rest. It had been said that it was inexpedient to attempt to foreshadow the future, and that prospective legislation was inexpedient. He was prepared to admit that there was a good deal of truth in that; but if the Chancellor of the Exchequer made use of such an argument he ought to be consistent, and abstain from foreshadowings himself. He had not, however, done so. He had spoken of probable reductions of other taxes, and had foreshadowed, to his mind at all events, that the agriculturists would look in vain for any modification or consideration of the malt duty; and it was that circumstance which had induced him to bring forward his Motion and to take the sense of the House upon the subject. As regarded the requirements of the State, for the last two years they had been progressing steadily towards an increased surplus. That was no doubt to some extent brought about by the extreme good management of their financial Minister, for whose abilities he entertained the highest respect, but he thought it was very greatly owing to the extreme vitality of England herself. They saw around them on all sides evidence of increasing wealth. If they went out to Bayswater and Kensington and saw the magnificent houses built there and inhabited as soon as they were erected, they must feel there was an increase of wealth. In many instances it was derived from the colonies, but from whatever source it came there it was, and no doubt could be entertained of the increasing wealth of the country. They had been in flourishing circumstances in their adversity. Even during the cotton famine, and whilst paying so enormously for expensive ships and arms, they had had a surplus. No doubt that had been diminished to the present time by the cotton famine. But though we had been under a dark cloud, light was breaking in on our horizon. We were now getting into better circumstances, unless it pleased God that we should be engaged in war; but if we should be so engaged, and if it should be necessary to support the honour and integrity of England throughout the length and breadth of the world, he, for one, should never speak a word about the reduction of that or any other tax. But, under present circumstances, when we had a right to look forward to a constant, steady, and increasing surplus, he did not think he had chosen an inopportune occasion for bringing forward his Motion. It was in consequence of what had gone before that we had a right to expect, in case of any modification of indirect taxation, that the malt tax, instead of being treated with contempt, should receive due and proper consideration. He had thus endeavoured to convince the impartial mind of the House that his Resolution was a fair, an equitable, an honest, and a reasonable one. But there was one person in the House whom he would rather persuade than all the rest put together. He did not mean exactly that; but he would be proud, indeed, if he could persuade the right hon. Gentleman. He had heard it said that the constant contemplation of pounds, shillings, and pence—the adding up of accounts, the balancing of books, and the general endeavour to "make both ends meet," although it produced a great deal of cleverness and subtlety, did not ennoble the man nor enlarge his heart. Judging, however, from the general attributes and character of the right hon. Gentleman, he would fain believe and hope that in his speech the right hon. Gentleman would demonstrate to the House that his occupation had in no way sullied or clouded that clear insight—with which he must have been born—into the difference between justice and injustice, between right and wrong. He was quite certain that if the right hon. Gentleman would allow his mind impartially to dwell on this subject, he would come to the conclusion that in future modifications of indirect taxes in this country, he having given a chance to every other class of taxpayers, the excise upon malt required consideration.

MR. DODSON seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "In case of any modification of the Indirect Taxation of this Country, the Excise on Malt requires consideration,"—(*Mr. Morritt,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, as it would appear from negative indications given by the House, that the debate was to be restricted within the narrow limits of a duel between the hon. Member (Mr. Morritt) and himself, he could wish that whether he succeeded or not in dealing with the argument in support of the Motion, he should be able to imitate the temper in which the hon. Gentleman had brought the subject before the House. The questions before the House were, on the one side, that in any future modification of indirect taxation the malt tax required consideration, and, on the other, that the House should resolve itself into a Committee of Supply. In point of fact, the Motion of the hon. Member was met by another, which, according to the forms of the House, was equivalent in this instance to the "Previous Question;" and those who voted that the Speaker should leave the Chair would not pronounce a negative on the proposition of the hon. Gentleman, but would indicate in a Parliamentary way that they doubted whether the House should be called upon at present to pass any opinion upon the hon. Gentleman's Motion. It was not a negative of the proposition that the Government asked the House to pronounce, and he should be very sorry to go the length of putting a negative on it. The hon. Gentleman admitted that it was generally unwise to pledge the House beforehand to make a selection of subjects for remission of taxation at a period when they must be necessarily in the dark upon many questions which ought to bear upon the matter. The hon. Gentleman thought himself justified in the course he had taken by assuming that he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) as the representative of the Government in matters of finance, had endeavoured by anticipation to exclude the malt duty from consideration. But such had not been his intention. It was quite true that in presenting his financial statement he offered a partial argument against the remission of the malt duty; but that was strictly and exclusively from one point of view—namely, from the competition in which the malt duty stood at that moment as the favourite subject of an important movement in the country, and with reference to the actual surplus at the time. It was not, therefore, that he wished the House to arrive at any conclusion with respect to its future course in regard to that tax. He would admit that, for a man standing in his position, it would be ten times more objectionable to endeavour to exclude the malt duty from the consideration of Parliament than for a private Member, and he was sure the hon. Gentleman would acknowledge that, when he spoke upon the question, he was reviewing several taxes which were thought fit subjects for reduction on account of the then existing surplus, and it was with respect to a comparison of the malt tax with the duties on sugar and tea alone that he used the argument. He trusted that he had disposed of the main ground which the hon. Gentleman urged as his justification for asking the House to do that which on general grounds was scarcely defensible—to pledge itself in a certain degree as to the disposal of the surplus not at present existing. The hon. Gentleman would not deny that the effect of his Motion was to establish that doctrine. He (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) admitted that it was capable of being alleged that the Motion, considered as an abstract proposition, in its terms, in the literal and grammatical meaning of its terms, was not only admissible but that it was incontrovertible — that in case of any modification of the indirect taxes of the country the excise duty on malt required consideration. Nothing could be more fair than to admit the proposition of the hon. Gentleman. But there were a great many propositions which were most fit to form the subject of an expression of opinion not only by private, but even by official men, which would assume an entirely new character when under peculiar circumstances they were placed on the Journals of that House, because it would be said, that though the propositions were true, yet it was not the business of that House to place upon its Journals all propositions that were true. And then the question would arise why, if the House thought fit to inscribe those propositions upon its Journals, it was not also fit to inscribe others equally true and pertinent to other matters? The duties upon tea and upon sugar were worthy of consideration, for though they had made a very large reduction in the duty upon tea it was still much heavier than the malt duty. He admitted the tea duty was a Customs duty, and therefore, as far as regarded form, was easier than a duty of Excise. But as far as restraint was concerned, a Customs duty on tea of 100 per cent was more restrictive than an Excise duty upon malt of a much lower amount. The meaning of the hon. Gentleman's proposition, as far as it was unexceptionable, was that it was the duty of the Government and of Parliament, from time to time when they had a surplus, to make an impartial review of the claims of various taxes for reduction. But, if the House were to affirm a Motion of that kind at once, it would carry it out of the region of literal truth, and render the declaration open to every objection which would lie against it as practically untrue. It was intended to anticipate a judgment on the subject, not wholly, but partially; and he put it to the impartial opinion of hon. Members whether such a decision ought to be anticipated at all. It was a great mischief to anticipate. It led to the creation of expectations which were in the nature of promises—promises from Members to constituents, from the House of Commons to the people. It might, perhaps, be said that he himself had made such promises. He could not admit that. It might be necessary, in support of particular proposals, in order to let the House comprehend their nature, that the consequences to flow from them should be indicated; but he had always protested, and he must always protest, against the practice of making a promise, or anything like a promise, in regard to such matters, as detrimental to the character and dignity of the House. He was sure the hon. Gentleman did not wish to lay up, for the future, causes of unnecessary dispute and contention. Experience, however, had shown that declarations of the kind, made in anticipation of circumstances which had not arrived, tended very considerably to aggravate political controversy when the time came. There was the case of the paper duty, for instance. It stood on record that the Resolution with respect to the paper duties, although of a very open character in its terms, was felt, in the result, an important Motion, though not a sole or conclusive one, in the selection of that measure of remission for a proposition to the House. But so far was it from being admitted that the declarations on that subject bound Government or Parliament in any degree, or justified the proposition which he made, there was rather absolute resentment at its being quoted, and the effect of it was to embitter the debate. He was not, of course, saying who was right or wrong in that case, but merely stating the effect of the abstract declaration. And now, he would ask, what sort of a surplus would be required in order to deal with the malt tax in an effectual manner? The House had for several years shown a strong inclination, not to lay down an unbending rule, but to adopt as a general practice the method of dividing any surplus between the subjects of direct and indirect taxation. He did not suppose the hon. Gentleman opposite would wish to commit the House to a Resolution to forego altogether the claims of the income tax, in order to apply the whole surplus to the reduction of the malt tax. [MR. MORRITT: I limited my Motion to indirect taxation.] But if the hon. Member desired to deal with the malt tax, of course it must be in a manner that would produce some sensible effect on the price of the commodity. He would not be content with a reduction of less than a half. [MR. MORRITT: I said a third.] The hon. Gentleman must take care that in trying to strengthen he did not weaken his argument, and lay his plan open to the objection, that while greatly diminishing the revenue it would leave all the evils of Excise restraint in force, and would not diminish the price of the commodity. He thought the general opinion was that the reduction of the malt duty by half was the minimum of change which it would be worth while to make. But for a reduction of between a half and a third they must have at command about £2,000,000, as the share of the surplus applicable to the diminution of indirect taxation. They were not so happy, however, as to have every year such a sum available for the purpose. Even a million, or half a million, was a large sum to have at command. The hon. Member spoke of millstones round the neck of the agriculturist, but they must take care not to impede the House of Commons in the discharge of its difficult duties by hanging millstones like that round its neck. They must take care not to expose the House to the reproach of bad faith, if it did not give preference to the malt tax, when it had at disposal a surplus capable of effecting great good if applied in other directions, but quite inappreciable and worthless when applied to the malt tax. They should endeavour to keep their honour clear and their words unambiguous in the face of the country; but the Motion was open to the objection of ambiguity, which was the most serious disadvantage which could attach to a legislative declaration. When it was said that in the reductions which had taken place of late years no relief had been given to malt, he must remind hon. Members of what took place thirty-five years ago. The country came out of the great war with France with a system of Customs duties wound up to the highest point on every article, oppressing, restraining—aye, in many cases, extinguishing trade and industry. In 1829, it was the good fortune of Parliament to possess a surplus of £3,000,000. Had that surplus been applied in the same manner as subsequent surpluses, for the relief of trade and industry, instead of being devoted to the reduction of the taxation on beer, a greater benefit would have been conferred on the country at large, and even that particular class which was interested in beer would have gained more by the increased strength and prosperity of the country through the general relief of trade. The repeal of that duty was a very strong measure, and certainly tended to weaken very much any residue of claims which might be made on behalf of that commodity to further relief. No other article had been relieved to the same extent as beer. In general terms, half of the duty weighing upon it was removed at once, and thus a benefit was given to England almost exclusively among the three kingdoms, and to a particular interest almost exclusively in England. The reduction of that duty was no doubt an advantage to the consumer, but it was a small advantage, indeed, compared to that he would have derived from the application of the money to the removal, in a more general manner, of the fetters on the trade and industry of the country. The hon. Gentleman had said that the malt duty was a millstone round the necks of the agriculturists; but, if so, he wanted to know what was to be thought of the duty upon spirits, which had an operation upon barley the same in principle as the malt tax, but in amount far more severe. Notwithstanding the repeal of the Corn Laws, the price of barley of late years had moved upwards instead of downwards, and while the malt tax was from 50 to 60 per cent upon malt, though not more than from 20 to 25 per cent upon beer, the spirit duty was from 400 to 500 per cent upon spirits. It would thus be seen that the millstone argument, if it had any weight at all, was far more applicable to the case of the spirit duty than that of the malt tax. The hon. Gentleman, again, had said there was no force in the argument derived from the pressure of the spirit duty and malt tax upon the three kingdoms. Every one knew that the great bulk of the malt tax was paid in England, but that, it had been said, was no reason why the tax should not be repealed. Certainly not, if the question was looked at in the abstract, and if the malt tax were an exceptional duty levied upon a commodity used in England, while the corresponding commodities used in Scotland and Ireland paid no duty at all. For example, if Scotchmen and Irishmen consumed not whisky but cider, upon which there was no duty whatever, the case against the malt tax would be immensely enhanced by its exclusiveness; but the truth was, Scotland and Ireland were far more heavily taxed in respect of their favourite liquor than England. Perhaps it was wrong that Scotchmen should drink whisky, but they must be allowed to judge for themselves, and he must say that whisky, when diluted into toddy, in which shape it was largely consumed, ought not to be made the subject of any very severe or sweeping condemnation. On the whole, then, he thought the House should pause before it gave a very large amount of public revenue to a commodity almost exclusively used in England, and, at the same time, left the corresponding commodities used in Scotland and Ireland under an overwhelming weight of taxation. But he did not think it desirable on the part of the Government that he should discuss this question at length. He had objected to embodying premature and unnecessary declarations of opinion in the shape of Resolutions, and he felt that the argument against the Motion of the hon. Gentleman had a tendency to lead him further than he should wish to go with respect to the merits of the question itself. It was desirable that the whole question of the malt tax should remain open and unprejudiced. At present he could not undertake to say what might be expedient for Parliament to do in future years. He had no means of ascertaining what sums might be at its disposal for the relief of the taxpayers, though on that point, apart from great convulsions, apart from special and extraordinary causes, he thought we might be justified in humbly entertaining sanguine hopes. It was to be hoped, therefore, that the House would carefully avoid embarrassing its future action by any premature declaration of opinion respecting the malt tax, and with the view of enabling it to do so, he had no hesitation in moving, as an Amendment, That the Speaker should now leave the Chair, which might be taken as equivalent to the previous Question.

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, he accepted, with pleasure, the admission of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that the subject of the malt tax was entitled to serious consideration, but he regretted that the right hon. Gentleman should have subsequently hinted, by his mysterious allusion to the tea and sugar duties in the present, and to the beer duty in the past, that in his opinion the repeal of the malt tax would be inexpedient for many years to come. There could be no doubt whatever as to the impropriety of the House of Commons pledging itself beforehand to the diminution or repeal of any particular duty on financial grounds, but in the case of the Malt Tax there were social and political considerations which might render a departure from that general rule both justifiable and expedient. The Motion of the hon. Member for the North Riding was merely a supplement to that past system of fiscal re-arrangement which commenced in 1842, but which, in the opinion of those who represented the agricultural interest, was not carried far enough. Since 1842 every tax which was thought to press upon the springs of industry, or which affected any branch of our textile manufactures, had been altogether repealed. The particular ground on which these great changes—changes which caused great distress among the agricultural classes—were justified, was the broad political ground that if they were once adopted, all causes of dissension between class and class would be removed, and that henceforth the agriculturist and the manufacturer would not be divided into hostile camps. But so long as the malt tax remained untouched was it true to say that there was no class of producers, no class of manufacturers, affected—and unjustly affected—by our present system? It was impossible to deny but that on the producers of barley on the one hand, and the manufacturers of meat on the other, these restrictions pressed harshly and unjustly. It was often said with respect to the growers of barley on good barley land, that the malt tax did not operate in a prejudicial manner towards them when they had a good harvest. But what was that but saying that with a bad harvest, and on indifferent ground, the malt tax did operate injuriously? And is it for free traders to justify a tax which punishes producers for a bad harvest in the one case, and for managing their business as they think best in the other? He now came to the other class—the manufacturers of meat. Perhaps no occupation now open to the farmers of England, Ireland, or Scotland was more profitable than the manufacture of meat, but it was quite evident that the malt tax did operate as a great hindrance and drawback on the manufacturers of meat. That was admitted by the right hon. Gentleman in the Bill which he introduced to allow malt free of duty to be used for the feeding of cattle. It was said, and said truly, that that Bill was a dead letter. The grievance was admitted but not remedied, and never would be remedied, until the producer of barley could apply it to the production of meat in the way most likely to benefit himself in his trade. The right hon. Gentleman went on to consider the question as affecting the general producer, and said that unless the House abolished one-half of the malt tax he did not see that any good would result to the consumer of beer. It was not necessary to take into consideration at present the proportion of the malt tax which might be reduced in a future year. It was sufficient that the Resolution was sound in principle, and on that ground they were justified in supporting it. He believed that in the case of the malt duty, as in the wine duty, and all that class of duties, where there was a considerable reduction in the amount of duty there would be a considerable relief to the consumer, and that there would be a recovery of the revenue. Two years ago his right hon. Friend the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley) whose absence, and particularly the cause of it, the whole House would regret, said, and said truly, that what wine was to the upper classes beer was to the lower, and consequently they had a right to argue by analogy from the effect of the diminution of the wine duties what would be the effect of the diminution of the malt tax. One of the most eminent and able permanent servants of the Crown, Sir Emerson Tennant, had published an elaborate treatise to show that if the wine duty was reduced the revenue would be permanently reduced; but the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not deterred by that prediction. In 1860 he reduced the duty, and in that year the total amount of gallons entered for home consumption was 7,272,308, and the amount of duty received was £1,828,998. He would pass over the next year, because the duty was then in a transitory state. The first year the new duties came into full operation the consumption had increased to 9,756,705 gallons, and the duty had fallen to £1,107,420. No doubt that was a most important and serious loss. But in 1864 the consumption had risen to 10,664,250 gallons, and the revenue to £1,233,824, showing an improvement in the revenue to the extent of £125,000 in three years. There was no reason to believe that a similar recovery would not follow a reduction of the duty on malt; *à priori* there was every reason to say that it would be more immediate and satisfactory. Every gallon of wine had to be produced abroad, and the consumption was liable to fluctuations from caprices in taste and habits; but beer and ale, which were produced at home, were as deeply rooted in the affections of the English people as anything could be. A writer in the first century had described the Britons as a people drinking fermented liquor made from barley, which was not known to any other people in Europe, and the earliest records of Parliament showed that one of its first Acts was to fix the maximum price of beer. There was no reason to doubt that the increased consumption of beer which would follow the reduction of the duty on malt would be greater than most people imagined. He was told that that might be so, but that the increased consumption of beer would decrease the consumption of spirits. He did not believe that in the least, and for the truth of that he would appeal to the figures which had been presented to the House. When the duty on wine was reduced and the consumption increased, did the consumption of beer or spirits fall off? Just the contrary. The duty on spirits during that period had increased about half a million, but the revenue on malt had remained stationary owing to the exorbitant duty. The House should remember this other illustration—that whereas in the first half of the last century the duty on malt varied from 7*d.* to 2*s.* 7*d.*, and the population never exceeded 8,000,000, the consumption of malt was quite as large as the consumption during the first sixty years of the present century, when the population had risen to 20,000,000—and why? Because in the interval the malt had been quintupled. This showed that the duty on malt kept down the consumption, and the moment the malt duty was reduced there was every reason to believe that there would be a greatly increased consumption of beer and other articles produced from malt. The right hon. Gentleman had touched on what might be called the geographical or nationality argument. When he (Lord John Manners) first heard the argument he was startled. He had no idea that the principle of nationality had made such way in that House, and that we had to apportion our taxation by geographical considerations. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to have been oblivious of geographical considerations in 1860, for he stood confessedly guilty of what he must now deem the great national crime of adding £2,000,000 of taxation on Ireland and Scotland, without imposing one halfpenny of taxation on England. In 1860 the right hon. Gentleman raised the duty on spirits to 10*s.* per gallon on 20,000,000 gallons, thus imposing the £2,000,000 of additional taxation to which he had referred. He presumed that at that time the right hon. Gentleman was not so impressed with his nationality argument; or perhaps, indeed, that he had not invented it. The right hon. Gentleman had talked about cider, and reminded the House that it was an untaxed drink. But how did that apply to the argument of nationality? There was a duty of 10*s.* per barrel on cider previous to 1830. It was then abolished, and what was the result? In fifteen years the consumption of cider had exactly doubled itself. Was the right hon. Gentleman, to redress the grievance of Scotland and Ireland and nine-tenths of England, to turn round on the cider counties and impose a duty of 10*s.* per barrel on cider? Let the House look for a moment into the question of nationality as it affected Scotland. The right hon. Gentleman said that in Scotland ardent spirits were the national drink. It was not a fortunate thing perhaps for Scotland that such was the case. But if spirits were the national drink of the people of Scotland, when and why did they become so? He had no doubt the House would remember the authentic ballad of King Arthur's Court, and the character of the servants he entertained, and the melancholy fate that befel those servants—

> "Usquebaugh burnt the Irishman,
> The Scot was drowned in ale."

He apprehended that there was nothing more clear than that at the commencement of the last century beer and ale were not only the drink of Scotch men but of Scotch women. In 1742 the Lord President Duncan Forbes addressed a memorial to the English Government complaining of the melancholy position into which the finances of Scotland had fallen, in which he said—

> "The cause of the mischief we complain of is evidently the excessive use of tea, which is now become so common that the meanest families, even of labouring people, particularly in boroughs, make their morning's meal of it, and thereby wholly disuse the ale which heretofore was their accustomed drink, and the same drug supplies all the labouring women with their afternoon's entertainments to the exclusion of the twopenny."

Why was the twopenny driven out of Scotland? The answer was that it was driven out by tea; but how came it that tea drove it out? The malt tax was imposed in Scotland in 1710, and what was the result? Why, in Glasgow, Leith, and all the great towns of Scotland there was bloodshed, and there arose a resistance of so formidable a character that the Peers of Scotland in London came together, and proposed a repeal of the Union between the two countries, and they were within an ace of succeeding, as they were only beaten by one vote. Therefore it was quite clear that in twenty years the people had been, against their will, driven to give up the drink they had formerly used, and taken to tea, upon which no duty was imposed until 1723. Therefore it was legislation of a fiscal character that had forced the people of Scotland to give up their old accustomed and popular drink to take refuge first in tea and subsequently in whisky; and, as legislation had done the mischief, Scotland had a fair right to ask that legislation should undo it. A few years ago he was walking in the classic groves of Keir with his hon. Friend the Member for Perthshire, when they came upon some men who were felling trees. He saw among the trees what he took to be an English cask, and, upon inquiring what it was, was informed that it was a cask of beer, which the men had asked to have instead of whisky. This was a most excellent change of taste, and for the sake of Scotland he wished that a great deal more beer was consumed there. Every hon. Member from Scotland ought to support the Motion of his hon. Friend, which might have the effect of substituting for the excessive use of ardent spirits the consumption of a wholesome beverage like beer. Let the House also look at Ireland. The right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary told them the other night that even in spite of the crushing effect of the malt tax, and the deleterious character of the beer supplied, the consumption had so largely increased that during the time he had been in the Irish office about 300 beershops had been opened in Dublin alone. That showed that the national bent of the Irish people was not exclusively towards spirits, and that if they could get beer they would be glad to consume it. Was there an Irish Member who had at heart the social improvement of the Irish people who would not gladly see the consumption of spirits considerably reduced by the substitution of beer? Then let them hear no more about the question of nationality. That which was good for England was good for Ireland and Scotland, and he sincerely trusted that all who had at heart the social, moral, and political welfare of the people of the three kingdoms would join together and present a firm front in favour of diminishing, and, they might hope, ultimately abolishing the tax, which was unjust in principle, unequal in operation, and productive indirectly of the worst effects in promoting the intemperance of the people. Another argument which he had heard used in the course of these debates was, that so great was the improvement in the beer brewed by the great brewers, and so great were the facilities which railway communication gave for the transmission of beer from the great brewers to different towns and villages, that there would be little recourse to private brewing even if the malt tax were repealed. To a certain extent that was true. Wherever there were large towns and convenient railway communication, it was probable that many of the class who fifty or a hundred years ago brewed would not now do so. But that was not true of many rural districts and places which had yet no railway communication. He was himself acquainted with a district in Shropshire in which, even under the disadvantages of the existing tax, the labouring people had never given up the habit of brewing. In that district every cottage that was built was provided with a proper brewhouse and copper. The farmers were in the habit of offering the labouring man 1*s.* a week extra, or half a bushel of malt once a month, and every labourer who had a copper chose the malt and rejected the shilling. If in any portion of the country they revived the habit of private brewing they would revive one which tended directly to increase the morality, happiness, and comfort of the labouring people. He would not now enter upon the question of the evil influence exercised by beerhouses upon the population. It was sufficient to say that every man who lived in the country knew that a great proportion of the smaller and a considerable amount of the greater crimes which afflicted the rural districts had its source in the beershop. He did not press that argument, but anything which tended to diminish the resort of the labouring man to the beerhouse did good to himself, to his family, and to the community among which he lived. He had to apologize to the House for having said so much, but on all these grounds of financial justice, of morality, and of increasing the comforts of the poor, he besought them to give a favourable hearing to the modest proposition of his hon. Friend.

Mr. POLLARD-URQUHART observed, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had exhorted them not to pass abstract Resolutions ; but he would remind the House that the repeal or diminution of the duties on paper, advertisements, and wine had in each case been preceded by a Resolution of that character. There must be a considerable difference of opinion on the subject between the right hon. Gentleman and some of his Colleagues. Some years ago when the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to reduce the duties upon wine, he dwelt with great force upon the adulteration to which wine was subjected. The argument was equally applicable to beer, and if it supplied a good reason for reducing the duty on wine, then it ought to be good for the reduction of the malt duty. He thought that free trade agriculturists had been too long treated on the principle of "Heads, I win, and tails, you lose." He therefore hoped that at the next opportunity the Chancellor of the Exchequer would take their case into consideration and do them justice.

Mr. NEATE, who had the following Notice on the paper :—

> "That the owners and occupiers of land, by reason of the immunities from Taxation which they now enjoy, and the comparative lightness of the burdens to which they are subject, are not entitled to any priority of consideration on any review of the Taxation of the Country,"

said, he had to apologize for not being present to move the Motion of which he had given Notice; but he had been under the impression that the House would not meet till six o'clock. He admitted that he had placed his Notice on the paper as a kind of challenge to the hon. Member for Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), and he regretted that he had not been in his place to make it good. If he had had an opportunity of moving his Resolution, he should have observed that he could not regard the agitation for a repeal of the malt tax in any other light than as one intended for the benefit of the landed interests. It was true that it had been argued as a consumer's question ; but he confessed he did not think the party opposite as the quarter where any great anxiety would be felt for the good of the consumer. Now he proposed to show that the agricultural interests enjoyed a great immunity from taxation. The most serious burden upon the land was no doubt tithe ; but as to the poor rate, about which so much was said, he did not see how it was more a burden upon land than upon any other property. The agriculturists complained of the exemption of stock-in-trade ; but, after all, what good would it do the agriculturists if that exemption were repealed ? If there were a National poor rate there might be something in the question ; but when the stock-in-trade of a parish was all of the same kind, it could not make any real difference; it would only make the difference between rating half or the whole of each man's property. No doubt land did contribute something, but it did not contribute to the same extent as personal property; and he thought it ought to pay up the arrears which were due from it in consequence of the unjust exemption it had so long enjoyed from the payment of probate duty. The land was in fact in the position of a man that presented a very small account to some one that had a very long account against him. He would do much better not to stir in the matter. One of the great questions that the next Parliament would have to consider would be that of direct as against indirect taxation. Now, the malt tax served as a buffer to shield the land from any attack ; but if it were ever removed it would leave it defenceless against inquiry into inequalities from which it now benefited. ["Divide, divide ! "] Did hon. Members who were crying out "Divide" really mean to act in the spirit of this Motion when they crossed the House ? He believed they did not ; and it was unworthy of a great party for mere electioneering purposes to hold out expectations which they never meant to fulfil.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, he should vote for the Resolution, although he should not have done so if it had proposed an immediate interference with the revenue. With regard to the proposition of the hon. Member for Oxford (Mr. Neate), implying that special exemptions were given to land, exceed in value the special burdens resting thereon, he had to say that whenever that hon. Gentleman should think fit to raise that issue, he (Mr. Newdegate) would be prepared to controvert the proposition. He should vote for the Resolution before the House, not merely with a view to the repeal of the malt tax, but with the intention of recording an opinion, that whenever a revision of taxation might be again considered, whenever there should be a surplus, which would render a reduction of taxation feasible, the subject of the malt tax should be considered not merely with reference to a repeal of the malt tax, but with reference to the position of the agricultural interest and the consumer as affected by the malt tax, and with a view to the adjustment of other taxation to the inequality produced by the malt tax if the malt tax is not repealed. It was for that purpose he gave his vote with the hon. Member for the North Riding in order to mark his sense of the injustice that would be done unless the incidence of the malt tax were considered in any future adjustment of taxation.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided* :—Ayes 166 ; Noes 118 : Majority 48.

LAW OF JERSEY.—OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. DIGBY SEYMOUR said, he rose to call attention to the system pursued of removing paupers and persons under sentence of banishment from Jersey to the seaports of England, especially Southampton. He had previously brought the Question before the House upon a memorial from the corporation of Southampton, complaining that people under sentence for crime, and paupers, were provided with a free passage from Jersey, and shipped to Southampton and other ports, where they became a burden to the ratepayers. He had been happy to hear that with regard to Guernsey that statement was not correct, but with regard to Jersey he was fortified with documents in support of the complaint he made on behalf of Southampton. In 1847, the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the state of the criminal law of the Channel Islands reported against the practice in question. The Jersey Civil Law Commissioners of 1859 also stated that strong representations had been made to them of the hardship to which the poorer classes who were not natives of Jersey were liable—of being at once removed from the Island to the place of their birth if they should become chargeable upon the rates. That was, they added, not only a great hardship upon the labouring classes, by whose industry the Island had for a long series of years been benefited, but also upon the port of Southampton, to which these paupers usually found their way. He had placed himself in communication with the authorities of Southampton; and by a letter from the clerk to the Board of Guardians, dated the 1st of June, 1864, it appeared that there was no doubt that since July, 1861, to December, 1863, no less than thirty-two persons either under sentence of banishment, or paupers who had no settlement in Jersey, had in this way been deported, become chargeable to the rates, and in that time cost the parish not less than £250. He had also been favoured with a letter from a resident in Jersey, whom he had asked whether persons belonging to the criminal class were allowed the privilege of a free passage. That gentleman replied that occasionally in cases before the Royal Court persons on promising to leave the Island were allowed to go without being sentenced, or after receiving very slight sentences. Another gentleman, who had published a work on the laws of Jersey, wrote to him stating that banishment from Jersey meant simply transportation to England; and that though the law had in practice been somewhat modified, so far as the severer penal cases were concerned, yet it might be revived and put in force at any time. That gentleman also mentioned an instance of some persons from Jersey being sent to the English hulks, where they were disposed of according to the English practice, and at English expense. Free passages were given to paupers, who were thrown on the shores of this country, and became chargeable to the English rates ; but he admitted that the paragraph in a petition he had formerly presented, stating that burglars and offenders of a high character were banished to England, was inaccurate. He begged to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, whether he has received any Report upon the subject from the Lieutenant Governor of Jersey?

SIR GEORGE GREY said, that when the hon. and learned Gentleman brought forward the subject some time ago he (Sir George Grey) stated that he had only received a report from the Lieutenant Governor of Guernsey, but not from the Lieutenant Governor of Jersey. He had, however, recently received a report from Jersey, upon the memorial of the corporation of Southampton. The memorial referred to the removal of persons charged with some crime to this country — he did not think it entered into the question of the removal of paupers — and therefore the Report of the Lieutenant Governor related only, he believed, to criminals or persons charged with crime. The best way of affording the House full information upon the subject would be to produce the memorial of the Town Council of Southampton, the letter referring it to the authorities of Jersey and Guernsey, and the Reports of the Lieutenant Governors of those Islands. If the hon. Gentleman would move for those papers they would be produced. But there had been in addition a correspondence conducted by the Poor Law Board with reference to the removal of paupers, which was quite a distinct question, but he had no doubt that that might be produced also.

COURT OF ADMIRALTY (IRELAND).

QUESTION.

MR. MAGUIRE said, he rose to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, When he will lay on the table of the House the promised Bill for regulating and reforming the Irish Court of Admiralty, and what his intentions are with regard to that measure? It would be remembered that a Bill was introduced by himself last year to assimilate the jurisdiction and practice of the Irish Court of Admiralty to those of the English Court, and in that course he was sustained by memorials and petitions from some of the foremost commercial bodies in the United Kingdom, including Lloyds, the Chambers of Commerce at Liverpool, Glasgow, and Manchester. The Court of Admiralty in England had been reformed several times with great advantage, its jurisdiction having been enlarged and the procedure simplified; and it was very necessary that the Irish Court should undergo similar amendment. Some difficulty might, perhaps, be raised by the Treasury, but the sum required was insignificant compared with the great benefit which would be secured to the commerce of the country. He withdrew his Bill on the understanding that the subject should be investigated by a Commission, which was then inquiring into another branch of the legal system of Ireland. After a very careful examination of the matter, the Commissioners reported very strongly in favour of an assimilation of the Irish Court in jurisdiction and practice to the English one. The reform in England had led to such an increase of business that, although the fees had been individually reduced, they had risen in the aggregate from £2,400 to £9,500 a year. The Commissioners were against the proposal to attach the jurisdiction of the Irish Admiralty Court to a Court of Common Law, and declared that it was desirable in the interests of shipping and commerce that the Court should, in accordance with the terms of the Union, be retained as a distinct and separate tribunal, exercising jurisdiction in Ireland in the same way and to the same extent as the Court of Admiralty in England. The Commissioners also reported that there was an almost universal concurrence of opinion among the classes interested in favour of the assimilation which they recommended. The jurisdiction of the Irish Court was at present very limited in many respects as compared with that of the English one; and a ship at Cork or Dublin did not enjoy the same advantages as at Liverpool or any other English port. A most objectionable practice also prevailed in Ireland, of allowing the registrar to detain in his possession during the trial of a case any money deposited in the Court. The salary of the Judge was much too little, and ought to be increased. As to compensation to the proctors on account of a change in the system, it would not exceed £1,500 a year. He begged to ask the Attorney General for Ireland, what he intended to do in regard to this important subject?

MR. O'HAGAN (THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND) said in reply, that, as one of the Commissioners, he could only endorse the Report, which, however, had only been issued a few days ago. He could assure the hon. Member that he took a strong interest in the matter. Not a moment should be lost without the subject being considered, although he could not pledge himself that the state of public business that Session would afford an opportunity for legislating during the present year.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY *considered* in Committee.

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again on *Monday* next.

INLAND REVENUE (STAMP DUTIES) BILL—[BILL 159.]—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

MR. HENNESSY said, he would beg leave to call the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the discrepancies which, he contended, existed between the Bill and a Bill introduced last Session with respect to brewers. On a former occasion the Chief Secretary for Ireland said that it would not be wise to assimilate the laws of England and Ireland on this subject; but in the present Bill there was a proposal for uniformity. He hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would state why the Irish brewers were included in the measure. He also wished to ask for explanation as to the 16th clause, which deprived magistrates of the power of allowing a person convicted of illicit distillation a few days for the payment of the penalty.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that hon. Members would readily understand why he had not made any statement on the Bill. It consisted of twenty clauses; but as no two of them related to one subject, he thought the better course would be to treat the Bill clause by clause. With reference to Clause 16, objected to by the hon. Member for the King's County, he would agree to postpone it, and the discussion could be taken on it when bringing up the Report. The 9th and 10th clauses merely facilitated the execution of the law; they imposed no new burden, and did not interfere at all with the provisions of the new Beer Act. One of them, indeed, would confer a great benefit upon licensed victuallers in Ireland, for it would allow them for the first time to brew their own beer.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 8, inclusive, were *agreed to.*

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN referred to an understanding with the Chancellor of the Exchequer on a previous occasion, that upon the introduction of the present measure the half yearly licences of Irish hawkers should be obtainable on the same principle as those obtained by English hawkers.

Clause 9 (Sections 54 to 65 of the 7 & 8 *Vict.* c. 52, and so much of Section 13 of the 3 & 4 *Will.* IV. c. 68, as relates to Brewers in Ireland, repealed).

MR. HENNESSY said, that the clause must interfere with the Beerhouses Bill, because the Government recommended that Bill as exceptional legislation, which, they said, was necessary for Ireland, while the clause declared that it was expedient that the laws relating to brewing should be made uniform throughout the United Kingdom.

COLONEL DUNNE said, that as the Bill was only delivered to hon. Members on the 18th inst., and no opportunity had been given to the brewers of Ireland to see and consider it, he should like to have some explanation as to its objects.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he could only repeat the explanation which he gave before the Speaker left the Chair. He was willing, however, if the hon. and gallant Gentleman desired it, to take care that there should be an opportunity of discussing on the Report any clauses the meaning of which he did not understand. The Bill had nothing to do with the Beerhouses Bill, one being of a fiscal character, and the other relating only to police regulations.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 10 (Extension to Ireland of certain provisions relating to Brewers in England).

MR. HENNESSY said, he wished to ask for some explanation.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: It is comprised in what I have said.

MR. HENNESSY: See how the Chancellor of the Exchequer is treating me! What is "comprised?"

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The statement which I made related to both clauses. They have both the same subject-matter.

MR. HENNESSY: That was a little irregular. The clause extended to Ireland certain sections of various Acts of Parliament, and he thought the right hon. Gentleman ought to tell the House what would be the effect of them when applied to Ireland.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that the hon. Gentleman had taken a course which was totally without precedent in that House. The regulations under which trades which were liable to revenue inspection were conducted were of the most voluminous character, and to call upon him to make such a statement as he had been asked for, and to read, as the hon. Member had done, to the House clauses which did not in the slightest degree explain themselves, was an abuse of the time and patience of the House. The hon. Gentleman had not raised a single definite objection to the clauses. When he stated that he objected to Clause 16, he immediately offered to postpone it, and he would have done the same with these clauses if any reason had been shown for taking such a course. Legislation of a complicated character could not be discussed in all its details, and he must decline to enter into all the details. He had already stated the general effect of these clauses. If objections were taken he would gladly meet them, and he would postpone the clauses if necessary; but he hoped the time of the House would not be wasted by pursuing the present discussion.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he had gone through the clauses, and could say that there was nothing objectionable in any one of those which it was proposed to extend to Ireland.

Mr. WHITESIDE said, he thought this a peculiar mode of legislation. The right hon. Gentleman was asked to state the effect of the clauses.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The effect has been stated.

Mr. HENNESSY: No description of them whatever was given.

Mr. WHITESIDE said, that if the Attorney General for Ireland would state that he had gone through all these Acts and could say that they were unobjectionable, he should be satisfied.

Colonel FRENCH said, all that was wanted was that there should be a plain statement of what the Act would do.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he would postpone the clauses until the Report if the hon. and gallant Gentleman would promise in the interim to read the sections and make up his mind whether they were objectionable or not.

Colonel DUNNE said, the proposal was merely to substitute the precautions practised in England for those practised in Ireland, and he really could not tell which were the more effectual. The chief objection seemed to be that so short a time had elapsed since the Bill was before the House that the Irish brewers really would not have time to consider the effect of those provisions.

Mr. HENNESSY said, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when appealed to for an explanation, had said that those clauses referred to some fiscal regulation; but he would inform the right hon. Gentleman of the scope of his own Bill. The effect of it would be in one instance to repeal an Act which prohibited adulteration, in the face of a recent statement by the Government that the adulteration of beer was increasing in Ireland. That was one mistake, and another was that a Bill only brought in on the 17th of June, which proposed to inflict on Irish brewers all the regulations existing in England, should be forced on by the Government without explanation, while, when a humble Irish Member asked for explanation, the right hon. Gentleman adopted a tone which was unworthy of his high position. In order to give the right hon. Gentleman an opportunity of looking into the Acts whose provisions he had incorporated in the Bill, but which he had evidently not read, he would move that the Chairman do report Progress.

Motion made and Question, "That the Chairman do Report Progress," — (*Mr. Hennessy,*)—put and *negatived.*

Mr. HENNESSY said that, having appealed in vain to the Chancellor of the Exchequer for an answer, he now put the question to the noble Lord at the head of the Government. The right hon. Gentleman, he thought, rather misunderstood his own position, and ought to have taken a lesson from what occurred not long ago. Having put upon the Notice paper several Amendments to one of the fiscal measures of the right hon. Gentleman, when it came on for discussion at a late hour a Motion of adjournment was made, and the right hon. Gentleman said—

The CHAIRMAN said, the hon. Member was not in order in referring to what was said in a former debate.

Mr. HENNESSY said, he thought that he was speaking strictly to the question. With regard to a Bill imposing restrictions similar to those contained in that at present before the Committee, he had ventured to move the adjournment of the debate. The right hon. Gentleman on that occasion said, that "an hon. Member who knew nothing of the subject had moved the adjournment of the debate." What was the result? On the very next stage the Bill was thrown out by a majority of four. It was a much more satisfactory mode of conducting business, that when explanations were asked for, they should be given at the time.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 11 to 15 *agreed to.*

Clause 16 *postponed.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered on *Monday* next.

COURT OF CHANCERY (IRELAND) BILL.

[BILL 78.]—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. LONGFIELD said that, bowing to the decision of the Speaker, that it was competent to re-commit the Bill, he intended to move that it be referred to a Select Committee. When the Attorney General for Ireland fixed the Bill for a morning sitting, objections were raised by Irish Members on that (the Opposition) side, from the feeling that they would be deprived of the attendance of English Members, upon whose good sense they relied to defeat what they considered to be a job. All the Irish Members who had given notice of Amendments were also engaged upon Committees, and then no fair opportunity for discussing the Bill would be afforded at morning sittings. It could not be expected that they would make a House to carry a job by which the Irish Members of the Administration were to be benefited. The right hon. Gentleman, however, did not consider the motives he (Mr. Longfield) had urged sufficient to induce him to alter his arrangement; but he fixed the Bill for a Tuesday morning sitting, when there were several Orders standing upon the paper. With some difficulty he (Mr. Longfield) left his Committee with a view of moving, if possible, the Amendment of which he had given notice. The Speaker, with his usual punctuality, was ready to take the Chair, but a House was not made till after half-past twelve. He could not longer absent himself from his Committee, which had not a quorum in his absence, and he had no option but to surrender. Defeated by the adroit generalship of the right hon. and learned Gentleman, he could not then bring forward the Motion of which he had given notice, and was obliged to reserve himself for another occasion. He had now, therefore, to move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. He entirely agreed with an able writer in the leading journal, that such was the only course, and it was quite a competent course for the House to pursue. The Bill contained 192 clauses, and embraced all manner of technicalities referring to the constitution, practice, procedure, and administration of the Court of Chancery in Ireland. The House was incompetent to deal with such a subject. Unhappily it involved also questions of patronage and jobbing, which a Select Committee upstairs was most competent to deal with, but which a Committee of the whole House, backed by all the power of the subterranean brigade, could not force through. If the Bill were really a *bonâ fide* measure, intended for the improvement of the Court of Chancery in Ireland, the House might feel assured that the Government would have no hesitation in referring it to a Select Committee. The Bill consisted of five different parts. The first and most important was the nomination of a Vice Chancellor, and the abolition of the Masters of the Court of Chancery. The others related to the procedure and practice of the Court of Chancery in Ireland, and to the superannuation and patronage of the different departments connected with the Court. The Bill, if passed, would add about £10,000 a year to the expense of the administration of justice in the Superior Courts in Ireland. At present the staff of Judges in Ireland numbered, as in England, twenty-two, with only one-tenth of the business. Besides, in Ireland they had the advantage of the four Masters, who were, in truth, Vice Chancellors, though with but small salaries, with which they appeared to be content. Shortly after the Court of Chancery in England had been reformed it was thought good to attempt to reform the Court of Chancery in Ireland on the English model. An Address was moved in the other House praying for the issuing of a Commission to inquire into the practice and procedure of the Court of Chancery in Ireland, with a view to diminish the cost to the suitor and the expenditure of the public money. In

1855 a Royal Commission sat, and recommended among other things the abolition of the Masters of the Court and the Commissioners of the Incumbered Estates Court, and the appointment of two Vice Chancellors. In 1856 a Bill on the subject was introduced into that House by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin, and a second Bill was at the same time brought in by the Government. Those Bills, involving the question of patronage, were referred to a Select Committee, on which sat Sir J. Graham, Mr. Walpole, Mr. Henley, the Law Officers of the Crown, and other eminent men; in fact, an abler Committee could not have been found for the task intrusted to them. The Committee was unanimously of opinion that those Bills were unadvisable, and they were accordingly dropped, and the country cheerfully acquiesced in the decision of the Committee, virtually superseding the unfortunate recommendation of the Royal Commissioners as to the appointment of Vice Chancellors. That Committee recommended, instead, a plan that was acceptable in Ireland and more economical. In 1861, however, another Royal Commission on the same subject was issued; and, to show the House how these things were managed, he might state that the new Commission included six of the very same Gentlemen who had sat as members of the former one. Of course, under those circumstances there could be but one result, namely, that the Commissioners would adhere to their preconceived opinions, and arrived at the conclusion at which they had an interest in arriving. He imputed to those Gentlemen, two of whom were in that House, nothing but what the House imputed to every Member in it when his interest was one way and his judgment was likely to be in the same direction. It required a declaration from every man before it allowed him to sit on the most insignificant group of railways that he had no personal interest himself, and that his constituents had none in the matter referred to him. The House knew that its Members were of the human race, and it took proper precautions against the operation of natural bias on their judgments. That, however, was not done in the case of the Royal Commission of 1861, which was so constituted that it was impossible it could be impartial. But that was not all. The English Commissioners knew nothing of the Irish Court of Chancery, and the Irish Commissioners knew nothing of the English Court; yet they had to consider how they might reduce the cost to suitors, keep down the expenditure of public money, and devise the best system of Chancery procedure. Not being competent themselves to do what they had been appointed to do, they began by at once selecting from the Irish Bar a gentleman of the highest capacity and skill to enlighten their confessed ignorance by drawing up for them an essay on the practice of the Irish Court of Chancery; and the same course was taken in regard to English Chancery practice. It certainly did seem ludicrous that when Royal Commissioners were chosen to inquire into a subject they should get other persons to do it for them. When the essays were printed they formed an octavo volume of some 400 pages, and he would charitably assume, though there might be room for doubt on the point, that all the Commissioners had read it. The Commissioners also sent a number of queries to some forty members of the Irish Bar, most of whom, having something else to do, took no notice of them. To reduce the cost of the suitors, or the expenditure of the public money, was wholly forgotten; but they did not forget the assimilation of the practice of the Court of Chancery in Ireland to that of the English Court of Chancery, because that assimilation would involve the abolition of efficient Judges in Ireland and the creation of new ones. But they did not ask a single question of any person who was acquainted with the practice of the English Court of Chancery. The Attorney General had frequently told the House that the proposed change would result in a saving, but there were such awkward things as facts and figures, and he would be a sanguine and a credulous man who should think that there would be any saving whatever, even a prospective one. The new offices immediately contemplated, of one Judge, half-a-dozen chief clerks, and half-a-dozen junior clerks, would form a present addition to the burdens of the country of £10,000 a year. The superannuations would be upwards of £11,000, for the influential gentlemen would be superannuated on full salaries, while the others would have to be content with two-thirds. And all that was irrespective of the building job. At the end of fifteen or twenty years, when those gentlemen who lived at home and enjoyed either their full salaries, or two-thirds of them died, then a saving to the public might, perhaps, commence; but that was problematical, because there was another clause in the Bill which authorized the creation of additional clerks from time to time, with the consent of the Treasury. If there was one way in which money could be spent mischievously and corruptly in Ireland, it was by adding to the Irish Judges. No one believed that new Judges were wanted; it was too absurd. But they were told that such was the recommendation of a Royal Commission. But how had the House dealt with the recommendations of various Royal Commissions before? The recommendations of the Royal Commission that sat ten years ago were afterwards referred to a Select Committee, which did not sanction them. They had the authority of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade for refusing to adopt the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Harbours of Refuge, on the ground that it was not impartially constituted, and that its members had an interest in carrying out a particular plan. And then there was the instance of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into certain public institutions in Dublin, who recommended the extinction of the Museum of Irish Industry.

Notice taken that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present—

MR. LONGFIELD resumed: The Royal Commissioners who investigated the subject, recommended the abolition of the masters in Chancery, and the substitution for them of a vice chancellor and chief clerks. That they had done entirely regardless of the cost to the country. They had not reported any evidence showing that the assimilation of the Irish and English practice would be judicious; but the Report exhibited on its very face that the idea was a preconceived one. The result would inevitably be that three of the Royal Commissioners would be provided for under the present Bill. Was that a Commission whose recommendations ought to be attended to? In that way the Royal Commissioners were voting themselves placemen to be paid by the public money, which they were told to save. He conceived that the House ought not to refuse to send the Bill to a Select Committee, the Members of which would be able to judge by evidence whether the measure would effect a public saving or not. It had been said that the Bill was for the good of Ireland; but there might be different opinions on that point, though it was certainly good for the Royal Commissioners. Indeed, when the Commissioners took upon themselves to declare the wishes of the people of Ireland, he was reminded of that French monarch who said, "I am the State," or the three gentlemen in Tooley Street, who claimed a right to speak in the name of the people of England. His right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Dublin had shown that the Bill would be attended with a great increase of cost to the suitors, and was the House to be told that it must swallow the measure, which increased the public expenditure and disregarded the interests of the suitors? He contended that it was a case which ought to be submitted to the investigation of a Select Committee. He had on other occasions voted with some hon. Members on the Ministerial side of the House to frustrate jobs. He had had the pleasure, in that way, of frustrating the South Kensington job; and if the result of sending the present Bill to a Select Committee was to postpone it, he would be glad, and still more glad if the Bill was altogether frustrated. A more senseless or extravagant project he never knew, and he moved, as an Amendment, that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

COLONEL DUNNE said, he rose to second the Amendment. Considering the thin state of the House, he thought that they were performing a most solemn farce in now pretending to discuss the Bill. An hon. Member connected with Ireland had twice or thrice moved that the House be counted in order to get it fuller, for it was well known that the subterranean brigade were ready, upon the usual summons, to emerge at any moment from the infernal regions. So far as a reform of the Court of Chancery, which the Bill proposed to effect, was concerned, he could only say, speaking as a country gentleman, that the mode in which the business of that Court was at present transacted in Ireland was perfectly satisfactory. Theoretically Chancery business might be better transacted in England, but Irishmen wanted no change in their system of Chancery procedure. There were in Ireland three masters, men of high legal attainments, and he saw no good reason why those three men should be paid salaries for retiring while others were put in their places who could not give greater satisfaction. He, for one, objected to the change, and should oppose the Bill in every shape and form.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the Bill be committed to a Select Committee,"—(*Mr. Longfield,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. HUNT said, he did not propose to discuss the merits of the Bill, but simply wished to enter his protest against the mode of proceeding which its promoters had adopted, believing them, as he did, to be acting in contravention of the established usages of the House. The Bill having been disposed of as it had been on Tuesday last, in Committee of the whole House, ought not, he thought, to be brought forward again in the present Session. On the occasion to which he referred the hon. and learned Member for Clare had, it seemed, voted by mistake with the majority, but he could say for himself, and he believed also for one or two other friends of his, that they were likewise the victims of a mistake, inasmuch as they thought the bell which rang two minutes before four o'clock on Tuesday could not be the division bell, and did not in consequence come into the House and vote in favour of the Chairman's leaving the Chair, as he at all events intended to have done. If a Bill were referred to a Select Committee and that Committee pronounced against it, it was not, he believed, usual to proceed with it in the House, and he did not see why the case in which a Bill happened to be disposed of by a Committee of the whole House should stand on a different footing. He recollected that in 1861, when the second reading of the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill was moved by Mr. M. Milnes, who had since been translated to a higher, and he hoped a happier sphere, he (Mr. Hunt) had moved a Resolution pointing out particular defects in it, but not amounting to its rejection, in the same way as the usual Motion made for that purpose. That Resolution he had carried by a small majority, and the Bill was disposed of for the time, but Mr. Milnes a few days after appealed to the Speaker to say whether he would be in order in proceeding with the measure that Session, and the decision was, that it was competent for the hon. Gentleman to appoint another day for the second reading; the Speaker, at the same time, however, informed him that when a Bill was defeated, as his had been, it was usual to take that defeat as an intimation that it should not again be pressed on the attention of the House. Now, the principle which governed that case applied, he thought, to the measure under discussion, and he hoped, therefore, its promoters would withdraw it from the cognizance of Parliament during the present Session.

MR. O'HAGAN (THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND) said, that as the House had already heard on two or three different occasions the same statements and imputations made in almost the same words as they had listened to that evening, and as he had on those occasions replied to those statements and imputations to the best of his ability, he should not go over ground again which he had before trodden. As to his own position in regard to the Bill, he could only say that it was not a measure of his, or, properly speaking, of the Government. In submitting it to the House he was simply endeavouring to carry out the recommendations solemnly made of a Royal Commission of the highest authority. Complaints having been made for many years of the gravest character with reference to the constitution and practice of the Court of Chancery in Ireland, all men belonging to the profession, and all persons outside the profession competent to form an opinion, felt that a change was necessary. At the instance not of the Government, but of a noble Lord who, as far as his Resolution went, was acting not in community with, but in opposition to, the Government, it pleased the Crown, upon an Address from the House of Lords, to appoint a Royal Commission. The fact that he, as one of the Law Officers of the Crown, was a Member of that Commission would not preclude him from bearing testimony to the eminent men, the highest in their respective professions at either side of the Channel, of whom it was composed, among them being the Master of the Rolls, the Attorney General, Sir W. Page Wood, and the hon. and learned Member for Belfast (Sir Hugh Cairns), whose recommendations seemed to meet with but scant approval from his political friends. The Commission, after full and conscientious inquiry, reported that Ireland ought to enjoy the benefit of those successive changes in the law which in England had been attended with great advantage, and have worked so satisfactorily for many years past. It then became a matter not of discretion but of duty with the Government to act upon their recommendations, and to produce a Bill carrying them into operation. As Attorney General for Ireland he was now discharging that duty; and the Attorney General for England would stand forward in due time to propose a measure giving effect to the Commissioners' recommendations regarding this country. He asked the House to believe that the measure had been framed for the general welfare, and not for the benefit of this man or that man. In fact, he felt ashamed to listen to the miserable insinuations that were put forward. The Bill had not come by surprise upon the House. It was introduced many months ago, and at the request of his hon. and learned Friends opposite had been postponed week after week to afford ample time for consideration. He thought it rather hard under such circumstances that he should be met with a suggestion to withdraw it on account of the advanced period of the Session. In its various stages it had been encountered with most obstinate, most unreasonable obstructions; not even the ordinary courtesy of being allowed to introduce it without an elaborate statement had been accorded to him. The clauses of the Bill, with the exception of 20 or 25, were all clauses copied from English Acts, working with the utmost satisfaction in Courts of Equity. The Bar of Ireland were most anxious to see the measure passed into law, the committee of the Incorporated Society had adopted resolutions in its favour, and only the previous day a meeting of the profession determined unanimously to support it. Representing, therefore, not only a Royal Commission, but the Bar, the solicitors, and the public of Ireland, he asked the House to adopt this Bill. Undoubtedly, he had endeavoured to press on the Bill at a day sitting, but it was well known that he had endeavoured ineffectually to obtain Friday and not Tuesday for the purpose. He trusted the House would pass a measure intended to give the country relief to the extent of £4,000 or £5,000 a year, and to confer upon Ireland the benefit of the English system.

Mr. WHITESIDE said, his right hon. and learned Friend had spoken with unusual ardour, considering that the subject of law amendment was one that generally tended to composure of the mind. As a young Member he would take the suggestion in good part, that the House was not absolutely bound by the recommendations of any body of men, even though they might include the Law Officers of the Crown. The question was simply, whether a number of new places should be created and a number of old ones abolished? His right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland had determined not to be bound by the decisions of the Committee and to persist in pressing on his Bill. He had rather attempted to take the House by storm than to persuade it by argument. It was quite true that a highly inconvenient day was fixed for the discussion of the question, when it was known that many Irish Members could not attend, and while he was collecting his books and papers Clause 11 was arrived at, and several good places created. He then exercised his undoubted right of stating his objections to the Bill, and the division was taken, in which his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Clare got into somewhat of a scrape. He believed that if the hon. and learned Gentleman had been content with recording his own vote, and had been less zealous in canvassing for other votes for the Government, the accident would not have happened. His Motion that the Chairman leave the Chair, which he had no doubt he would have been very glad to do, was read early in the day, and he could not suppose that the Government were ignorant of its importance. The Committee knew what it meant, and after hearing the discussion decided in favour of it. He did not dispute the ruling of the right hon. Gentleman, that it was quite competent for the House to rescind what had been done in Committee; but Mr. May's book distinctly stated that, as a general rule, when the Chairman of Committee had been moved out of the Chair, the Bill was supposed to be dropped for the Session. It was perfectly ludicrous to represent it as a wrong to Ireland that there should be any delay in appointing a vice chancellor and train of officers, when there was no place for them to sit in and no business for them to do. Such a statement was too much for the patience of even so patient a man as himself. The names connected with the Select Committee which inquired into the subject carried with them as much weight as the names of the Commission. The Committee was not content with sending papers round to be filled up, but examined witnesses of great experience and authority; and, after a very careful investigation, decided that the existing tribunal was more useful and economical than the new one proposed. It was rather singular that the witnesses, whose evidence was not acted upon by the Committee, were appointed members of the Commission, and of course they supported their own testimony by reporting against the decision of the Committee. It had been supposed that the duties of the Commission were at an end; but he had, to his surprise, received a letter from Mr. Napier stating that the Commissioners were to meet in London in the first week of July to settle the official establishment of the Court of Chancery. Who could have imagined that such a measure as that now under consideration would have been introduced before the Commission had come to a decision on that part of the subject? Prior to the Commission coming to any conclusion on that point, the House was asked to appoint a vice chancellor, with £4,000 a year, in the interim, for doing nothing. Mr. Napier also mentioned that the Bill had never been shown to him, as, being a Commissioner, it certainly ought to have been. One of his right hon. Friend's own witnesses, a Queen's Counsel, was examined as to taking the accounts, and he stated that the practice to be adopted ought to be similar to that in the Landed Estates Court, which had worked admirably well. He therefore called upon the Attorney General for Ireland to recast his Bill, because the chief clerk was not wanted in Ireland. The Commissioners, no doubt, found the chief clerk system existing in England; but side by side with the Court of Chancery in Ireland was the Court which he had the honour to reconstruct, and in which the Judge who sold the estates disposed of the accounts and settled the question of the money. If the Bill were withdrawn for the purpose of being re-considered during the recess, he would recommend the right hon. and learned Gentleman to strike out every clause relating to the chief clerk, and enact that the Judge should do the whole business himself. It was a proper subject of inquiry—and if the Secretary to the Treasury did his duty, he would look into the matter and consider whether the Landed Estates Court might not give one of its Judges, with the staff, so as to save £6,000 a year, and at the same time accomplish the chief object in view. The right hon. and learned Gentleman declared that the whole profession as well as the public had called out for this Bill. He maintained, on the contrary, that the profession were generally opposed to it. It was stated in the draught of the measure that the chief clerks were all to be solicitors. He had the highest respect for the body of solicitors, but he doubted the wisdom of converting them suddenly into Judges. He was told that the certificates of the chief clerks in England were often very long, very complicated, and frequently objected to. Mr. Rogers in his evidence said, that the taking of accounts was often the most important part of the case, that it was of the most vital importance to the parties concerned, and that in dealing with it, points of law of extreme nicety were to be decided. Mr. Rogers added that it was better that these matters should be decided by the Judge himself. He challenged his right hon. Friend to read him one passage from the evidence in which it was stated, that the taking of these accounts would be better done by the persons on whom the duty would be thrown by the Bill than by the Judges of the landed estates, or by the present masters. A vast quantity of the business of the Court required to be transacted in a cheap, easy, and expeditious manner. The right hon. Gentleman was under the impression that the business would be more cheaply done under his Bill. He had, however, asked one of the most experienced officers of the Court of Chancery to give him in writing his opinion on the subject of cost. That gentleman stated his belief that the increase of expense would be more than one-third compared with the present system. Would the right hon. Gentleman point out in favour of his Bill one single scrap of evidence on that vital question in every legal reform—the question of cost? He felt confident that the Attorney General for Ireland would be able during the recess to draw up a more compendious and cheaper Bill for carrying out many of the suggestions of the Commission. Considering the character and size of the Bill, the differences of opinion which prevailed, and the late period of the Session, he appealed to his right hon. Friend to postpone the measure for another year. It was the opinion of the Master of the Rolls that more than one-half of the reforms in this Bill could be effected by general orders. Those orders might be drawn up in the recess, and Her Majesty's Attorney General would, no doubt, look them over. He warned every hon. Gentleman who cared a farthing for the public purse, of the increased expense which the Bill would cause. When some of the gentlemen whom it was proposed to pension off made their appearance before the Committee of 1856, it was shrewdly remarked that they seemed in very good health; and he was happy to inform the House that they were still alive and capable of work. As vacancies occurred among the Masters, he would recommend his right hon. Friend not to fill them up. Let the number fall down gradually to one, and if his right hon. Friend was determined to have a vice chancellor, let him take one of the Judges of the Landed Estates Court—that admirable Englishman, Mr. Hargrave, or one of the others—with all his staff. There were many other questions of great importance which he should like to have discussed had there been time; but, in conclusion, he would suggest that his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Mallow should withdraw his Amendment, and he would then move his, which was more direct — that the Speaker leave the Chair that day three months.

MR. LONGFIELD said, he had no objection to adopt the suggestion, and would therefore withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Whiteside,*)

—instead thereof.

MR. BUTT said, he hoped that the House would clearly understand before it went to a division, that the short question before it was, Whether reforms which had been carried on in England, and found to work most successfully, should be extended to Ireland?

MR. GEORGE said, that a Bill of 192 clauses, which proposed to alter the whole practice and procedure of the Irish Court of Chancery, required a great deal more discussion than it had received before it could possibly become law. The Masters in Chancery in Ireland fulfilled the very duties which they proposed to create expensive officials to discharge. The Commission of 1861 was composed of men of the highest character, but the Committee of 1856 was equally composed of men of the highest character. It was strange, however, that no reference was made in the Commission of 1861 to the labours of the former Committee. Not a single English witness was examined by that Commission. The labours of the masters had been most valuable. Out of 14,400 cases decided by them in ten years there were only 137 appeals, and only forty reversals. He believed that the change proposed was unpalatable to the whole Bar of Ireland.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 51; Noes 49: Majority 2.

Original Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. VANCE said, that after the very narrow majority by which the Government had defeated the Amendment of his right hon. and learned Friend the Member for the University of Dublin, he thought they should not press the Motion for going into Committee. He understood that eleven of the clauses had been agreed to when only four or five Members were present, and he therefore thought that they ought to re-commit the Bill *de novo.* As, however, he did not think they ought to be called upon to go into the clauses at that late hour (twenty minutes to twelve o'clock), he would move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Vance.*)

SIR GEORGE GREY said, it was true the majority just obtained by the Government was a small one, but it was larger than that by which the Motion for the Chairman to leave the Chair was carried on Tuesday last. If the House would allow the Speaker to leave the Chair, and would go into Committee on the Bill, the Government would not proceed with any of the clauses that night; and before the Committee on the Bill was resumed, his right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland would consider what course he should take with reference to the measure, regard being had to the circumstances which had already taken place, and to the period of the Session at which the House had arrived.

MR. HUNT observed that, as it was obvious the Government could not carry the Bill during the Session, it would be more graceful of them to at once withdraw it.

MR. O'HAGAN (THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND) said, the subject was one of great importance with reference to proceedings in Ireland, and he did not think that he ought to be called on to come to a decision off-hand as to the fate of the Bill, but he would give the matter his best consideration.

Question put.

The House *divided:*— Ayes 51 ; Noes 56 : Majority 5.

Original Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. COLLINS moved the adjournment of the House. After the division which had taken place he thought they ought not to proceed that night with the discussion of the Bill. Perhaps the noble Lord would tell them whether he knew of a single instance of the attempt to set aside the decision of the House that the Chairman should leave the Chair.

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Collins.*)

SIR GEORGE GREY said, no doubt the hon. Member was a great authority in these matters, but he ought to have recollected that the Speaker, in answer to a question addressed to him, had declared that the course which had been pursued was strictly in accordance with the rules of the House.

MR. WHITESIDE said, he did not understand that such a proposition had been laid down. On the contrary, he thought the rule was that a vote that the Chairman do leave the Chair was regarded by any Gentleman charged with a Bill as a strong hint not to introduce it again. It seemed, however, that with right hon. Gentlemen opposite the strongest argument in favour of the Bill was that the opinion of the House had been pronounced against it.

COLONEL W. STUART said, that though the Speaker had decided that they might, according to the letter of the law, go on with the Bill, yet they all felt that it was sharp practice to go on with it with only a majority of two in favour of such a proceeding, while a majority of one the other day had stopped the progress of the Bill. The other day the Chief Secretary for Ireland was present, but to-night he was not in his place.

MR. ESMONDE said, he would remind the House that the Bill had only been put into its present position by the operation of the letter of the law, for if there had been any Parliamentary equity, the vote of the hon. Baronet (Sir Colman O'Loghlen) would have been recorded according to his intention.

MR. F. S. POWELL said, he did not understand the feverish anxiety of the Government to pass the Bill, and to cover their reputation at the expense of the sister country. He hoped they would yield to the undoubted feeling of the House, and take further discussion at a reasonable hour.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that his right hon. and learned Friend did not ask them to make further progress with the Bill that night, but he did wish that effect should be given to the Vote which had been twice taken. He protested against the assumption that a majority of the House in Committee was to prevent the House receiving the Bill. If that were so, measures of great importance might be frustrated by a casual Treasury Bench majority.

Question put.

The House *divided :*—Ayes 53 ; Noes 56 : Majority 3.

Original Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. LYGON said, he wished it to be understood that he felt himself incompetent to discuss the Bill upon its merits, but having watched its varying fortunes, fluctuating as they did every five minutes, he would ask the Government if they intended to persevere with it. If it were right to reinstate it upon a technical objection, it was perfectly right also for that side of the House to urge technical objections against its progress. He begged leave, therefore, to move the adjournment of the debate.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON said, that there was one great difference between the objects of the two sides of the House. The Government desired to see the Bill discussed on its own merits, and to have it passed if the House concurred in the opinion they held of the advantages which they believed it would confer, while the other side of the House desired to prevent its passing under any circumstances—not to defeat it by argument, but to prevent its progress by offering every obstruction in their power. As, however, the point was not in reality one of great importance, the Government would consent to the adjournment of the debate.

Debate *adjourned* till *Monday* next.

DRAINAGE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LANDS (IRELAND) BILL—[Bill 100.]

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Frederick Peel.*)

Mr. GEORGE said, that this Bill was a most unjust one, though in a very small compass. There was in existence no Act of Parliament which gave rent charges for drainage a priority over other incumbrances as regards unimproved land; and as he objected to such a priority, he begged to move that the Bill be read a second time that day three months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. George.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. BAGWELL said, he did not see what was the use of the Bill, for until the Government undertook the arterial drainage of the country nothing could be done.

Mr. PEEL said, that the Act of the last Session was coming into rather extensive operation, and it would be very undesirable if, after all the trouble that had been taken to form district boards, they should find that the security which they could give the Government for loans was not such as it could accept. The Bill was mainly intended to repair that defect; and he could not see, therefore, what exception could be taken to it. The mortgages of persons who had a priority of claim before the Government would really be improved by the draining of the land; but if there were any case of hardship, he should be glad to insert words in Committee to meet it.

Mr. WHITESIDE said, that there was something in the objection to the Bill, but as the right hon. Gentleman proposed to improve it in Committee, he would not oppose the second reading.

Mr. O'HAGAN (The Attorney General for Ireland) said, the land drained would often not be worth the expense of the drainage, and therefore the cost was proposed to be secured on the adjoining land not required to be drained; otherwise the money would not be advanced at all for the draining. He would suggest that the second reading should be agreed to, modifications being made in Committee.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read 2°, and committed for *Monday* next.

House adjourned at One o'clock, till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, June 27, 1864.

MINUTES.]—*Sat First in Parliament* — The Duke of Cleveland, after the Death of his Brother.

Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Superannuation (Union Officers)* (No. 154); Civil Bill Courts (Ireland) (No. 67); Servants Hiring (Scotland)* (No. 146); Coventry Free Grammar School* (No. 153).

Committee—Army Prize (Shares of Deceased)* (No. 106); Countess of Elgin and Kincardine's Annuity* (No. 149).

Report—Army Prize (Shares of Deceased)* (No. 106); Countess of Elgin and Kincardine's Annuity* (No. 149).

Third Reading—Beer Houses (Ireland)* (No. 134), and *passed.*

DENMARK AND GERMANY.

THE CONFERENCE.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

Earl RUSSELL: My Lords, I have to lay upon your table, by command of Her Majesty, the Protocols of the proceedings of the Conference upon the affairs of Denmark and Germany, which has just been brought to a close. In laying these papers upon your Lordships' table I propose to follow the course which was pursued by the Earl of Liverpool in 1823, and I am confident that in following that example I am pursuing a course which is perfectly fair to this House and to the country. In that case the English Government had been carrying on negotiations first at Verona, the Conference at which place was attended by the Duke of Wellington, and afterwards at Paris, on the subject of the invasion of Spain. The Government of that day declared that the invasion of Spain was contrary to all the principles of English policy, and that it was an interference which was entirely opposed not only to the sentiments of this country, but to the settlement of Europe which had been come to some years before.

They, therefore, protested against it, while at the same time they thought it advisable to preserve peace and declare a neutrality between this country and France. Upon the present occasion I have to discuss a question which is of a very intricate nature, and which for a long time was considered to be one that might go on for many many years without raising any exciting interest, and which was almost too complicated and too wearisome to engage much of the public attention. For the last year, however, that question has been in a very different condition.

My Lords, before I refer to the proceedings of the Conference it is necessary to take some notice of those engagements which have been the origin of these disputes, though they were intended to put an end to all differences between Germany and Denmark. Your Lordships are well aware that in these times it is necessary that a treaty should not only have the signatures of envoys and the ratifications of Sovereigns, but that in its working it should be made to accord with the sentiments and wishes of the people who are to be governed under it. A remarkable instance of difference in this respect has occurred with regard to the operation of the Treaty of Vienna of 1815 with respect to Lombardy, and the operation of the same treaty with reference to Genoa. Your Lordships are aware that for many years great discontent prevailed in Lombardy, which was only removed by the separation of that province from Austria. On the other hand, in Genoa, by the wise and patriotic conduct of the Kings of Sardinia, all the objections, all the repugnance, which originally existed in Genoa against their rule have been finally overcome and removed, and Piedmont and Genoa are now in perfect harmony. Unfortunately the Treaty of 1852 in regard to Denmark, and the engagements which were entered into in the previous year, 1851, with respect to an arrangement between Germany and Denmark, were in their operation exceedingly unsatisfactory. It was declared, and has lately been repeated in the Conference, that an attempt was made by the King of Denmark, contrary to the engagements of 1852, and contrary also to all sound policy, to make the people of Schleswig change their national character, and so to interfere with their churches and schools as to keep up a perpetual irritation, thereby violating the spirit of the engagements between Denmark and Germany. How far those accusations were true as regards the exact letter of those engagements I will not stop to inquire; but it is quite certain that there was prevailing in Schleswig great dissatisfaction at the manner in which the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein were governed, and that great complaints were made on that account against the Danish Government. It was for a long time the public opinion in this country that Germany had no reason to complain of Denmark as violating her engagements; but I am afraid that, by an impolitic course at all events, the Danish Government produced the feeling in Germany that the subjects of the King of Denmark of the German race were not fairly governed. Oppression there could not be said to be. The Government was a free Government, and, generally speaking, the people living under it were prosperous; but there was in the two Duchies much of that irritation which prevailed in Belgium previous to its separation from Holland. On the other side, it must be said that the German Governments, instead of asking that which might fairly have been demanded — instead of asking that the engagements should be kept in their spirit, and that arrangements should be made (which could easily have been devised) to give satisfaction to the people of the Duchies—made proposals inconsistent, as it appeared to me, with their engagements, pushing beyond their legitimate sense the words of those engagements, and suggested arrangements which, if they had come into operation, would have made Denmark completely subject to Germany. Among other proposals—indeed, one of the chief — was that the 900,000 people who were said to be of German race, and even the 50,000 of the Duchy of Lauenburg, should have a representation equal to that of the 1,600,000 inhabitants of the kingdom of Denmark. This was evidently so unfair and calculated to be so destructive of Danish independence and nationality, that Denmark refused to accede to it. It was, in fact, such a proposal as if Scotland and Ireland were to demand each an equal number of representatives with England in the Imperial Parliament. The consequence of these disputes, unfortunately, was, that instead of the treaty taking root and fully satisfying the wishes of the people of the Duchies, there was a kind of never-ceasing irritation which burst forth as occasion arose; and, as Germany was greatly more powerful than Denmark, it was but too probable that the latter would have to suffer one day on account of the complaints which were made by the Germans. It was impossible not to foresee that such would probably be the consequence, and that the irritation to which I allude would not go on for ever without exciting great dissension and perhaps war. Therefore in September, 1862, when I was at Brussels in attendance on Her Majesty, I explained to Sir Augustus Paget, who was shortly about to return to Denmark, a plan of pacification which it appeared to me would keep the Duchies under the rule of the King of Denmark; which would be satisfactory to themselves; which would give them a Minister for Schleswig and a body of representatives; a Minister for Holstein and a body of representatives, and would thus put an end for ever to the demand that at Copenhagen there should sit a majority of representatives for the Duchies. The Danish Government—as I think unfortunately—utterly rejected that proposal, and matters went on in the same unsatisfactory state. The diplomatic correspondence which the British Government proposed should take place did take place between Germany and Denmark, but it only produced increased bitterness and further irritation. At length in October, 1863, the German Governments at Frankfort declared that they must proceed to Federal Execution. If, my Lords, that Federal Execution had been founded on any infringement of the rights of Holstein — if it had been founded solely upon the misgovernment of Holstein, or on any violation of the rights of the Confederation, no Power would, I think, be entitled to complain of it. It embraced, however, a point which had nothing to do with Federal rule—the point of an equal representation at Copenhagen. It was, then, that the British Government declared that that could not be a matter of indifference, because it aimed, in fact, not only at the integrity, but at the independence, of Denmark. Things remained in this state until the death of the King of Denmark, which produced an entire alteration in the state of affairs. It was then contended on behalf of Germany that, after looking closely into some very intricate questions of representative and hereditary succession, they were bound to declare that the King of Denmark had no right to succeed to the Duchies, but that by the law of the Confederation the Prince of Augustenburg was the proper heir to the throne. This declaration, adopted almost throughout the whole of Germany, was received with applause not only by the popular, but by the Conservative party; by persons of the highest rank as well as by the general mass of the community; and every Government that pretended to adhere to the Treaty of 1852 was denounced as recreant to the cause of Germany. In this state of affairs the Governments of Austria and of Prussia took a somewhat singular and not very defensible course. In the beginning they declared in the Diet that, having a majority in favour of this declaration, they would proceed to Federal Execution — thereby, to all appearance, making the present King of Denmark responsible for that which was done by the late King, and to all intents and purposes, as it would seem, acknowledging his sovereignty over Holstein. They, at the same time, however, somewhat privately and without the general knowledge of Europe, declared that they reserved the question of the succession. It did not appear to the Danish Government, nor did it appear to Her Majesty's Government, that Federal Execution could be resisted without increasing the complications of the position. But, immediately after that took place, Austria and Prussia declared that they must occupy the Duchy of Schleswig in order to obtain the fulfilment of the engagements of 1852. Your Lordships are well aware that shortly before that declaration the Government of Denmark announced that they were ready to repeal the Constitution of November, 1863, which was the apparent ground of the proposed Federal Execution. Unfortunately, they had not acceded to that proposal when Lord Wodehouse went to Copenhagen, and when the concession might have been effectual. The German Governments, in their hurry to go to war, and being evidently determined on going to war—in the first place in order to gratify the German sentiment on the subject — took no heed of the proposal which was made by the British Government, and which was supported by France and Russia, that a protocol should be signed by the different Governments, binding Denmark to a repeal of the Constitution of November, and the German troops of Austria and Prussia entered Schleswig. I think it was impossible for the British Government to give any advice on this occasion. It was evidently the invasion of a territory which did not in any way belong to Germany, and a territory to which according to our view the King of Denmark had the fullest right. It was said that it was to be occupied as "a material guarantee;" but no country is, I conceive, obliged to submit to an occupation of its territory which it believes it has the power and right to resist. Your Lordships are fully aware of the events of the war which subsequently took place. It resulted, as must naturally be expected, in the defeat of the Danes and the occupation of the Duchiés by an overwhelming force of Austrian and Prussian troops. That being so, and the Austrian Government having always said that they were ready to agree to a Conference, and Prussia assenting to that proposal, Her Majesty's Government proposed that a Conference should be held. The Danish Government refused an armistice, but declared themselves ready to enter into a Conference. The Austrian and Prussian as well as the French Government expressed a wish that it should be attended by a Plenipotentiary of the German Confederation, and after some delay one was sent. The Conference was not assembled regularly until the 25th of April, and some delay then took place with a view of obtaining, if not an armistice, at least a suspension of arms for a considerable period. The Danish Government would not agree to an armistice; but a suspension of arms they did agree to, which was only to last for the period of four weeks. My Lords, it was difficult in matters so intricate, and on which passions had been so much roused, to come to any agreement beforehand; but Her Majesty's Government thought it their duty to proceed to the Conference, in the interests of peace, even without any such agreement. On the 12th of May, after the suspension of arms had been agreed to, I asked the Austrian and Prussian Governments to declare what it was they asked for in the interests of peace. Now, be it observed that although the Prussian Government, and the Austrian Government likewise, had continually declared that they had certain engagements to insist upon which had not been fulfilled, they never yet had agreed to specify what these engagements were which would secure peace, and by which they would be bound. When Lord Wodehouse went to Berlin on his way to Copenhagen he endeavoured, according to the instructions he had received, to obtain some explanations from the Prussian Government on this point. The Prussian Government replied, "Let the Danish Government first repeal the Constitution of November, and we will afterwards see what arrangement they propose to put in the place of that; we will judge of that proposal and give our opinion upon it." Nothing, I must say, could be less explicit, or a less justification for the course they were pursuing; because at the same time they were ready to carry on war to the extremity, to use all their means to invade Schleswig with all the dreadful consequences, without making a distinct declaration of their terms. When, however, the Powers were assembled in Conference, and the Plenipotentiaries of Austria and Prussia were obliged to meet the Plenipotentiaries of Russia, France, and Sweden as well as of Great Britain, they found themselves compelled to make some statement of the terms which they would require. Be it observed that throughout—even up to the 31st of January—the two German Governments had declared that they adhered to the Treaty of London, and the execution and occupation were proofs that they still adhered to the integrity of the Danish Monarchy. Her Majesty's Government, therefore, had no reason to suppose that their proposal would be of a different character. We were told, however, upon authority so high as to be almost official, that there was an intention on their part to propose what was called a personal union; and that personal union was to be of this nature—that the whole Duchy of Holstein and the whole Duchy of Schleswig were to be united; they were to have a separate army and navy from those of Denmark; that they were to have complete self-government; and, in fact, that the King of Denmark was to have scarcely any influence over the two Duchies. In one of the last meetings of the Conference M. Quaade, one of the Danish Plenipotentiaries, declared that if that personal union had ever been proposed, it would have been impossible for the Danes to agree to it. Indeed, it was likely that, with the disposition which prevailed in Germany, German agitation would have produced a declaration of separation on the part of the two Duchies, and German arms would then have supported the Duchies in that wish for separation. Therefore, though nominally maintaining the integrity of Denmark, and though nominally adhering to the Treaty of 1852, the proposition of a personal union would have been, in fact, a separation of the Duchies from Denmark under a very thin transparent disguise. That, however, was not the exact proposal of the German Plenipotentiaries. In the meeting of the 17th of May the first Plenipotentiary of Prussia declared that—

> "What the Austrian and Prussian Governments wished was a pacification which would assure to the Duchies absolute guarantees against the recurrence of any foreign oppression, and which, by thus excluding for the future any subject of dispute, of revolution, and of war, would guarantee to Germany that security in the North which she requires in order not to fall again periodically into the state of affairs which brought on the present war. These guarantees can only be found in the complete political independence of the Duchies and their close connection by means of common institutions."—*Protocol*, No. 5.

Now, this declaration on the part of the two Powers is not a little remarkable. Your Lordships will observe the phrase, "guarantee against foreign oppression." That oppression meant the oppression of the Government of the King of Denmark. But he was Duke of Holstein *de facto* and *de jure*, his title had never been disputed, and his government, if it was oppressive, could only be a domestic oppression. The two Powers, therefore, of Austria and Prussia, to whom Europe had a right to look for respect for the faith of treaties, declared at once that the government of the Danish Duchies was of the nature of a foreign oppression. At the same time, the declaration "for a security against any subject of dispute, war, and revolution," was so ambiguous that none of the Plenipotentiaries could tell what its meaning was. The Russian Plenipotentiary said he was quite at a loss to know what it meant. The French Plenipotentiary followed in the same tone; and for a long period we were quite unable in the Conference to say what was really the intention of the two Powers. We asked who was to be the Sovereign of these two Duchies which were to be thus governed? The answer of the German Plenipotentiary was that that was a question to be decided by the Diet. Austria and Prussia, but more especially Austria, had declared hitherto that the Treaty of 1852 was a question that was decided—that the late King of Denmark had a right to settle the succession, and that his decision in favour of Prince Christian, the present King of Denmark, would be respected by those Powers. It was equally notorious that the Diet, if it met, would, by a considerable majority, declare against the title of the King of Denmark. Count Bernstorff did not deny that, and the Plenipotentiary of the German Diet declared at once that the majority of the Diet would never consent to an arrangement which, even in an eventual or conditional form, would sanction a union between the Duchies and Denmark. Thus, while the two Powers, Austria and Prussia, were in appearance consenting to the maintenance of the Treaty of 1852, telling us that the Diet might ultimately decide in favour of the King of Denmark as the legitimate heir, the German Plenipotentiary, who, in fact, had greater Power than either the Plenipotentiaries of Austria or Prussia, because they never at any time ventured to oppose that which he declared to be the will of Germany, declared that Germany would never consent to the restoration of the Duchies to Denmark.

My Lords, at the next meeting of the Conference, which took place on the 17th of May, there was a more positive declaration. Austria and Prussia then declared that they could no longer acknowledge the King of Denmark as Sovereign of the Duchies; that the whole of the two Duchies ought to be separated from Denmark and placed under the sovereignty of the Prince of Augustenburg; that he should be declared the rightful possessor of the throne of these Duchies, and that that was a declaration which would be hailed throughout Germany and would meet the wishes of the German people. Before this declaration was made, in preparation for such an event, the Plenipotentiaries of the neutral Powers had met to consider the situation. The Government of France had had some communication with the Government of this country. The French Government had declared that they thought the personal union could not be the foundation of a lasting peace, and that the only mode of obtaining such a peace would be to separate the Danish nationalities in the Duchies from the German nationalities. After these communications I consulted the other neutral Plenipotentiaries, who met at my private house for the purpose of considering the matter. We came to the conclusion that it was useless to propose that the two Duchies should remain under the King of Denmark. It was quite obvious that unless we had been prepared—I should say all of us prepared—to carry on a great war for the purpose, after the hostilities which had taken place, after the declarations which had been made by the German Powers, if anything like a personal union had been established there would at once have been a declaration on the part of the Duchies and on the part of the German Confederation, supported by Austria and Prussia, that the Prince of Augustenburg was entitled to hold the Duchies, and that he was the rightful Sovereign; and that if the Danish troops entered to dispute possession of the Duchies, they would be opposed by Austria, Prussia, and the whole Confederation. We had therefore to consider what we could propose which would be most favourable to Denmark under the circumstances which I have stated to your Lordships. Of course we could only propose something of a diplomatic nature, which we thought likely to be accepted. We accordingly prepared a proposition, which I as President of the Conference was to submit, and which I was assured would be supported by the Plenipotentiaries of France and Sweden, and as far as possible by the Russian Plenipotentiary, though he had not then received definite instructions. What we proposed was that the King of Denmark should yield to Germany the Duchy of Holstein and the Southern portion of the Duchy of Scheswig—that the boundary should be drawn as far as the Schlei, and should go along by the Dannewerke; that there should be no menacing fortresses on the boundary; that the German Powers should not interfere any further or any more in the internal affairs of Denmark; and that a general guarantee should be given by the European Powers for the rest of the Danish possessions. With regard to this proposal, the Danish Plenipotentiaries made a declaration which I think did that Government the highest honour. They declared that the King of Denmark had accepted the Crown of that country according to the Treaty of 1852, thinking that his doing so would tend to the peace of Europe and to preserve the balance of power; but, as the surrender of a great part of his territory was now demanded, he was ready to make that concession, provided that entire independence and self-government were left to the remainder of his dominions. The King of Denmark declared he was ready to accept the line of the Schlei as proposed; and without defining it he declared it was necessary there should be a military and commercial line drawn for the sake of the independence of Denmark; and he declared moreover that there should be an European guarantee for the possession of the remainder of his territory. The German Governments, while they accepted the proposal for the partition of Schleswig—while they no longer demanded the whole of that Duchy—declared that, according to their views, the line of demarcation must go much further north. They said that the line must be from Apenrade to Tondern; and that they could not assent to the line proposed on the part of the neutral Plenipotentiaries. They declared, at the same time, they were perfectly ready to agree that, with regard to the territory to be left to the King of Denmark, there should be no right of interference and no interference whatever with the independence of Denmark. I confess, my Lords, it appeared to me that the proposal we submitted was the best arrangement that could be made. It was not to be expected that those Duchies could be retained under the nominal sovereignty of the King of Denmark without giving rise to fresh disputes and fresh complications. It was obvious, also, that if that sovereignty had been admitted to be vested in the King of Denmark, there would be constant interference on the part of Germany, and that interference, which has gone on for the last twelve years, giving rise to continual disputes, would cause constant contentions in future. It would be far better that Denmark should have a restricted territory, with the understanding that in her restricted territory her own Government should have absolute control, than that she should be subject to perpetual interference and control on the part of the German Powers. The French Government more especially took that view. The French Plenipotentiary declared it had always been the opinion of his Government that the division of the nationalities was the cause of all the complications which had taken place, and that nothing could be settled satisfactorily until there had been a separation of the nationalities; but he declared in the name of the Emperor, at the same time, that it was necessary great forbearance should be shown towards Denmark as the weaker Power; that the part evidently and confessedly German should be given to the Duchy of Holstein; and with regard to the mixed districts, as well as the Danish part, they should be left to Denmark as a means of preserving her independence, and giving her a mercantile and military line. Unhappily, my Lords, upon this occasion, as throughout those questions, the German Powers, instead of taking those views of generosity and forbearance which were urged so well by the Emperor of the French, determined to insist on what, undoubtedly, was their right if the right of conquest was the only one to be considered. They stood on the right of conquest; they stood on the victory they had gained on the disputed territory; but with respect to generosity and forbearance towards a Power so disproportionate to themselves—with respect to a due consideration for the peace of Europe—with respect to the absence of a desire to rush again into war in order to retain that which by right of conquest they might say they had acquired—I should not be treating your Lordships with sincerity if I said there was any such forbearance, any such generosity, any such regard for the peace of Europe, manifested on the part of Austria, Prussia, and the German Confederation. I must say likewise, my Lords, that there was an assumption which was not justifiable on the part of Denmark, and in reference to which my noble Friend Lord Clarendon made a clear and pointed statement at a subsequent meeting of the Conference. The Danish Government considered that the line which we had proposed in the name of the neutral Powers, and after consulting the neutral Powers, as a basis of pacification, was an English proposal—an English proposal by which England was bound to abide, and which she was bound to maintain at all hazards. Nothing of the kind, however, was ever stated by the British Plenipotentiaries; nothing of the kind had Denmark a right to expect. I did inform the Danish Plenipotentiary, when there was a question of continuing the Armistice, that I should not propose nor support any division but the line of the Schlei without the consent of Denmark; but I never gave him to understand that England would support that line otherwise than by urging its adoption in conjunction with the other neutral Powers at the meetings of the Conference. The last suspension of arms was only for a fortnight, and it remained for us to consider what should be done—the two parties being obstinately bent on the maintenance of their different rights—the Germans insisting on the line from Apenrade to Tondern, and the Danes insisting first upon a line extending more to the south than that which the British Plenipotentiary had proposed in the Conference, and afterwards agreeing to that line, but declaring that they would make no further concessions. What could be done to bring about an amicable understanding? In this situation of affairs, knowing that Denmark would not consent to any other line—indeed, not knowing whether the German Powers would concede any other line—the Prussian Plenipotentiary said that he was ready to recommend to his Government a line which should proceed from the north of Flensburg to Tondern, but that he was not authorized to propose that line in the name of his Government. The Austrian Plenipotentiary did not accede at first, but afterwards said that he would recommend it to the consideration of his Government. But the Danes at once refused it, and the proposal fell to the ground. It then remained to be considered whether, without proposing any other line, some means could not be found by which peace might still be preserved. We considered that question very anxiously, and it came to be a subject of reflection whether we could not, even at the last moment, propose something which might bring the two Powers to an agreement. It was obvious that many and great difficulties had to be removed. The King of Denmark was ready to yield a part of his dominions of which he had been deprived by war. The German Plenipotentiaries were ready to say that a part of the Duchy of Schleswig should remain under the rule of the King of Denmark. Both Powers were ready to accept the proposal that there should be no interference in future in the internal government of Denmark; and all the Powers, I think, would have been ready, if there had been an agreement on other points, to give a guarantee—a European guarantee—to Denmark, which would have left that Power, indeed, without any sovereignty over the German population, but still possessed of an independent territory, and still possessed of a free and happy Government, not subject to foreign interference. Well, the question was, whether, there remaining only this line of frontier to be decided, it could not be arranged in some way to which both Powers would agree. We thought it possible that in that case the spirit of the Protocol of Paris might be adopted. The Protocol of Paris said, that when serious differences arose between any Powers, and there was danger of those differences being carried to hostilities, the good offices of a friendly Power might be resorted to, and it appeared to us that if this principle could be brought into action, the continuance of the war might be obviated. It was stated at the same time by the French Plenipotentiary at Paris, and by others, that where the honour or the essential interests of a country were mainly concerned, it could not be expected that such differences should be submitted to a friendly Power. But, in our opinion, this was not such a case. It appeared to us that sooner than rush into war—sooner, above all, than expose Denmark again to such an unequal contest — it was possible to propose the good offices of a friendly Power, with this condition — that both Powers should submit to the decision respecting the line of frontier offered by the arbitrator to whom the matter might be referred. In fact it was to be an arbitration rather than good offices. Now, I cannot but believe that any impartial arbitrator would have fixed upon a line far more favourable to Denmark than that which the German Powers had proposed. A Power which was impartial and without passion would probably have given, not the line as far as the north of Flensburg, but a line to the south of Flensburg, whereby that important town might have been preserved to Denmark, and that Power would have had a port in the Northern Sea by which her independence might have been maintained. It was, however, entirely a question for the two Powers to accept or to refuse that arbitration. I may say further that my noble Friend (the Earl of Clarendon) and myself, who were the British Plenipotentiaries at the Conference, thought that after the fairness and the impartiality which the Emperor of the French had shown throughout this question, his friendliness, and at the same time his wish for the maintenance of peace, the two Powers might well have accepted his good offices. The opinion was, however, expressed by one of the Plenipotentiaries — an opinion afterwards confirmed by an official declaration—that no Power represented at the Conference, and therefore committed to a certain degree as to the questions before the Conference, could properly be accepted as the arbitrating Power. It then appeared to us, and we so informed the Plenipotentiaries, that in our opinion the King of the Belgians, whose impartiality is likewise well known, and whose long experience of European affairs makes him most desirous to preserve the peace of Europe, might perform these functions to the satisfaction of the Powers concerned. But the question of who should be the arbitrator never arose. Austria and Prussia said that they could accept the good offices of a friendly Power in accordance with the Treaty of Paris, but that they could not accept the decision of that friendly Power as final; and in the mean time they asked for a long armistice. Now, my Lords, it appeared to us that if that proposal were accepted, then, after a period of two or three months of armistice, during which the naval operations of Denmark would be suspended, a decision would have been announced which, if it in any way displeased the German Powers — if it did not go to the full extent of all their demands—would have been refused by them. The Plenipotentiary of the German Confederation completely confirmed our view of this question by declaring that in his opinion this territory of Schleswig belonged altogether to the Prince of Augustenburg, or rather belonged to the competency of the German Confederation; that they could therefore accept no arbitration, and could not be bound by anything that was decided. They evidently meant that every foot of territory in Schleswig might, if they chose it, be demanded at the end of the good offices by the German Confederation. Thus, according to what I am sorry to say has been the usual manner of the German Powers, their refusal was not a direct and straightforward one. It is somewhat like their declaration at the beginning, that they went into Holstein for the purpose of Federal Execution, that they went into Schleswig for the purpose of material occupation, and that they wished the question of the sovereignty of Holstein and Schleswig to be decided in the German Confederation, knowing perfectly well how that decision would be made; and then, lastly, they wished to have the appearance of accepting the good offices of an arbitrator without really intending to accept them. The Danish Plenipotentiaries, most unfortunately in my opinion — most imprudently in my opinion—gave a decided refusal to the proposal. Of course, it was for them to judge as to the security of their own country and the prospects of war; but I certainly regret deeply that they should have rejected the arbitration. The proposal that I made certainly did not exactly agree with the line of the Schlei, but it was a proposal which we, the British Plenipotentiaries, thought was for the benefit of Denmark, and was most likely to obtain for the Danes a peace which would have been satisfactory to them. And now, my Lords, all other means having failed, one other proposal

Earl Russell

was made on the part of France by the French Plenipotentiary, who was directed to make this proposal—that, leaving the Danish part of Schleswig to the Danes, and the German part to the Germans, the line to be drawn in the disputed district should be decided by a vote of the population, to be taken in some fair manner, the details of which might be considered afterwards. [The Earl of CLARENDON: The votes were to be taken in each commune.] Yes, and these votes were to decide the line to be drawn and the district which was to belong to Germany and to Denmark respectively.

THE EARL OF DERBY: May I ask the noble Earl if that decision was to be taken during the occupation of the province by the German troops?

EARL RUSSELL: No; the French proposition was clearly that the Prussian troops should evacuate the district before the vote was taken by means of Commissioners. At the same time, it was the opinion of the Danes—and I believe that opinion to have been well founded—that although the people of Schleswig generally were perfectly satisfied to remain united to Denmark, such had been the effects of the occupation, such had been the agitation on the part of Germany, the political societies in Germany having sent persons to agitate all over the country, that the decisions would through that influence have become corrupted, and the plan of the Emperor, which otherwise might have been successful, would have been rendered unjust. The proposition was accordingly refused. My Lords, it was with great regret that the Plenipotentiaries of the neutral Powers received this decision.

My Lords, I must say that my noble Friend (the Earl of Clarendon) and I have received from France and from the other neutral Powers the firmest support during the continuance of the Conference. We held frequent private meetings with the neutral Powers, in which we discussed the proposals to be made. There was nothing exhibited in those meetings but the most earnest desire to provide for the safety and independence of Denmark, and I must say that the utmost harmony prevailed on all sides; and the French, Russian, and Swedish Plenipotentiaries alike did all in their power to contribute towards the success of the proposals we made. We shall, therefore, leave the Conference with a strong sense of our obligations for the support which we received from them. After this decision there remained nothing more for the Conference but to accept the declaration which was made at the last meeting—and which has been repeated to me to-day by the Austrian Ambassador—it is simply that the two Powers, Austria and Prussia, have no intention of carrying on hostilities with the view of obtaining possession of any territory beyond the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, and that they have no intention of making any conquest of any portion of the Danish territory on the continent or of the Danish islands. That declaration is purely voluntary, and is not in any way extorted as to the manner in which these Powers propose to act. At the same time it comes rather late—though they make the declaration I suppose they cannot intend us to accept it—and we certainly cannot accept it as one upon which we can implicitly rely. After that which has happened with respect to the Treaty of 1852, and after that which has happened with respect to the treatment of the Danes after the pledges given, but more as I am afraid owing to German popular opinion, which Austria is desirous to conciliate, which Prussia is desirous to conciliate, which the German Confederation, above all, is anxious to conciliate, I am sorry to say that, greatly as I have respected Austria, greatly as I have respected Prussia, we can no longer rely, as we have done, upon their declarations.

Well, my Lords, but the question comes as to what, at the end of the Conference, is our position, and what will be our course? And without intending, or being able to pledge, the Government in case of contingencies which have not arisen, I think it is due to Parliament and to the country—especially at this period of the Session—to declare what is the view which the Government take of the position, the duty, the interests, and the future policy of England. My Lords, with regard to our honour, I conceive that in honour we are in no way engaged to take part in the present war. Although it has been stated to the contrary on the part of Denmark more than once, there has been at no time any pledge given on the part of this country or Her Majesty's Government promising material assistance to Denmark in this contest. Three times Her Majesty's Government during the period I have held the seals of the Foreign Office have endeavoured to induce Denmark to accept propositions which we regarded as favourable to her interests. In 1862 I made propositions to her, but those propositions were rejected. When Lord Wodehouse went to Denmark, he and the Russian Plenipotentiary proposed that Denmark should repeal the Constitution which she had concurred in but a few days before; but she would not at that time receive the proposal. We believe that, if she had consented to the arbitration which we proposed in the Conference, the result would have been as favourable to her as, under the circumstances in which she was placed, she could have expected. My Lords, I do not blame Denmark for the course she has thought fit to pursue. She has a right—I should be sorry to reproach her in any way in her present state of weakness—she has an undoubted right to refuse our propositions, but we on our side have also a right to take into consideration the duty, honour, and interests of this country, and not to make that duty, that honour, and those interests subordinate to the interests of any foreign Power whatever. My Lords, our honour not being engaged, we have to consider what we might be led to do for the interests of other Powers, and for the sake of that balance of power which in 1852 was declared by general consent to be connected with the integrity of Denmark. My Lords, I cannot but believe that the Treaty of 1852 having been entered into, if there had been at an early period—say in December or January last—if France, Great Britain, and Russia, supported by the assistance which they might have counted upon receiving from Sweden, had declared for the maintenance of the Treaty of 1852—the succession of the King of Denmark might have been established without difficulty, and might have been peaceably maintained, and that the King and his Government would have remedied all the grievances of which his German subjects complained. I believe the King of Denmark would have found it to his advantage to grant to his German subjects that freedom, those privileges, and that self-government in their internal and domestic matters which they had demanded, and that they would thus have become quite contented as subjects to the King of Denmark. That desirable result, however, could not be brought about. In reference to the Treaty of 1852, I have to repeat what I stated on a previous occasion—that it was not a treaty of guarantee, that the Governments of France and Russia were competent to acknowledge the treaty, but that they had not pledged themselves to maintain the connection of Schleswig and Denmark, that not being a question of the general balance of power in Europe. Well, the French Government have frequently declared and have repeated to us only within the last twenty-four hours, that the Emperor does not consider it essential to the interest of France to support the line of the Schlei. He declares he does not think that France would be inclined to go to war for such an object. He urges that a war with Germany would be a most serious thing to France, that our armies would not be marshalled to oppose the invasion of Denmark, and that such a war would consequently be attended with great cost and great risk. I think that if that war were successful, France would expect some compensation on account of her participation, and that compensation could hardly be granted without exciting general jealousy among the other nations of Europe, and thus disturbing the balance of power which now exists. I cannot deny that if the Emperor of the French puts forward these considerations—if he declares that for these reasons, though he would give us moral support, he would afford us no material assistance in such war—I must say I think he is justified in that refusal, and in adopting such a line of conduct. I cannot but admit that if a great war with Germany arose, whatever might be the issue, it might reproduce those great contests which took place in 1814, and which led to such unsatisfactory results. The Emperor of the French is a Sovereign singularly wise and sagacious, and I will say valuing, as he has proved that he values, the peace of Europe, I am not in a position to find fault, nor can Her Majesty's Government find any fault with the decision to which the Emperor has come. But the Emperor of the French having thus declared his policy, and the Emperor of Russia having constantly refused to join with us in affording material support to Denmark, our position, of course, must be greatly influenced by those decisions. In the first place, is it the duty of this country—if we are to undertake the preservation of the balance of power in Europe as it was recognized in 1852—is it a duty incumbent on us alone? The French Government sees very clearly the dangers to which France might be exposed by interfering, but it says at the same time that it would be an easy operation for England; that England, with her naval power, might add most materially to the strength of Denmark and assist in bringing the war to a conclusion. My Lords, I must say there are many considerations which induce me to arrive at a different conclusion. I cannot but think, in the first place, that we should suffer perhaps considerably if our commercial marine was exposed to depredations such as might take place in the event of our being at war with Germany. That is one consideration which ought not to be overlooked. But there are other considerations of still greater moment. One is—Would our interference bring this war to a conclusion? Without giving military aid could you recover Schleswig and Holstein, and even Jutland from the Austrian and Prussian forces? Well, my Lords, we have for a long time in our conduct of foreign affairs shown great forbearance and patience. I think we were right in being forbearing, and think we were justified in being patient. But if our honour or our interests or the great interests of Europe should call upon us to interfere, I think such interference ought to be clearly effectual, as nothing would more tend to diminish the influence of this country than a course of action which would show that while we were predominant at sea, and that no Austrian or Prussian ships of war could venture to leave port, yet at the same time our interference could not insure, as we hoped it would, the safety of Denmark, nor lead to a speedy termination of the war. But, my Lords, the whole position and influence of this country with regard to foreign countries ought to be fully considered by Parliament and by the country; for we have great interests with multiplied complications arising from various connections and various treaties with every part of the world. It is no longer a question with reference to the balance of power in Europe. There are other parts of the world in which our interests may be as deeply involved, and which we may some day or other find it necessary to maintain the honour and interests of this country. The civil war now raging in America, ending how it may—whether by the establishment of an independent republic in the South, or whether it ends most unexpectedly, as it would be to me, I confess, by restoring the Union — still the United States of America or the Northern States, or whatever they may be called, will then be in a totally different position to that which they were in a few years ago. A great army will then be maintained by the United States. A formidable navy will also be kept up. Our relations with that Power are liable at any moment to interruption. I hope and trust that our friendly relations may continue uninterrupted; still, those relations must be considered and kept in view as well as our interest in the maintenance of the balance of power in Europe. My Lords, let us look at other parts of the world. Look at the great commerce which has grown up in China, where it is necessary for us always to maintain a considerable naval force to protect it. Look at our immense possessions in India and see how necessary it is that they should be considered at all times. In any question, therefore, of peace or war—while it is very probable that this country with allies could carry on a war successfully—yet when it comes to be a war to be carried on by England alone, there are other contingencies to be looked at, and the position of this country is to be considered with reference not to Europe alone, but with reference to our interests in every quarter of the world. My Lords, these are considerations to be borne in mind with respect to this question of Denmark. It may be said that other combinations might be made—that although we could not ourselves attack the German Powers with any great amount of success, yet there are vulnerable points upon which they, and especially Austria, may be open to attack; that those doctrines and theories which Austria and Prussia have put forward, with regard to foreign nationalities, may be retorted upon them, and especially upon Austria with effect—they may be applied to other parts of Europe than Schleswig and Holstein; that the German nationality is not the only nationality in Europe; that the Italian nationality has as much right to be considered as the Germans; and that if we were to enter upon a course of supporting nationalities, we should be perfectly justified by the doctrines and conduct of Austria. This, no doubt, would be sufficient if the object were merely to show to Austria and Prussia that they are vulnerable on their own ground. But, my Lords, I think it is the duty of England to show a greater attachment to peace than Austria and Prussia have shown, and not, if possible, to light a flame which might extend to every part of Europe, but rather to endeavour to confine the war within the narrowest limits possible. Therefore, my Lords, with regard to this question, it is the opinion of Her Majesty's Government that we should maintain the position which we have occupied, and that we should be neutral in this war. I do not mean to say that contingencies may not arise in which our position might become different, and in which our conduct might be altered. It may be said, " Will you allow these German Powers to act as they please? If, contrary to their professions and promises, they should decide upon sending a combined Austrian and Prussian force to Copenhagen with the declared object of making Denmark assent to terms which would be destructive of her independence—will you then remain entirely indifferent to such proceedings?" My Lords, I can only say in answer to such a question, that every Government in this country must retain to itself a certain liberty—as long as it possesses the confidence of Parliament—a certain liberty of decision upon such points. All I can now say is, that if the Government should think it necessary to come to any fresh decision—if the war should assume a new character—if circumstances should arise which might require us to make another decision, it would be our duty, if Parliament were sitting, immediately to apply to Parliament upon the subject; and if Parliament should not be sitting, then at once to call Parliament together in order that it may judge the conduct which Her Majesty's Government should pursue.

In the meantime, my Lords, I have given you an outline of the course of these negotiations. I have given you an account of the efforts we have made for peace, which, like the efforts made in 1823 by the Governments of Lord Liverpool and Mr. Canning, have been unfortunately unsuccessful. I say that our policy at the present time is to maintain peace. If there is any party in Parliament—if there is any individual in Parliament—who thinks as Lord Grey thought in 1823 that we ought to go to war, it will be competent for them to ask Her Majesty to interfere materially in the contest. If they think that in any respect we have failed in our duty, it is competent for them to take any line of conduct they may think proper. But, for ourselves, I say with confidence that we have maintained the honour of the country, that we have done everything in our power to preserve the peace of Europe, and that, those efforts having failed, we can rest satisfied that nothing has been wanting on our parts which was needed by the honour or the interests of this country—that nothing has been left undone which it was our duty to do.

THE EARL OF DERBY: My Lords, the almost unprecedented attendance of your Lordships on the present occasion clearly indicates that you are keenly sensible of the gravity of the statement which has just been made by the noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. My Lords, it is impossible to overrate the magnitude and importance of the interests involved in that statement. Interests of such vast importance are hanging in the balance at the present moment — the peace of Europe—I do not say the present, but the ultimate peace of Europe — is placed in fearful peril—anything which may pass in this House may have for good or evil so serious an effect—that if I have risen to follow the noble Earl in the statement he has made, it is not for the purpose of going through the various topics on which he has touched, or commenting on the different parts of his speech, but for the purpose of expressing my earnest and anxious hope that your Lordships may see, not only the propriety, but the absolute necessity, of abstaining on the present occasion from all partial and, consequently, unsatisfactory expressions of opinion. The noble Earl has entered at very great length upon three distinct topics, which he has treated, no doubt, with very great ability and with great clearness. He has entered on a justification of the course which Her Majesty's Government has pursued in relation to the Conference; he has given a statement of what has passed in the Conference; and somewhat vaguely, certainly, but with sufficient explicitness for the present, he has stated what is the policy which Her Majesty's Government are prepared to pursue in the position in which we are now placed. My Lords, of the first part of the noble Earl's statement I have no complaint whatever to make. It was perfectly natural that in laying on the table, by Her Majesty's command, the Protocols of the late Conference held in London on the affairs of Denmark he should have brought under your Lordships' notice the circumstances in which the Conference originated, the position of Europe at the time it assembled, and the result at which it has arrived. And I do not complain of the general statement which the noble Earl has made, although, undoubtedly, there were some very material facts he altogether omitted, and some circumstances to which, perhaps, he gave a colouring in which I can hardly concur. But, as I said, I am not going to enter upon a discussion of the statement of the noble Earl as to the position in which we are placed ; still less of the more important, yet totally different, circumstances to which that position may be owing — to what conduct on our part or on the part of foreign Powers, to what policy pursued by the Government, it may have been owing that we were placed, at the period of the assembling of the Conference, in the unfortunate position in which we now stand. My Lords, that may—probably will—form the subject of further discussion, if not in this, at all events in the other House of Parliament —and probably in both Houses of Parliament. But on the present occasion, ce - tainly, your Lordships would not deem it expedient to enter on all the various phases which the Schleswig Holstein question—simple enough in its commencement and complicated enough in its progress — has presented since 1852, or from an earlier period. But I must say the noble Earl has taken a course this evening not in accordance with ordinary practice, and perhaps not with the ordinary procedure of the House, when he proceeded to enter on a discussion and give his own account of various proceedings which passed in the Conference, reading from a number of papers which he laid on the table, but of which, not being yet in the hands of any one of your Lordships, we are bound to accept his statement without discussion. But I confess, for my part, my Lords, while I think the most important part of the question which Parliament has to consider is the course of policy which Her Majesty's Government have pursued—whether they have taken the course best suited to effect their own objects—namely, to obtain a satisfactory arrangement between the different belligerents and, at the same time, maintain inviolate the honour of England—while I say they are of the utmost importance, I think all these questions must have much greater reference to an earlier period — namely, to that before the commencement of the Conference, and to things which then took place of which we know nothing. Because, with all respect to the opinions of the noble Lords and the right hon. Gentlemen who have stated that as soon as you could get the Plenipotentiaries assembled around the table there would be no sort of difficulty in coming to a satisfactory conclusion—without in the slightest degree disparaging the ability which the two noble Earls engaged in the Conference have conducted its affairs—I think I may venture to say that, beyond the limited circle of the Members of Her Majesty's Government, there were few, if any, persons who could anticipate from the circumstances under which we entered upon that Conference any other than a signal and lamentable failure—although many there were, of course, who wished for a very different conclusion. Why, what were the circumstances? There were at that moment eight parties who had been called to the Conference, which was composed of thirteen gentlemen representing eight different interests. Of these eight different interests four were belligerents—three engaged on one side and one on the other ; and there were also the four neutral Powers—England, France, Russia, and Sweden. With regard to the belligerents, what was the position of affairs on which they were invited to enter? It is true that with regard to the three belligerents on the one side, their aims, their notions, their ulterior objects appear to have had considerable diversity ; but all three were from various motives unitedly bent on destroying the Kingdom of Denmark—all three were not quite so equally united, perhaps, in the ulterior objects of their spoliation, or their portion in the division of the spoil ; but all were combined in the determination to carry war and spoliation into the territories of Denmark. It was at this moment when, flushed with the triumph of their arms, and with the glory of their successes, which had been gained by their enormous numerical superiority, and the superiority of their ammunitions and artillery—it was at this moment when flashed with the prospect of success, proud of the military glory they thought they had obtained, and seeing before them nothing but a feeble and more than half-vanquished enemy, they consented most reluctantly to be arrested in their career, and they hardly yielded—from no unappreciable motive—to the pressing solicitations of England—not of the four neutral Powers, but of England alone—to a temporary suspension of hostilities, and would not even consent to an armistice between the belligerents. On the other hand, there was the Kingdom of Denmark—a small, gallant nation, who were fighting with the utmost determination and the courage of despair in behalf of all they held dear and sacred—in behalf of their homes, in behalf of their constitution, in behalf of their King, in behalf of their families — fighting against overwhelming odds — and seeing themselves deserted by the whole European community, from which, whether with or without reason, they had undoubtedly entertained strong hope that they would receive support — finding themselves pressed to the very uttermost, I say, in their position the courage despair would give might naturally induce them to refuse another suspension of hostilities which they might naturally consider unfavourable to themselves at the moment, and say, "Rather than enter into such discreditable terms, let us die in the face of day and in the face of Europe, which, to its shame, has permitted us to do so." Now, such were the circumstances under which the Plenipotentiaries came to the Conference—unwillingly, all of them—with different views — three on one side and one on the other—the subject of oppression and violence—on the part of the small and weak Kingdom of Denmark. On the other hand, the four neutral Powers entered into discussions without the slightest previous agreement between themselves as to what they should ask, what they should recommend, and what they should insist upon. Eight different interests were collected together in Conference in the middle of the excitement of a war, without any previous basis of negotiations being agreed upon, without anything being settled, except that which the noble Lord at the head of the Government is reported to have described when he said that the basis of the Conference was the restoration of the peace of Europe. On that basis, and on that basis only, you entered into the Conference, without previous communications, without previous agreement, without previous understandings—and you profess to be astonished that the Conference led to nothing but failure! It is a matter of comparative indifference—the two noble Lords charged with the interests of England may have conducted the affairs of the Conference with more or less ability, with perfect sincerity, no doubt, to maintain the peace of Europe—I have not the slightest doubt on that subject—Prussia and Austria may have been more or less unreasonable, Denmark may have been more or less firm in her decisions, the Diet may have been more or less exacting — the belligerents may have placed themselves more or less in opposition to all their previous declarations before entering into the Conference—all these questions are matters of comparative indifference, because, in my judgment, from the time the Conference began to sit it was a doomed Conference from which it was impossible to hope any practical result could arise. Therefore the absence of these Protocols do not place your Lordships under the slightest disadvantage in judging of the position and policy of Her Majesty's Government in bringing this matter to the position in which it now stands; still less will the imperfect statement which has been made, and in the absence of any important information as to the facts of the case, enable you to express any opinion whatever upon that most important decision which it appears Her Majesty's Government have arrived at—namely, to acquiesce in the present state of affairs, and remain in the position of passive neutrality. At the commencement of the Session I ventured to express, in terms as strong as it was possible for man to use, the infinite danger which I saw in even the possibility of a war with Germany—with that Power with which we had been so many years associated—which has been, and, unless modern aggressive ideas have too far prevailed, is the great conservative central counterpoise to the ambitions of the East and of the West—a Power naturally connected with us by many ties, and a war with which could not but be productive of the most lamentable consequences, not only to them but to ourselves also. But, my Lords, what I also said was this. I feared —and that is the great question that we shall have to discuss hereafter—I feared the Government had, by the course of policy they had pursued, placed us in the position in which we must be subjected either to the lamentable consequences of such a war or to the discredit in which we should be held—and in which, I fear, we are held—by the whole of Europe, not for having abstained from war now, but for having for a long period held out to the contending parties menaces on the one hand, and encouragement on the other—a course entirely inconsistent with that policy which Her Majesty's Government now profess, and properly profess — namely, an earnest desire and determination to maintain unbroken the peace of this England, so far as that can be done with honour. That is the question on which serious discussion must take place; that is the question the decision of which will solve in the mind of Parliament and the country whether Her Majesty's Government have maintained inviolate the honour of the country, or whether, on the other hand, their policy has not been such as to expose them to the charge of a feeble and vacillating opposition, yielding at every step when encroachment was threatened, always suggesting that that encroachment would be met by a firm resistance, but whenever the encroachment took place yielding and protesting only that further encroachment would not be tolerated. That is the charge against which Her Majesty's Government —not now, but hereafter — will have to defend themselves. That is the feeling which I believe is very prevalent in the minds of the people of this country. That is the feeling which has taken deeply hold of the Parliament and of the country. And if I wanted any confirmation of its application to the course which Her Majesty's Government have pursued, and to the course which they may be expected to pursue, I should find it in the concluding portion of the noble Earl's speech, in which, after elaborately discussing all the disadvantages and all the dangers of going to war—all the injury we should sustain, all the loss to our commerce, and all the serious consequences, not merely present consequences, but even the fear of consequences as possibly leading to a rupture with the States of America at some future time—the noble Earl, to my astonishment, concluded by saying—not "Nothing on earth shall induce us to go to war," not "We hold ourselves altogether aloof from this question," not "Our interests are so vitally concerned, our commerce is so extensive, our relations so various, our treaties so numerous that we are determined, *coûte qui coûte,* to keep the peace, and we appeal to the country to give us credit for having maintained the country in a state of peace, prosperity, and wealth" —but "We reserve to ourselves, if further steps should be taken, a perfect right to alter our course," to sacrifice all these considerations upon which he laid so much stress, to enter upon that war which he so justly and so seriously deprecated, and altogether to depart from the principles which the Government have laid down, and upon which they have acted for the last two years. Why, my Lords, that is exactly what the noble Earl and the Government have been saying all along. First of all, Germany is to take into its serious consideration the dangers which must ensue, and must incur all the responsibility of Federal Execution in Holstein. Then Denmark is recommended, "As this is only Federal Execution in Holstein, we advise you to submit to it; but if the Germans go beyond Holstein, if they once cross the Eider, if they enter Schleswig, if the Diet is permitted to turn Federal Execution into an international question, then the case will be altogether altered; then Her Majesty's Government may see the necessity of departing from the course which they have hitherto laid down in certain contingencies, and afford you material assistance." Schleswig was occupied; but we were assured it was taken only as a material guarantee for the fulfilment of certain other engagements. "Oh, if it is only occupied as a material guarantee for the fulfilment of other engagements, that alters the question; but if you mean a permanent occupation of Schleswig, that is a thing the Government cannot for a moment tolerate." Schleswig was occupied. "Then, at all events, you cannot pass into Jutland; you must not think of Jutland." Well, into Jutland walked the troops—for strategic reasons, as the noble Earl has observed, which he does not presume to justify; but the entrance of troops into Jutland was not a contingency which, although it was seriously threatened before, induced Her Majesty's Government to depart from their pacific intentions. Now, I ask the noble Earl, what is the contingency which will? And I think that Parliament is bound to have some assurance on that point. "We will not go to war," says the noble Earl, "but we may see reasons to alter our course." I think the noble Earl went so far as to say that if Copenhagen should be blockaded and bombarded, then possibly—possibly Her Majesty's Government might think that the contingency had arisen which should induce them to depart from their prudent resolutions. But, short of the capture of Copenhagen, we want to know, and the country wants to know, how far the noble Earl will be—I was going to say—driven before he departs from the prudent resolutions—and I do not deny that they are prudent if they can be maintained with honour—which he has laid down. I hope I may be pardoned for having gone as far as I have in pointing out the questions to which I think it will be the duty of Her Majesty's Government hereafter to give a distinct answer, and upon which I hope that Parliament will insist upon having, not only a distinct answer from the Government, but a distinct decision upon the judgment of Parliament. For the present, however, I confess that I should be very sorry that this discussion should be prolonged. Perhaps, as I certainly have gone beyond my own intentions, I may have gone beyond what was desirable in the temptation of following the noble Earl for the purpose of pointing out, not that which we are to discuss now, but that which we shall have to discuss, and must discuss hereafter. For the present, I repeat, I earnestly hope that, neither with regard to the past, nor with regard to the more important future, will your Lordships be led, upon the partial statement which has been laid before you, to enter upon an *impromptu* discussion, still less to pledge yourselves individually or collectively to any line of conduct, either of condemnation of the Government for the past or of assent to or dissent from the course which they have propounded for the future.

Earl GRANVILLE: I think that the House ought to come to a clear understanding as to the course which it intends to pursue; whether it is to be that which was recommended by the noble Earl at the commencement and again at the end of his speech, and cheered by the House, of abstaining from any discussion upon this great subject until your Lordships have in your hands the papers which are necessary to explain it, or that which the noble Earl has adopted in the course of his observations, touching upon all those points which appear to him most vulnerable, and making statements and using arguments with reference to the Conference which appeared to me to be applicable to any Conference whatever which might be assembled for the purpose of establishing peace between a stronger and a weaker nation, the stronger nation being flushed with victory and the weaker one not assured of the support of the neutral Powers. That may go on. On both sides of the House declamatory arguments may be used without reference to facts, which may create popular prejudice, but cannot affect the reason of the country; and we may all imitate the example of the noble Earl who has put into the mouth of my noble Friend statements which neither in his speech today nor in the course of the negotiations has he ever made. To such alternatives as the noble Earl has put to us, asking us either to declare to Europe and the world that, whatever our honour and interests may require, we will pronounce ourselves determined never to go to war at all, or that we should—as has often been demanded by Members of the Opposition—pledge ourselves as to the future, our answer must be that we should not be justified, as representing Her Majesty's Government in this House, in exactly defining every possible contingency without knowing what course events may take in the future. I cannot help thinking that the feeling of the House is in favour of the course recommended at the beginning and end of the noble Earl's speech, and that your Lordships do not desire to discuss this question at present. All that I can say on behalf of Her Majesty's Government is, that if the House is of a different opinion we are ready at once to take the whole discussion, but we beg that it may not be of a piecemeal description.

Lord BROUGHAM was understood to express his regret that the belligerent Powers had refused to submit the questions in dispute between them to arbitration, and especially to condemn the roundabout manner in which the German Powers had intimated their refusal.

CIVIL BILL COURTS (IRELAND) BILL.

[No. 67.] SECOND READING.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2^a.—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

The Earl of LEITRIM said, that the Bill did not embody all the improvements which were desirable. The Bill proposed a very important alteration in law; but it was very imperfect.

The Marquess of CLANRICARDE said, that although undoubtedly the Bill was very imperfect, still he thought it was a measure which deserved the support of the House. He would further express a hope that the Government would go still further in the path of law reform, and that they would not abandon the Irish Court of Chancery Bill, which had been introduced into the other House.

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE was understood to remark upon the power given to the sheriffs to appoint the bailiffs who were to execute the civil bill decrees.

The Earl of BELMORE said, that he wished to make two or three observations before the Bill was read a second time. He quite agreed with all that had fallen from the noble Earl who spoke last; and from his own experience as a magistrate, he found that a great part of the crime to be dealt with in his part of Ireland consisted of assaults committed in resisting the execution of civil bill decrees. It was, therefore, very important that the bailiffs who executed these decrees should be under proper control. By the 37th clause of this Bill it was provided, that the Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench should have the power to make and alter rules with regard to appeal cases stated for their decision. Now, his (the Earl of Belmore's) attention had been called to the fact that appeals were made to the other Superior Courts of common law as well as to the Queen's Bench. He would, therefore, give notice of an Amendment in Committee to provide for those cases. By the 6th clause of the Bill the Chairman was to have power to fine the bailiffs for neglect or misconduct. These bailiffs were generally taken from a very low class, and not possessed of any property, so that the power to fine them would not be productive of much effect, and he thought that the Chairman should have some further control over them. These were minor points, and he would give due notice of Amendments to be proposed in Committee.

After a few words, in reply, from The Lord CHANCELLOR,

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the whole House on *Monday* next.

House adjourned at a quarter before Eight o'clock till to-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, June 27, 1864.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE —On Expiring Laws, *appointed* and *nominated* (*List of Committee.*)

SUPPLY — *considered in Committee* — MISCELLANEOUS ESTIMATES.

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* [Bill 176].

Second Reading — Contagious Diseases * [Bill 163]; Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* [Bill 152]; Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* [Bill 164]; Inclosure (No. 2)* [Bill 170]; Mortgage Debentures * [Bill 169] (*Lords*)

Referred to Select Committee—Contagious Diseases * [Bill 163]; Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* [Bill 152].

Report of Select Committee—Cattle Diseases Prevention, and Cattle, &c. Importation * [Bills 27 & 28], Report * (No. 431).

Committee — Greek Loan [Bill 144]; Factory Acts Extension * [Bill 55]; Naval and Victualling Stores * [Bill 178] (*Lords*); Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers) * [Bill 62] —R.P.

Report — Cattle Diseases Prevention * [Bill 27] (*re-committed*); Highways Act Amendment * [Bill 177] (*re-committed*); Greek Loan [Bill 144]; Factory Acts Extension * [Bill 55]; Naval and Victualling Stores * [Bill 178] (*Lords*) (*re-committed*).

Considered as amended — Settled Estates Act Amendment * [Bill 142] (*Lords*); Weights and Measures (Metric System)* [Bill 165].

Third Reading—Chimney Sweepers Regulation * [Bill 148] (*Lords*); Railway Construction Facilities* [Bill 111], and *passed.*

Withdrawn — Cattle, &c. Importation * [Bill 28].

POOR LAW RELIEF.

QUESTION.

MR. WARNER said, he wished to ask the President of the Poor Law Board, Whether he will lay upon the table of the House in the present Session a Bill to carry into effect the recommendations of the Select Committee on Poor Relief?

MR. C. P. VILLIERS said, in reply, that the recommendations of that Committee had reference to matters of various kinds, and not immediately connected with each other, and it would probably be convenient to introduce several Bills to carry them into effect. He had directed the Report to be sent to the different Boards of Guardians, with the view of ascertaining if there were any practical difficulties in the way of adopting some of the Amendments proposed. He should shortly be in a position to inform the House what course the Government would adopt with regard to the Report. At all events, if he could not introduce any Bill this Session he should be prepared at the earliest moment of the next Session to introduce a Bill on the subject.

STATE OF PARK LANE.

QUESTION.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY said, he would beg to ask the hon. Member for Bath, as a Member of the Metropolitan Board of Works, Whether that Board has come to any decision as to the opening of Hamilton Place to public traffic, with the view of relieving the crowded state of Park Lane?

MR. TITE said, in reply, that the Metropolitan Board had had under its consideration the crowded state of Park Lane, and had come to the conclusion that the best, if not the only, mode of relieving it would be by the opening of Hamilton Place. They had communicated this opinion to the First Commissioner of Works. There were difficulties in the way on account of the opposition of the tenants of some houses, who were Crown Lessees; but since all that was required in order to effect the improvement was a slip of land only 100 yards in length, he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would lend his aid in carrying out this great metropolitan improvement.

EGHAM RAILWAY ACCIDENT.

QUESTION.

Sir RICHARD BULKELEY said, he rose to ask the President of the Board of Trade, Whether his attention has been drawn to the evidence given at the inquest on the sufferers by the late Railway accident at Egham by Mr. Robert Archibald Scott, Traffic Manager of the South Western Railway, in which he says—

> "Ordinarily, I should think there would not be the slightest danger in starting them (the trains) at an interval of five minutes, allowing the first train to make a first stoppage at a distance of eight miles. It is quite an ordinary working of the trains. Some lines allow only three minutes."

Also to the evidence of Thomas Gibbard, office porter at Egham, whose duty was to note the arrival and departure of the trains, and who states—

> "That the Royal train (containing their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales) passed through Egham in the morning at 12·51, and that Lee passed through at 12·47."

Whether the President of the Board of Trade would inform the House on what lines trains are started at intervals of three minutes only; whether starting trains on the same line at intervals of three minutes is done with the knowledge and sanction of the Board of Trade; and whether he considers the safety of their Royal Highnesses was sufficiently protected in allowing a heavy passenger train to precede them by four minutes only?

Mr. MILNER GIBSON said, that the Board of Trade had no legal authority to interfere with the traffic regulations of railways, and therefore any regulations in force could not be said to have had the sanction of the Board of Trade. Nevertheless, the Inspectors of Railways gave information to the Board of Trade from time to time on which the Board thought it right to send letters to the Railway Companies calling attention to any representations that might be made in regard to regulations of a dangerous character. With regard to the third Question, he had asked Colonel Yolland what was the state of the case, and he told him that it was quite exceptional to allow so small an interval as three minutes between trains, the ordinary practice being to allow at least five minutes between the starting of trains. Colonel Yolland added, however, that the question of time was not material if proper precautions were taken. With regard to the last Question, as to the safety of the Royal train in going from London to Ascot, he had to state that circumstances under which that train was proceeding were quite different from the circumstances under which the trains were proceeding in the case where the collision took place. The other trains were stopping at the various stations, but the Royal train and that which preceded it were going through to Ascot without stopping. As a matter of fact, he believed there was only an interval of four minutes between these two trains.

CHURCH LIVINGS (IRELAND).

QUESTION.

Mr. O'REILLY said, he would beg to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, in reference to Return No. 267 of this Session, "Established Church (Ireland), number of livings in each diocese in Ireland, value of living, &c." Whether the net annual value of each living which is given was exclusive of the glebe house and land, and whether in the possession of the incumbent or let to tenants?

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, in reply, that in the Return in question the net annual value of the livings was exclusive of the value of the glebe house, but was inclusive of the net value of the glebe land, whether in the occupation of the incumbent or not.

GUNS FOR THE NAVY.

QUESTION.

Mr. CORRY said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, with reference to his recent statement that a large order had been given for the manufacture of 10½-inch smooth-bore Guns for the Navy, throwing a spherical shot of 150lb., Whether the Admiralty will consider the advisableness of having those Guns rifled on the shunt principle, so as to admit of their being fired either with round shot or with elongated projectiles?

LORD CLARENCE PAGET said, in reply, that the right hon. Gentleman was under some misconception. What he had stated on a recent occasion was, that a large order had been given for 110-pounder rifled guns for the navy, and that likewise a certain number of 10-inch guns were in preparation, some of which were already on board the *Royal Sovereign.* It was the intention of the Admiralty to rifle those guns, and the mode of rifling them was under the consideration of the Ordnance Committee.

EXPIRING LAWS BILL.

Select Committee *appointed*,

"To inquire what temporary Laws of a public and general nature are now in force, and what Laws of the like nature have expired since the last Report on the subject; and also what Laws of the like nature are about to expire at particular periods, or in consequence of any contingent public events, and to report the same, with their Observations thereupon, to the House:"—Mr. PEEL, Mr. MASSEY, Sir STAFFORD NOTHCOTE, Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL, Mr. SOLICITOR GENERAL, Mr. ADDERLEY, Mr. COWPER, Sir WILLIAM JOLLIFFE, Colonel FRENCH, Mr. BARING, Mr. BRAND, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Lord JOHN MANNERS:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Three to be the quorum.—(*Mr. Peel.*)

DENMARK AND GERMANY.
THE CONFERENCE.

Copy *presented*, of Protocols of Conferences held in London relative to the Affairs of Denmark [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Sir, I rise to move that these papers be printed. In doing so, I am quite aware that there never was an occasion, probably, on which a Minister of the Crown had to make a statement—short and simple as I intend to make it—to this House of Parliament, and through it to the public, on which the feelings of the country, the sympathies of the country, the aspirations, and, I may say, the anxieties of the country, were more deeply engaged than in the question on which it will be my duty for a short time to detain the House. Sir, the sympathies which the British nation feel in the cause of Denmark will do honour to them in all time wherever they are recorded. ["Hear, hear!"] I stand here, however, not to excite those sympathies or to profit by them. I stand here upon this occasion simply to communicate to the House in a short abstract the substance of those proceedings of the Conference, which are recorded in detail in the papers now laid upon the table—and although on Friday I doubted whether the record of the proceedings of Saturday would be sufficiently ready to be laid before Parliament in conjunction with the papers relating to the preceding events, I am now able to say that they will be delivered to Members to-morrow morning, together with the papers relating to the other proceedings of the Conference. Among them will be found an abstract of the proceedings of the Conference drawn up by one of the Plenipotentiaries, which will greatly assist hon. Members in making themselves masters of the more detailed negotiations recorded in the Protocols.

But, to explain more fully, and to make this House understand completely the nature of the questions which were treated of in the Conference, it will be necessary for me to go a little further back, and to offer some remarks as to the points upon which the subsequent controversies and the proceedings of the Conference turned. The House, however, is sufficiently familiar with those transactions and their origin to make it unnecessary for me to do more than give a general outline of the affairs to which I refer. The Treaty of 1852 was negotiated by myself and by Lord Granville, who succeeded me, and was concluded by Lord Malmesbury, who succeeded him; so that, as far as the policy of that treaty is concerned, all parties in this country are equally bound by it. It was founded upon European considerations. It did not originate simply with England—it was an arrangement dictated by European interests. ["Hear, hear!"] The state of the matter was this:—The law of succession in Denmark admitted females to the throne; the law of sucession in Holstein confined the right to males. If, therefore, any case should arise in which there was a default of issue male in Denmark, it was clear that, by the operation of those conflicting laws, Denmark and Holstein would be separated. But the late King of Denmark, being advanced in years, had no offspring; the Prince who would have been his immediate successor, had he outlived the King, had no offspring either; and therefore the Powers of Europe felt it necessary to take into consideration the threatened splitting up of the Danish monarchy, which they held to be inconsistent with the general interests and the balance of power in Europe. For this purpose it was necessary to assimilate the law of succession in the two parts of the Danish monarchy. To alter the law in Holstein was impossible, because it was the law of the Germanic Confederation of which Holstein is a member. The other expedient therefore was adopted, and it was agreed that the *lex regia* of Denmark should be altered so that males only should succeed to the Crown. It was also agreed that the King of Denmark should have the power of naming his successor to the throne of Denmark, and that arrangements should be made by which that successor should inherit the Duchy of Holstein. These arrangements were the object of the Treaty of 1852. The King of Denmark chose as his successor Prince Christian of Glucksburg; and there being a question of the right of the Duke of Augustenburg to Holstein, that right was commuted by a pecuniary indemnity. The Duke of Augustenburg having been in rebellion against his Sovereign on a former occasion, his estates were confiscated; but the value of those estates was now given to him on condition that he renounced for himself, his heirs, and successors all claim to the Duchy of Holstein. The Treaty of 1852 provided, therefore, as far as the foresight of the parties to it could go, for the maintenance of the integrity of the Danish monarchy as then constituted, by the possession on the part of Denmark of the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. That treaty was greatly approved by all the parties who were concerned in it. A question, however, arose whether, as Holstein was affected by the treaty, it should be submitted for the concurrence of the Diet at Frankfort? The asking for that concurrence was at first objected to by all the Powers concerned—by the German Powers, by Russia, by Sweden, and by Denmark. My noble Friend Lord Granville, when he held the seals of the Foreign Office, did, however, propose that the treaty before it was concluded should be submitted to the Frankfort Diet. But that proposal met with no assent. On the contrary, as will be seen by the papers now in the hands of Members, some parties expressed their dismay at such a proposal — dismay arising from the delay which they held would be the consequence of such an application—and a different course was adopted, namely, that, whereas the Diet consists only of representatives of the different German Powers, application should be made to those Powers themselves to accede to the treaty which had been concluded. The application was made, and several States acceded; but it is right to say that some other States, including Bavaria and Baden, declined to assent to the treaty in consequence of feelings connected with German opinion as bearing upon the Duchies of Holstein and Schleswig. Well, Sir, that treaty was preceded by certain diplomatic communications between Germany and Denmark, which led to various arrangements; but the material arrangement was this—that whereas, on the one hand, the great object of Denmark had always been to incorporate Schleswig with Denmark, and whereas, on the other hand, the great object for which the Germans had always contended was the political and administrative union of Schleswig with Holstein, both should give up their respective pretensions—that the King of Denmark, on the one hand, should engage not to incorporate Schleswig with Denmark, and the Germans, on the other, agree no longer to require the political union of Schleswig with Holstein. So stood matters at the conclusion of the treaty, in which, if all the parties had been equally animated by a spirit of conciliation — and I must say of justice—it would have been better for them, and I am not aware that any serious complications would have arisen. But during the ten years which elapsed between the conclusion of that treaty and the death of the late King of Denmark a series of mutual complaints arose between the parties. The Germans contended, and I am afraid not without some reason, that the Danish Government had not acted fairly in its treatment of the German population of Schleswig—that in their extreme desire to extend Danish influence and rule they had in some degree interfered with the free exercise by the German population of that duchy of those privileges which belonged to them as the subjects of a free State. It is also to be borne in mind that in March of last year a Patent — that is to say, a Constitution—for Holstein was proclaimed by the late King of Denmark, which the German Confederation stated to be in its details at variance with the general laws of the Confederation. Moreover, in November a Constitution was passed by the Parliament at Copenhagen for Denmark and Schleswig which the Germans contended was at variance with the engagements given by Denmark in 1851-1852 not to incorporate Schleswig with Denmark. It was contended that an arrangement for united representation and the united action of deputies at Copenhagen was virtually an incorporation *pro tanto* of Schleswig with Denmark. The late King of Denmark died while these questions were still under discussion between Germany and Denmark. The Patent of March for Holstein in the meantime remained in force; and the present King, from considerations connected with internal matters, found it necessary upon his recent accession to the throne to give his sanction to that Constitution of November, which up to that period had wanted the Royal Assent, and was not complete until the Royal Assent had been given. Germany remonstrated against all those arrangements. In October the Frankfort Diet had passed a Resolution that Federal troops should enter Holstein for the purpose of compelling the late King of Denmark, as Duke of Holstein, to revoke the Patent of March.

I will deal with the political question first. Matters stood in the position which I have described towards the conclusion of the year. Her Majesty's Government, thinking and believing that there were grounds for the German objections to that Patent, urged the Danish Government to revoke it, and by so doing to place themselves in the right in regard to that question. The Danish Government did so. ["Hear, hear!" *from the Opposition.*] But the Diet changed its ground, and, instead of contenting itself, as it had done up to the death of the late King, with disputing the right of the Duke of Holstein to give a Constitution which they maintained was at variance with the Federal law, they took up another ground, and contended that the question had fairly arisen who should be Duke of Holstein; they denied that the King of Denmark had succeeded legally to the Duchy of Holstein; and a proposal was made in the Diet to occupy Holstein by Federal troops until that question should be decided by the Diet. In my opinion the Diet had and has no right to consider and decide that question. There is nothing, in my opinion, either in the Treaty of 1815 constituting the Diet and giving to it birth and origin, or in the final Act of 1820 completing the Diet arrangements, which entitles the Diet to determine who should succeed in any State within the Confederation; and I am not aware that when an Emperor of Austria resigned, and was succeeded by a member of his family, the Diet claimed any right to interfere in that matter. But Austria and Prussia moved in the Diet, not that the Federal troops should not enter Holstein, but that the entrance of these troops should be what is called an "execution" and not an "occupation." By the term "execution" is meant an act of the Diet, in accordance with the Powers of the Diet and German law, to compel any Sovereign of territory belonging to the Confederation to adapt his legislation to the laws of the Confederation, if those laws should have been broken. Austria and Prussia carried their proposal, and the Diet resolved, not that the entrance of the troops should bear the character of an occupation to hold the Duchy of Holstein until the rightful heir should be determined, but that the entrance of the troops should be an act of execution, to compel the existing Duke to alter the Patent and revoke it as not being in accordance with German law. The entrance, therefore, of the Federal troops into Holstein as a measure of execution was a distinct acknowledgment by the Diet at that time that the King of Denmark was Duke of Holstein, and it was to compel him to alter or revoke the Patent of March that that execution took place. It is also to be remembered that whereas it would have been perfectly legitimate for an execution to take place if the King of Denmark had persisted in refusing to revoke the Patent, yet in point of fact the Patent was revoked before the German troops entered the Duchy of Holstein; and consequently that entrance was unjust in itself, though founded on a plea which would have given a warrant to it had the plea still held good. Well, these troops having entered on the distinct understanding that they were there to compel the King of Denmark (Duke of Holstein) to revoke the Patent, those proceedings then took place which are known to everybody, and which led to the supersession of the authority of the King Duke, and to a declaration in favour of the Duke of Augustenburg.

Then came the case of the Constitution, uniting to a certain degree, as we were compelled to admit, Schleswig with Denmark, in violation of the engagements entered into by Denmark in 1852. Her Majesty's Government felt all the evils which would arise from an occupation of the territory of Schleswig by the German troops. I should say that though the Government of Denmark had engaged, at the suggestion of England and, I believe, the other Powers, to take the earliest means constitutionally possible to revoke that Constitution, the Germans determined to enter into and take possession of Schleswig as a material guarantee for the performance of that engagement. We proposed that some diplomatic transaction—some engagement on the part of Denmark taken in the presence of the other Powers parties to the treaty—should be accepted by the Germans as a sufficient security that the engagement would be fulfilled: but that proposal was not accepted, and the German troops entered Schleswig. When the Federal troops entered Holstein, the Danish Government, partly on advice and partly from considerations of prudence, refrained from offering any resistance to the Germans, and there was no war arising on that occasion; but when the German troops entered Schleswig the feelings of the Danish nation were too strong to admit of a similar course being pursued, and resistance—an obstinate and heroic resistance—was made against the very superior numbers which the Germans brought to bear. Up to that time, all the parties who had signed the Treaty of 1852 continued to admit its validity, and to acknowledge that they were bound by its engagements, so far as related to the acknowledgment of Christian IX. as King of Denmark and to the maintenance of the integrity of Denmark, and all the territories then held by the King. Even Prussia up to that time did not refuse to admit the binding nature of the treaty; but it is only fair to say that she intimated that if resistance should arise, and if different events should take place, then it would be possible that the German Powers might have to reconsider the engagements of the treaty. Not to weary the House by a recital of military operations which are familiar to everyone, I will state that the course of war led to the occupation by the Germans of the whole of the continental part of Schleswig, and such part of Jutland as they thought fit and expedient to occupy.

In this state of things it occurred to the Powers who were parties to the treaty and not engaged in the war, that it was desirable that a Conference should assemble, composed of the Plenipotentiaries of the belligerents, and of the four neutral Powers—England, France, Russia, and Sweden—to consider the means of re-establishing peace on a solid and permanent footing. That proposal was agreed to, and on the 25th of April the Conference met. It continued its labours until last Saturday. The first proposal made in the Conference was for a suspension of hostilities, because it was felt by the neutral Powers, England, France, Russia, and Sweden, that until the fighting ceased there was no fair prospect of a satisfactory conclusion being come to. We wished that a suspension of arms should precede the Conference; but we found it impossible to obtain an assent to such an arrangement. Well, after some delay, and a good deal of discussion when the Conference had met, a suspension of hostilities was agreed upon, to take place on the 12th of May, and to last for a month. The next thing was, that the belligerent Powers were asked on what conditions they were willing to put an end to the war and come to an amicable conclusion. The Germans, of course, were the parties on whom the question was pressed. There was some delay in extracting from the German Powers what their intentions were. They first proposed—still maintaining the principle of the integrity of the Danish Monarchy as settled by the Treaty of 1852, or at least not departing from it in words, though in substance they were thought to do so—that there should be a political and legislative union between Schleswig and Holstein, and that the connection between these united Duchies with Denmark should be the link, simply, of the Crown. They coupled that, however, with another condition, namely, that the arrangement should be reserved for the approbation of the Diet; and there was some reason to suppose that under that condition it was intended to include a discretion on the part of the Diet to decide whether the united Duchies should still continue united with Denmark, or whether the claims of some other party pretending to their possession should be considered. The Danish Government would not agree to that proposal. The German Powers then made a different proposal, but one far more objectionable —namely, that Schleswig and Holstein should be separated from the Danish Crown. That, of course, the Danes would not agree to. The neutral Powers concerted among themselves, and — seeing that Schleswig and Holstein were actually in the occupation of an overpowering military force, that it did not suit the views of France or Russia to take any active steps to dislodge that force, that Denmark was unable to do so, and that, I need not say, England was not willing singly to enter into the undertaking ["Hear, hear!"] —agreed to propose to Denmark the separation of Holstein from the Danish Crown, together with such parts of Schleswig as might be agreed upon; and the line of separation settled and proposed on the part of the neutral Powers was the line running along the Schlei down to Husum on the other coast. That proposal, coupled with other conditions which I shall not trouble the House by going into, but which will be found in the Protocol, was accepted by Denmark. Denmark said that, however unwilling to make a territorial cession, she was willing to agree to the proposal ["Hear, hear!"]; that, feeling all the inconvenience of perpetual disputes between herself and Germany, she wished to be quit of all interference on the part of the Diet in her internal affairs; and, provided she had assigned to her a frontier which in a military and commercial point of view was consistent with her interests, she was willing to accept the line I have mentioned, separating Holstein and the southern part of Schleswig from the Danish territory. The German Powers refused that arrangement. [*Opposition cheers.*] They asserted that the line would not include a sufficient amount of the purely German population; that there would still be a large number of Germans subject to Danish rule, and that their desire was to draw such a boundary that the great bulk of the German population should be included with Holstein. In regard to Schleswig, the fact, I take it, is this—that the extreme northern part is entirely Danish; that the extreme southern part is purely German; and that between the two there is a large extent of district in which the population is mixed—mixed not only as villages, but even as streets in the villages. It is, therefore, absolutely impossible to draw any line in the centre of Schleswig which shall entirely separate the German population from the Danish. Consequently the ground taken by the Danish Government appeared to be a fair one—that, it being impossible to draw the line with regard to nationality, it should be drawn so as to give to Denmark such a frontier as was susceptible of military defence, and would insure those commercial advantages which she was naturally anxious to secure. The Danish Government, therefore, I say, accepted the line of the Schlei. ["Hear!"] The German Plenipotentiaries, on the contrary, having given up part of Schleswig, were directed to insist on the line from Apenrade on the east to Tondern on the west coast. Between these two lines lies a district of considerable extent as compared with the extent of Schleswig, but in an European point of view of no great importance. In the course of the discussions the Prussian Plenipotentiary, Count Bernstorff, on his own authority, stated that, seeing how small the difference was which prevailed between the two parties, he would undertake to recommend to his Government to depart from the northern line of Apenrade and Tondern, and to be content with a line drawn from Flensburg to the west coast. That recommendation, however, his Government rejected, and he was obliged to say that his Government and Austria stood by the northern line, originally proposed, from Apenrade to Tondern. In the meanwhile, time pressing, the Plenipotentiaries naturally wished for a prolongation of the armistice — or, rather, I should say — for there is a technical difference between the two — the suspension of hostilities, which was to expire on the 12th of June; and with great difficulty Denmark was induced to agree to an extension for another fortnight. The German Powers were willing, as might have been expected, to extend the suspension to the beginning of winter. [*Opposition cheers.*] Denmark, on the other hand, grudged every fortnight of the summer that was withdrawn from her naval operations. ["Hear!"] The Danes, therefore, said they would not prolong the suspension beyond the fortnight, unless in the meanwhile some agreement should have been come to, with regard to the frontier and other things, that gave an assurance that the negotiations would result in a peaceful and satisfactory arrangement. The suspension was accordingly extended for a fortnight, which ended yesterday.

In the whole course of these negotiations I may say there was perfect unanimity between the neutral Powers — [*Ministerial cheers*] — between England, France, Russia, and Sweden; and although my noble Friend Earl Russell was chosen as President by the Conference at the outset, and although it may therefore have fallen to him to make several of the proposals which were submitted, these proposals must all be regarded as the proposals of the neutral Powers, because they were discussed, arranged, and settled, at meetings of the neutral Powers before they were brought before the Conference. [*Ministerial cheers.*] That is a very important point. ["Hear, hear!"]

As there was no possibility of bringing Germany and Denmark to agree upon any middle line between the two lines which they respectively stood by—the Schlei line being demanded by Denmark, and the Apenrade line by Germany—a last attempt was made by the neutral Powers to induce the belligerents to refer the question in dispute to arbitration. The dispute, it will be observed, had really been narrowed to a comparatively small point. It was no longer whether Holstein should be governed in a particular manner; it was no longer whether or not Schleswig should be united politically and administratively with Holstein, and whether the two Duchies should be connected by the link of the Crown with Denmark. Denmark had consented to the alienation of territory, Germany had been content with that arrangement, and the only question was, whether that arrangement should be carried out by dividing Schleswig in one part or by dividing it in another. It appeared to the neutral Powers that the territory lying between the two lines proposed was not so important to either party as to justify the resumption of the war, and that it might fairly be deemed, in accordance with the recommendation of the Conference of Paris, a question for the decision of an arbiter. Accordingly my noble Friend, as the organ of the neutral Powers, proposed that arrangement to the belligerent Plenipotentiaries. Each party, naturally, took time to refer the question to their respective Governments, and on Friday their answers were to be given. The answer of the German Powers was that they looked to the words of the Conference of Paris, which recommended the "good offices" of a friendly Power, and that the Protocol having been quoted by the neutrals, they accepted the reference of the question in dispute to a friendly Power, provided they were allowed to reserve their decision as to whether they should accept or refuse the line which the friendly Power might fix upon. [*Laughter, and ironical cheers from the Opposition.*] That was at variance with the proposal made ["Hear, hear!"]; because my noble Friend, as the organ of the neutral Powers, in recommending the adoption of a reference as suggested by the Conference of Paris, distinctly stated that it was with the object that a friendly Power might decide and determine the line to be drawn between the two parts of Schleswig. ["Hear, hear!"] Therefore, the answer of the German Powers would have been more frank and candid if they had simply declined the proposal, instead of accepting it with a condition which nullified it. ["Hear, hear!"] On the other hand, the Danes, who throughout the whole transactions have certainly clung more to their decision and principles than they have shown pliability in adapting themselves to the force of circumstances, declined the arbitration, and said that they had accepted the line of the Schlei, and further north they would not consent to go. [*Opposition cheers.*] There seemed now to be an end to all further attempts to effect an understanding; but the Ambassador of France, by order of his Government, made another and a last effort. He proposed that, whereas the Danes had agreed to give up as far as the Schlei, and the Germans not to pass northward beyond the Apenrade line, an appeal should be made to the population of the intermediate district in order to ascertain, first of all, their relative nationality, and then what their wishes were and what arrangement they would like. ["Hear!"] That proposal the British Plenipotentiaries agreed to; but it was negatived by Denmark. [*Opposition cheers.*] A proposal of the same sort had been made in an earlier stage of the negotiations, but had not found favour with any party, except Prussia, who was willing to try it; Austria and Russia had decided objections to it [*a laugh*]; and, therefore, the idea of ascertaining the views of the population in that way was not adopted at any time in the course of the proceedings. My right hon. Friend near me reminds me that a portion of the proposal was, of course, that there should be perfect freedom of choice on the part of the population, and that such freedom could not exist unless the occupying troops were withdrawn during the voting. Prussia, as I have said, would have been willing to accept, but Austria took a different view, and thus the labours of the Conference were brought to a close. We have endeavoured by every possible means, in conjunction with the other neutral Powers, to bring the two parties to an agreement, and we now lament, as everybody must, that war should begin again, for a matter which might so easily, we think, have been adjusted, and on a question not involving the existence of a nation or of a Government, but simply relating to the possession of a comparatively small strip of territory.

Sir, the Conference having unfortunately ended in the manner I have stated, it became the duty of Her Majesty's Government to take into serious consideration the course which it behoved them to adopt. We felt great sympathy for Denmark; we remembered that, although she had at the beginning been in the wrong, yet another Sovereign had succeeded to the throne, a different Ministry had the direction of her affairs, and that there had been manifested by acts a strong desire to set right that which had been wrong [*cheers*]; we believed that, from the commencement to the end of these last events, Denmark had been ill-used [*cheers*]; that might had overridden right [*renewed cheering*]; and we knew also that the sympathies of almost the whole of the British nation were on her side. [*Continued cheering.*] There is a natural disposition in all who have proper feelings to take part with the weak against the strong, especially if the weak are oppressed, and if the strong are acting unjustly and tyrannically. We should, therefore, for these reasons have been glad if we had found it possible to advise our Sovereign to take part with Denmark in the approaching struggle. But then, on the other hand, it was to be considered that, whatever wrongs Denmark may have sustained—and they are many —she had in the beginning been wrong herself ["Hear, hear!"]; that at the very last of the Conferences she had rejected a proposal reasonable in itself, and one which, if accepted by the two parties, would necessarily have led to a peaceful solution of the question in dispute. ["Hear!"] Her fault in that, no doubt, was equally shared by her antagonists [*cheers*]; but still, in considering the position which England ought to occupy, that matter could not altogether be left out of sight. We had also to consider what really was the matter in dispute for which hostilities were to be begun, and it did not appear to us to be one of very great importance. It did not involve the independence of Denmark; it went little beyond what Denmark had herself agreed to, and related simply as to whom a particular strip of territory should belong. On the other hand, as men who were considering what advice in a very important European crisis—and I do not wish to disguise its importance — should be given to their Sovereign, we could not lose sight of the magnitude of the resistance which had to be overcome, and the comparative means which England and her supposed antagonists would be able to bring to bear in the struggle. It had been ascertained early in these transactions that France—for reasons of which she was entitled to be the judge—declined to take any active measures in support of Denmark, and we knew that her resolution in that respect still continued unchanged. We had likewise ascertained that Russia, for reasons of which she also was entitled to be the judge, was not inclined to take any active measures in support of Denmark. We knew, therefore, that the whole brunt of the effort, whatever it might be, requisite for dislodging the German troops and those which might come to their assistance from the rest of Germany, from Schleswig and Holstein, would fall upon this country alone. Under the circumstances, we have not thought it consistent with our duty to advise our Sovereign to undertake such a task. We know the honourable sympathy which the people of this nation feel for the unhappy condition of Denmark; but, at the same time, we do not think it consistent with our duty to recommend Parliament and the country to make those great exertions, and to undergo those great sacrifices, which would have been the necessary consequence of entering into a conflict with the whole of Germany. I assume that, in the present state of things upon which our decision was made, the real contest lies between Germany and Denmark with respect to—I am afraid I can hardly say that part only of Schleswig which was in dispute before the Conference closed, because it is not impossible that the whole of Schleswig may be involved in the struggle. It would be more honourable on the part of the German Powers to be satisfied with that they have demanded, but we know that strength and success frequently carry men beyond the line which, on cool reflection, they might be disposed to stand upon. Still, the contest is as regards Schleswig, and not as regards the independence of Denmark, or the safety of the capital of the Danish monarchy. I do not mean to say, therefore —I think it right, indeed, to put in this reservation—that if the war should assume a different character; if the existence of Denmark as an independent Power in Europe should be at stake; if we had reason to expect to see at Copenhagen the horrors of a town taken by assault, the destruction of property, the sacrifice of the lives, not only of its defenders, but of its peaceful inhabitants, the confiscations which would ensue, the capture of the Sovereign as a prisoner of war, and other humiliations of that kind—I do not mean to say that if any of those events were likely to happen the position of this country might not be a subject for re-consideration—[*Renewed cries of* "Oh!" *laughter, and ironical cheering from the Opposition followed by counter cheers from the Ministerial Benches*]—we might then think it our duty to adopt another course. But this I say on the part of the Government, that if any change of policy be thought advisable, such change shall be communicated to Parliament if Parliament is sitting, and in any case the earliest opportunity shall be taken of asking the judgment of Parliament upon the matter. ["Hear, hear!"]

I have now to apologize to the House for having gone so much into detail. It was not my wish to provoke discussion. My desire simply was to explain as fully as I could the state of the matter. The papers, which will be in the hands of hon. Members to-morrow morning, contain full accounts of all that passed in the Conference. All the events which took place before are recorded in the papers which have now for some time been before Parliament; and, therefore, every hon. Member upon looking at those two sets of documents, will be capable of forming a proper opinion of the conduct pursued by Her Majesty's Government in regard to Danish affairs. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. DISRAELI: I quite agree with the noble Lord that it would be very inconvenient if the House on this occasion were to enter into a general discussion respecting the transactions that have taken place between Denmark and Germany, and the policy of the English Government with regard to them. One of the reasons why I now rise is to remind the House of the exact position which it occupies at this moment. As far as the negotiations of Her Majesty's Government with respect to the dispute between Denmark and Germany are concerned, the House has incurred no responsibility whatever. ["Hear, hear!"] Since the end of last Session the House has given no opinion upon the subject. ["Hear, hear!"] Considering that I have myself taken some part in bringing about the position which the House now occupies, I trust I may not be deemed presumptuous in reminding the House of it. On the first night of the Session, interpreting the feelings of Gentlemen on this side, I expressed my want of confidence in the foreign policy of the Government, and my disapprobation of the manner in which their negotiations had been carried on, especially in the North of Europe, as well as of the results which had been realized. Had the papers been presented to the House on the meeting of Parliament, according to custom, and as we now know they might have been, there would have been no difficulty before April in asking the opinion of the House upon the conduct of these negotiations; and, indeed, what has occurred in the Conference—judging from the narrative, perspicuous though not satisfactory [*a laugh*], which the noble Lord has given of it, and from what otherwise has reached the ears of many Gentlemen—has very little to do with the great question upon which the House ought to give its decision. I may say here, by the way, that the origin of the Conference has not been correctly described by the noble Lord. The Conference was not called at the desire of the neutral Powers, but was called by one neutral Power, and that Power was Great Britain. ["Hear, hear!"] It met without hope, and it rises without hope; it met without a basis, and therefore it leads to no result. ["Hear, hear!"] But let me remind the House that from the period when Parliament met until the meeting of the Conference the House expressed no approbation whatever of the conduct of Her Majesty's Government with respect to these transactions. On one occasion alone its opinion was asked for in the shape of a formal Motion by an hon. Gentleman opposite. On that occasion I myself interposed, and moved the Previous Question, on the ground that the circumstances which prevailed rendered it, in my judgment, not expedient for Parliament to give any opinion on the subject. And, therefore, Her Majesty's Ministers did not enter the Conference with the confidence of Parliament, but with the Previous Question. That was the basis, as far as Parliament was concerned, on which they entered into the Conference. Well, it is necessary that the House should understand clearly they are not in any way committed to any approbation of the conduct of Her Majesty's Ministers in the matter. But, Sir, I think that the time has arrived when some opinion ought to be pronounced by this House. [*Cheers.*] Although five months have elapsed since the period at which, as it now appears, that opinion might conveniently and properly have been taken, I myself do not regret the delays that were occasioned, because they were occasioned on both sides of this House by those feelings which, I think, do honour to the House of Commons. I have always believed that one of the principal reasons why the House of Commons, as a political institution, has been so successful and so marked out in its practical character from all other popular assemblies may be found in the respect which it entertains for the prerogatives of the Crown and the functions of constitutional Ministers. Therefore, Sir, I think that the course we then pursued was a wise, a temperate, and a patriotic course. ["Hear, hear!"] At the same time, I must say it is my conviction that we should forfeit all claim to the respect of our countrymen, and not fulfil one of the most important functions of Parliament, if, in the present critical position of affairs, we hesitated to give our opinion upon the conduct of Her Majesty's Ministers on this question. [*Cheers.*] And having on several occasions expressed that conviction, I must say now that it is my intention on an early—I would say even the earliest—opportunity to ask the opinion of the House on that subject. I have no doubt that I shall find no difficulty raised by the noble Lord opposite in fixing on the period which I may think most convenient to the House for that purpose. [Viscount PALMERSTON: Not a bit.] Sir, I would add no more were it not for the closing observations of the noble Lord, which, it appears to me, ought not to pass unnoticed. I must say that I heard them with astonishment. [*Renewed cheers.*] Are we, then, to be taught to-night by the noble Lord that it is the Islands only of Denmark that are necessary to the independence of that country? Then why is it that we have been committed to a policy which has so long and so pertinaciously declared that the possession of Holstein and Schleswig by the Crown of Denmark was necessary to the balance of power and to the maintenance of the public law of Europe. Sir, it is too much for us now to hear, under those circumstances, that war may be impending at any moment, and that the Parliament, which is soon to be prorogued, may be suddenly called together because the noble Lord and his Colleagues, who for a considerable period have been defining the grounds upon which the balance of power and the maintenance of the public law of Europe alone depend and ought to be vindicated, find at the last moment, while they recede from the scene of action, the possibility of a smaller issue which may arise, and in the interval agitate Europe and distract the public mind. ["Hear, hear!"] After the experience that we have had on this subject, I can really look on this only—and it is some consolation to adopt that view of the question—I can look on this only as a continuation of those senseless and spiritless menaces [*loud cheers*], which have impaired the just influence of this country in the councils of Europe, and, by impairing that influence, have diminished the most effectual means of maintaining peace. [*Cheers.*] I think that the noble Lord might have spared that contingent menace to the House, to the country, and to Europe. I must say myself that, judging from the past, I would prefer that the affairs of this country should be conducted on the principle of the hon. Members for Rochdale and Birmingham than on the policy which is avowed and announced at least by the noble Lord. [*Cheers.*] I think that in that case, as the consequences would almost be the same, our position would be more consistent; it would certainly be more profitable, and in my opinion it would really be more dignified. At least those hon. Gentlemen would threaten nobody ["Hear!"]; at least, they would not tell Denmark that if she is attacked she will not find herself alone [*cheers*]; at least they would not exasperate Germany by declaiming in the full Parliament of England against the "aggravated outrages" of her policy [*cheers*]; at least they would not lure on Denmark by delusive counsels and fallacious hopes. [*Renewed cheers.*] I declare that, in my opinion, the position of England would be more dignified if the policy which those hon. Members profess regulated our affairs rather than the policy by which the noble Lord seeks to guide us. Why, have we not now, for months upon months, been menacing almost every country in the world? [*Laughter and cheers.*] And yet, when we thought that we had at least secured the blessings of peace—when we supposed from the gloomy narrative of disappointment and discomfiture which we have received this evening, we were at least in an intelligible position, and enjoying what some may have thought to be purchased at a great cost, but which was a clear result—namely, the possession of peace, we are at the same time to have that announcement accompanied by the continuation of these unsatisfactory menaces, and told that absolutely at this moment the whole country is to be agitated by the possibility of Parliament being called together suddenly in order that the noble Lord may commence a policy of action which, if ever justified and called for, ought to have been commenced long ago. [*Loud cheers.*] Sir, I trust, however, that these questions will be entered into fully and completely. When I listened to the narrative with which the noble Lord favoured us to-night of these transactions—of the continued sacrifices of Denmark—of the continued approaches of the enemies of Denmark—I confess, Sir, that I was not myself much surprised — though the point naturally awakened some curiosity and interest—that the noble Lord should have entirely omitted any notice of the inducements which made Denmark submit to these sacrifices, or any mention of those menaces addressed to the aggressive Powers which were always treated with contempt. But I should certainly have liked, while his *précis* of the proceedings on this question was being given us by the First Minister, to have had some account of the causes of the dreary consequences which he communicated to us. ["Hear!"] Sir, we shall soon have an opportunity of entering into that matter. I accept the noble Lord's courteous promise that he will make no difficulty respecting the day on which I shall venture to ask the opinion of the House of Commons on the policy of the Government, and I shall take care that no unnecessary delay occurs before I avail myself of it. [*Loud cheers.*]

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

ANNUITY TO THE KING OF GREECE.

RESOLUTION.

MR. AYRTON said, he desired to bring under the notice of the House a matter of considerable importance, bearing in mind the precedent it involved, and the effect it might have on their future proceedings. In 1832, after the British Government of that day had adopted the decisive policy of establishing the independence of Greece, they determined, in conjunction with Russia and France, to afford such material assistance to the new kingdom as might enable it to organize a regular Government. In fulfilment of that design, a Convention was entered into between those three Powers for the purpose of enabling Greece to raise a loan sufficient to meet the financial necessities of that country. By that Convention it was provided that a sum of 60,000,000f., or about £2,400,000, should be raised by way of loan in three separate instalments. The first was to be raised immediately; the other two as the circumstances of Greece might require. The Government of that day took care that the Convention should preserve to the House the opportunity of expressing its judgment on the transaction, and, accordingly, while the Emperor of Russia bound himself at once and unconditionally to guarantee one-third of the loan, the constitutional sovereigns of France and England only bound themselves, the one to recommend to the French Chambers, and the other to recommend to Parliament, the expediency of giving a similar guarantee. Some three or four years afterwards, in 1846, a question arose whether the British Government were bound to guarantee the second and third loans, if the other Powers did not adopt the same course; and the Government of that day, instead of taking it on themselves to decide the question, applied to the House of Commons for an Act to amend the original proceeding and to resolve the doubt. From 1832 to the present time no less than £977,000 had been paid out of the Consolidated Fund on account of the Greek loan. The treaty undoubtedly contained provisions for the repayment of the loan, which was to be a first charge on Greek revenues, but until the year 1847 the Greeks did not pay anything. In 1848, the attention of the Government having been called to the fact, some pressure was put upon that country, and about £40,000 was paid on account of the advances they had received. Greece was then allowed for some years to go to sleep again and to disregard its obligations, but in 1860 the British Government, in conjunction with the other protecting Powers, was moved to make a strong remonstrance against its disregard of the duties imposed by the Treaty of 1832. An investigation was made into the resources of Greece, and recommendations were made that she should forthwith set apart some 900,000f., equal to £36,000 a year, in discharge of her obligations. In the same year the Greek Parliament voted £36,000 as a first instalment in accordance with that requisition, and £12,000, the third of that amount, was paid into the Consolidated Fund. But from that time Greece had been in a very troubled condition, and her troubles culminated in what he might call the politest revolution that had ever taken place, the King having been escorted on board ship and informed that he might go upon his travels to any other country. Negotiations were then set on foot to find him a successor and the country a King, and when the Prince of Denmark ascended the throne one of the terms of the proposal signed by the protecting Powers was, that out of the £36,000 a year which the Greek Government had engaged to pay annually, £12,000 a year should be paid to the Prince of Denmark, of which sum the proportion to be given by Great Britain would be £4,000 a year. When that proposal was laid on the table he called attention to the peculiar language in which it was couched, no reservation being contained as to the right of Parliament to express any opinion. The Under Secretary of State undertook that the matter should be considered, and the hon. Member for Horsham (Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald) having reminded the Government of their promise to explain, on the 8th of July the Chancellor of the Exchequer said it was intended to afford Parliament an opportunity of expressing its views, but as it would be necessary to reduce the transaction into the form of a diplomatic act, that might not be accomplished before the close of the Session. After it had expired, the treaty which had been negotiated on the 13th of July was published, and as regarded the annuity to the King of Greece it was precisely in the same terms as the Protocol itself. Another treaty subsequent to the cession of the Ionian Islands was made, with a proviso that it should not endanger or in any way impair the obligations of the Treaty of 1832, or the transactions relating to the loan. The House, he thought, could hardly doubt that the making of treaties, disposing of the public money in those absolute terms, and without reserving any right to Parliament of expressing an opinion, was a matter which they were bound in some manner to notice. Nothing could be more clear than that all casual receipts, either derived from revenues at home or from foreign countries, belonged to, and ought to be paid into, the Consolidated Fund. An Act was passed in 1854 to abolish the practice of intercepting the public revenue in its way to the Consolidated Fund. In order that everything should go into the Consolidated Fund, Parliament also provided that hereditary pensions and other hereditary claims should be no longer paid out of special sources of revenue. The Chancellor of the Exchequer on the 6th of July last year, in the fullest manner, accepted the doctrine that it was the duty of the Government to obtain the sanction of Parliament in all matters of this kind, and yet seven days afterwards Earl Russell signed a treaty by which the doctrine was set at naught, because, instead of reserving to Parliament the right of expressing an opinion, the treaty was made in absolute and definite terms that gave to Parliament no option. The prerogative of the Crown had, in fact, been exercised in a manner which set at naught the privileges of the House of Commons. Parliament had for many years interested itself in the right of the Crown to grant annuities out of the public revenue. In 1782 it was provided that no pension should be granted by the Crown of a greater amount than £1,200 without a previous Resolution and Address of both Houses of Parliament. It was further provided that no pension should be payable out of any particular source of revenue, but that all pensions should be paid at the Exchequer, so that they could not escape observation. There was one exception in favour of the families of the reigning Sovereign. It would be seen that the treaty in question violated both the rules laid down. At the end of the reign of George III. another Act was passed further to check the extravagance of the Sovereign. In that and every succeeding Act for the settlement of the Civil List, Mr. Burke's Act of 1792 was cited and made one of the regulating statutes. There could be nothing more clear than that Parliament had restrained the right of the Crown to grant annuities. The question of pensions again excited the attention of the House of Commons at the beginning of the reign of William IV., and a Resolution tending to restrain the power of the Crown in this respect was the cause of the change of Administration which placed the Whigs in power. That Resolution was in 1834 followed by another of a more stringent character—namely, that no pension should be granted by the Crown except for public services which were to be particularly stated. On the accession of Queen Victoria, and the arrangement of the Civil List, that Resolution was cited in the Act as the rule for the future granting of pensions. The Act further provided, that instead of the Queen having a large fund available for pensions she should have a stipulated sum of £1,200 a year for this purpose. Parliament had strictly limited the authority of the Crown in regard to the granting of pensions, but notwithstanding all these statutes the Government by this treaty had bound itself to grant an annuity to the King of Greece in a manner which deprived the House of Commons of all legitimate opportunity of expressing an opinion on the subject. It was true that the Government had submitted to Parliament a Bill for confirming the annuity; but it was idle to ask the House to give an opinion on the Bill, as it was impossible to set at naught a treaty which had not only been ratified, but partly carried into effect. This treatment of the House of Commons contrasted forcibly with the liberty which had been given to the Ionian Parliament. The Protocol reserved to the Ionian Parliament the right of expressing an opinion on the dotation of £10,000 a year to the King of Greece. The Ionian Parliament formed an opinion of its own, and determined that the dotation should not be a separate charge on the Ionian Islands, but should be only a temporary charge until Greeee and the Ionian Islands came to an agreement on the subject. The treaty had, consequently, to be altered in this sense. Her Majesty's Government were by no means so desirous to make provision for the public servants of Her Majesty in the Ionian Islands, for they had left them to be dealt with by a convention with the Greek Government, so that it might possibly happen that our pensioners in the Ionian Islands might be left to be paid out of the revenues of this country. The question was, whether before passing the Bill the House would not place on record some distinct declaration in regard to the power of the Crown to enter into engagements which affected the revenues of the country without first consulting Parliament. If the House were to allow this Bill to pass unchallenged it would form a most dangerous precedent. He was desirous of asking the Chancellor of the Exchequer to explain how he could reconcile the terms of the treaty either with precedent or his own pledge; and if he could not do so, the House ought to place on the Journals some record of its opinion of such proceedings. In conclusion he begged to move that the grant to the King of Greece of an annuity of £4,000 out of moneys belonging to the Consolidated Fund by treaty not made subject to the sanction of Parliament was a violation of the privileges of the House of Commons.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the Grant to the King of Greece of an Annuity of £4,000 out of monies belonging to the Consolidated Fund, by Treaty not made subject to the sanction of Parliament, is a violation of the Privileges of the House of Commons,"—(*Mr. Ayrton,*) —instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he would give the hon. Gentleman all the explanation in his power. He believed the hon. Gentleman had challenged the proceedings of Her Majesty's Government — first, with regard to the promise stated to have been made by them last Session; and, secondly, with respect to precedents in analogous cases. With regard to the promise, it had, he believed, been fulfilled, both in the letter and the spirit. In the record of the proceedings of the House he found that, in answer to a question put by the hon. Member for Horsham (Mr. S. Fitzgerald), he stated that the sum in question, £4,000, must, in the first place, be the subject of diplomatic arrangement, and, as it would not be until after such an arrangement that Her Majesty's Government would be able to apply to Parliament for an Act, he apprehended they would not be able to submit a Bill upon the subject during that Session. Therefore, he stated distinctly that there would be an Act of Parliament, but that it could not be introduced until after the negotiations then pending, nor probably during the Session then drawing to a close. He spoke on the 6th of July, the treaty was signed on the 13th, but it was not ratified for a considerable time after. If, however, it had been ratified on the 13th of July, it would not have been possible or becoming to bring before the House, at such a late period of the Session, a question which, in a constitutional point of view, was one of a high order. Her Majesty's Government, therefore, had done exactly what they had engaged to do. But the hon. Gentleman had asked whether such a proceeding was in accordance with practice? It was fully in accordance with practice that when a sum of money to which the Crown of this country was entitled was surrendered by the Crown, that the surrender should be made by treaty, and it was not customary to make that surrender contingent upon the assent of Parliament. He admitted in a constitutional point of view that the assent of Parliament was necessary, but it was not usual to make it a condition in the diplomatic instrument. On the contrary, when the Crown undertook to pay a sum of money, it was customary to make that payment conditional on the assent of Parliament. But there was, in a formal point of view, a broad distinction between engaging to pay a sum of money which was to be levied upon the people and surrendering money which had never formed part of the revenue of the country. The difference between the Ionian Parliament and the British Parliament was founded upon that distinction which he had pointed out. Of this practical distinction it would be easy to give instances. There might be a distinction between surrendering a sum of money once for all, and making a surrender which would extend over a series of years. In the case of the Ionian Parliament, the question was to provide an income for the King of Greece out of the Ionian revenue, to be raised from year to year in the Ionian Islands. In this case the question was to provide him with a portion of his income, not out of the revenue of this country, but out of money due to us as part of a debt. There were two precedents which might be cited for the course which the Government had taken in this matter; the one in respect of the remission of certain claims upon Austria, the other of a similar remission with regard to Portugal. On the 22nd of January, 1815, a treaty was signed at Vienna, in which the King of England remitted to Portugal certain outstanding payments in respect of a loan of £600,000, which had been spent in the service of Portugal in the year 1809. In that instance the grant was never challenged or called in question by Parliament. He believed he was correct in saying, that no application was made to Parliament on the subject, and that the remission never received its sanction. Her Majesty's Government did not seek to cover themselves by that precedent, which, however, more than covered them. The other case was that of the Austrian loan, which was, perhaps, more immediately in point. In the year 1823 a convention was made between His Majesty the King of Great Britain and the Emperor of Austria, by which the latter engaged to pay £2,500,000, and the King agreed to accept that sum in satisfaction of all claims whatever on the Emperor, a much larger sum having been due to us under previous engagements. That was by a treaty signed at Vienna on the 27th of November, 1823, and in March, 1824, an Act was passed which recited the original proceedings, the raising of money on behalf of Austria, and likewise the convention to which he had just referred, and then it proceeded to enact in conformity with the provisions of that convention itself. Therefore, as far as precedent was concerned, he had shown that Her Majesty's Government had followed exactly that precedent which was before them. His hon. Friend might possibly say that it was the duty of Government to come down to Parliament with a proposal anterior to making the arrangements. But when last year he stated the course which the Government intended to pursue—namely, first to enter into a convention, and then to come to the House for its sanction, that explanation seemed satisfactory. Indeed, he did not think it would have been possible to come to Parliament for its sanction beforehand, for one peculiar reason, that the dotation, as it was called, of £4,000 a year was not a single arrangement; it was a small and limited portion of an extended political negotiation involving transactions with other parties. The hon. Gentleman appeared to apprehend that in a certain case this sum of money might have to be reimbursed out of the revenues of this country. He was not aware of any contingency in which such an obligation would arise. The money was not received and accounted for as part of the revenues of this country, and paid over into the hands of the King of Greece. The English Government were not bound, as far as he was aware, to see that the King of Greece received it; but in the terms of the convention they remitted so much of their claim on Greece as was represented by it. Therefore there was no engagement to pay the money in any contingency out of the revenues of this country. The question still remained, whether it would be possible to introduce any improvement into the established practice with regard to cases of this kind. That was a very fair matter for consideration, but it was not the subject at present before the House; and as the proceeding which had been taken was in accordance with the announcement made by the Government before the end of last Session, and with the course taken in former cases, he hoped the hon. Gentleman would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

THE LAW COURTS.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. MONTAGUE SMITH said, he rose to call the attention of the House to the buildings and sheds used for the Superior Courts of Law and Equity, and to the inadequate accommodation afforded by them. He had hoped to be spared the necessity of directing notice to this grievance, as last year the Government intimated that some steps would be taken to remedy it; but the introduction of their promised measures was still delayed. The House took great interest in the discussions relating to picture galleries or museums for the exhibition of art, but he was sure the country would think it of much greater importance than spending money even on such desirable objects that the courts in which justice was administered should be made worthy of the nation. The state of the Courts of Law was as bad as it possibly could be, and the word "sheds" fairly described many of the buildings used as courts. Last Session he called attention to this subject on account of the Second Court of Queen's Bench being obliged to close its sittings, because the Chief Justice stated that it was utterly unfit for a Court of Justice, and detrimental to the health of all attending it. In the present year the Judges of the Queen's Bench had again had occasion to complain of the places allotted to them for the purpose of exercising their functions. On a recent occasion, when a necessity arose for having a Second Court of Queen's Bench, no other place was at the time available for the purpose but a miserable room, with access by a dark staircase, which it was almost impossible to find. Justice on that occasion was certainly in a state of vagrancy, and had to hide her head from the suitors endeavouring to follow her, in an obscure chamber, where Mr. Justice Blackburn said that it was not possible to see, hear, or breathe. The state of the Courts at Westminster was shortly this, that eight courts were sometimes required, and there were only two fit for the despatch of business—the Court of Queen's Bench and the Court of Exchequer. The Court of Common Pleas, which was built when the serjeants only had audience there, was now much too small for its business, which amounted to one-third of the whole legal business of the country. The Bail Court, in which jury cases were now tried, was intended originally for the sitting of a single Judge to dispose of what were known as "bail cases," and might be likened to the "black hole," for it was below the ordinary surface of the ground, and had only one entrance. The Bar were accustomed to the annoyance, and had got in some degree acclimatized to it; but the public who had to discharge the duties of jurors and witnesses, had had no such training, and felt most severely the inconveniences to which they were subjected in consequence of the heat and want of ventilation. He did not know anything more painful than to address a jury in an incipient state of apoplexy. The Courts of Equity were, he believed, in some respects no better. [MR. MALINS: They are worse.] His hon. and learned Friend near him said that they were worse, and certainly he could say with regard to two of them that they might very properly be called sheds, or places of temporary shelter. Such sheds, with better ventilation, might make good cavalry barracks. In Guildhall matters were no better, some courts there being built on the model of cucumber frames with glass at the top. In Edinburgh and Dublin there were excellent courts, with libraries for the use of the Bar; but in London there was no court which had a library, or any room in which those attending the courts could study during the intervals of their engagements. There were also no waiting rooms for witnesses, so that they had either to sit or stand in court, or haunt the purlieus of Westminster Hall. There was not the slightest accommodation for jurymen. Frequently jurymen had to wait in court for several days before the cases on which they were summoned were called on. A merchant who had been summoned as a special juror wrote to him to say that he had to wait in court from ten till half past four, and that during the greater part of that time he was unable to obtain a seat; and he suggested that with the view of providing a room to which professional men, while waiting for the cases on which they had been summoned as special jurors, might retire for the purpose of writing letters and seeing their clerks on urgent business, special jurors should be paid only £1 instead of £1 1*s.* per day, and the odd shilling should be devoted to the providing of such a room. Was it not a reproach to those who had the management of these affairs that such a suggestion should have been made by a juror? Several spasmodic efforts had been made to build new courts, but the evils which had been so long felt and so frequently complained of still remained. Bench, Bar, jurors, witnesses, and suitors had equally a grievance in the present state of affairs. A Commission—consisting of Sir John Coleridge, Sir W. P. Wood, Sir George Lewis, Sir R. Phillimore, and Mr. John Young, a solicitor of eminence — inquired into the subject in 1860, and, although attempts had been made since then to improve matters, they remained much the same as before. The Commission reported that the Bail Court was wholly unsuited for jury trials, that the Common Pleas was too small for the convenient discharge of business, and had sometimes to borrow a Parliamentary Committee-room or a Chancery Court for the purpose of a second court, that the Court of Exchequer was also inadequate, and that in the Queen's Bench, as in the other courts, the accommodation for Bench, Bar, and other parties was very defective. He thought he was entitled to expect from what was said when he drew attention to the question on a former occasion, that something would before now have been done. His hon. and learned Friend the present Solicitor General owned that there was a crying grievance, and the Attorney General also condemned the present state of the courts, declaring that an immediate remedy was required, and that, in his opinion, there were sufficient funds in hand for the purpose. The Chancellor of the Exchequer also said that the Government were waiting only for the concurrence of the House, and that after the encouragement which had been given he had no doubt they would not be unwilling to discharge the duty to which attention had been called. He was sorry that the Government had not as yet fulfilled that duty, but he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not plead that his words were uttered in the heat of debate, but would give effect to them. The lawyers were a long-suffering race, but he trusted that something would be done, without delay, to meet their just expectations in this matter. At the beginning of the Session the Chief Commissioner promised to bring in a Bill for the erection of new Law Courts between Carey Street and the Strand, but that promise had not yet been fulfilled. And on three other occasions the Government assured the hon. Member for Taunton (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) that they would bring in a Bill on the subject. Something had been said about a financial difficulty, but he believed that means could easily be found, and, at all events, it was the duty of the Government to provide for the decent administration of justice. Luxurious accommodation was not asked for. Nothing more was required than such accommodation as would be consistent with the dignity of the country, and would promote the despatch of business, without occasioning inconvenience to those who were engaged in it. Quiet as the Session had been no step had been taken, and now, unfortunately for the question, more exciting times were in prospect, but he hoped that the reproach which now rested on our legislation in this respect would speedily be removed.

Mr. MALINS said, he regretted the absence of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, because he wished to hear that right hon. Gentleman explain why the present state of things was allowed to continue. This was not a subject on which there was any difference of opinion. All agreed that the present state of things was disgraceful to the country. There were only two Equity Courts that were fit for the purpose, the Lord Chancellor's Court and the Lords Justices of Appeals' Court. As for the Equity Courts, no one would say that any of the three Vice Chancellors occupied a court fit for the administration of justice. And what accommodation was there for the transaction of that enormous mass of business which was referred to the Judges' Chambers? He reminded the House that four years ago, when he came down with the intention to put a question on this subject, his noble and learned Friend the present Lord Chancellor told him that the Government were going to bring in a great scheme, and that in two years they would have new courts open. Since that time not a single step had been taken on the subject. He had asked the right hon. Gentleman the Commissioner of Works again and again when the Bill was to be brought in, and he had been assured that it was intended to do it speedily. He had asked the Lord Chancellor on more than one occasion what was the cause of the delay. He could, however, get no satisfactory answer; and he concluded it arose from the consideration of money. The Attorney General had agreed to the necessity of the measure, the Solicitor General had agreed to it, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whose duty it would be to see that public accommodation was duly provided, had agreed to it. For three if not four Sessions notice had been given by the Government to owners of houses between Searle Street and Fleet Street, that they would require their property, and the inhabitants there were in a state of great inconvenience and uncertainty. One lady, who was the owner of property in Boswell Court, was almost reduced to a state of destitution, for she could not find tenants for her property because the Government would not make up its mind. His hon. and learned Friend had represented the condition of the Courts of Common Law. The Courts of Equity also were extremely bad. There were no waiting-rooms for witnesses, no retiring-rooms for juries; the Judge himself was obliged to retire to a room eight or nine feet square; and, in short, the whole state of things was a disgrace to the country. And what was the excuse offered? The Society of Lincoln's Inn had made a proposal to build three Vice Chancellors' Courts within the Inn, and lay out on them £100,000 if the Government would pay them £4 per cent on that outlay, and he confessed he would rather accept that proposal than that the present state of things should continue. If the Lincoln's Inn scheme could not be successfully promoted, he, for one, would concur in a general scheme which would place all the Courts of Law between Lincoln's Inn and Fleet Street. He thought that a case had been made out so clearly that the Government owed some explicit explanation to the House. The Government ought either to bring in a Bill at once, or declare their intention to abandon the question, so that the Courts of Equity connected with Lincoln's Inn might take their own course.

Mr. Malins

MR. ARTHUR MILLS said, he was unable to understand what could be the obstacles to the introduction of the Bill on that subject. The dilatory pleas which had so often been put forward were hardly becoming, and the Government ought not to give reiterated promises if they had no *bonâ fide* intention of fulfilling them. The owners of property on the proposed site of the new Law Courts had been exposed to great loss, owing to the notices which had been constantly served on them during the last three years, and they had good reason to complain of the suspense in which they were kept, as well as the serious injury they sustained while the Government were making up their minds either to proceed with or abandon the scheme. He had asked before Easter whether it was intended to proceed with the measure, and he was told that the Bill would be brought in immediately after Easter, but it had not yet been introduced.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, the intentions of the Government had been perfectly *bonâ fide.* Difficulties had, however, interposed which, very much against the will of the Lord Chancellor and everybody else concerned in the preparation of the measure, had caused it to be delayed till the present time. It would be possible, he believed, to bring the Bill in within a very short time, although at that period of the Session he was aware it must depend on the goodwill of the House whether it could pass that year. But, even if it did not then pass, there would be some advantage in having the plan, upon which the Government had at last determined, submitted to the House, so that it might be maturely considered by all who were interested in it before another Session commenced. He agreed that the evil and scandal of the present state of things could not possibly be exaggerated, and that it was an object of the most pressing importance that the Courts of Law and Equity and all the offices connected with the administration of justice in its various departments should be put on a worthier and more satisfactory footing. He was thoroughly convinced that no scheme could be satisfactory which did not aim at bringing the whole of the Courts together, thereby contributing to the greatest possible despatch, the saving of the time of suitors, and facilitating communication between all persons engaged in every branch of the administration of justice. It was true the Government two years previously brought in a Bill founded on the recommendations of the Commission of 1860. That Bill was met by an opposition mainly arising from the preference which some members of the legal profession felt for the plan proposed by Lincoln's Inn as to the Equity Courts. The Society of Lincoln's Inn was anxious to retain the Equity Courts within its own precincts, and desired their peculiar inconveniences to be remedied as soon as possible, whatever became of the case of the Common Law Courts. It would not, he thought, have been an expedient or long-sighted course to agree to that proposal. It would have tended to perpetuate one portion of the evil incident to the existing state of things, by separating one branch of the administration of justice from the rest, and interposing a real obstacle to the final and worthy settlement of that question. On the other hand, fears were expressed by some hon. Members—by the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge University amongst others — that the Government were about to launch on a boundless sea of expenditure, as had been done in regard to the building of the Houses of Parliament, and the House hesitated, chiefly on that account, to commit itself to their scheme. Before introducing another Bill on the subject the Department of the Government concerned in the matter had been very anxious to be quite sure of their ground, especially as to the pecuniary arrangements. The necessary inquiries had occupied, undoubtedly, a longer time than was anticipated at the beginning of the Session; but they were confident of being able to recommend to the House, and eventually they hoped to secure the adoption of, a measure which would obviate all the principal objections raised to the former project. In the first place, the Government had taken pains to ascertain by competent and independent opinions, whether the views of the architect consulted in the first instance, and who no longer had anything to do with the matter, could be safely relied on, and whether the estimates for the purchase of land and erection of buildings between Carey Street and the Strand were adequate. He was happy to state that the original estimate was fully borne out; they were confident that it was an outside estimate, and were confident it would not be exceeded even if the entire plans were carried into effect. A change had been made in the proposed method of dealing with the funds, which would obviate the necessity of throwing any charge upon the public purse. Instead of taking the whole of the funds considered to be available in Chancery, amounting in round numbers to £1,500,000, a portion would be reserved in order to recoup to the public any advances which might have to be made on account of annual charges. The difference it was proposed to make up partly by taking into account the value of the present buildings and sites for building, which would be gained to the public, and partly by having money advanced from time to time by the Public Loan Commission. It was proposed to spread the reimbursement of that portion of the loan over a considerable number of years, and to raise the moderate annual sum which would be required to pay interest and instalments of principal by fees of small amount to be laid upon the several steps and processes taken in those Courts deriving benefit from the new building which were unconnected with the Court of Chancery, and did not contribute any portion of the funds taken out of that Court. In that way the funds connected with the Court of Chancery, which were owned by no one and belonged to the public, would still contribute the principal portion of the cost, and the remainder would be distributed in the way he had explained. The necessary investigations relating to the plan of which he had given the outline had unavoidably occupied a considerable period of time; but if the House, generally, should be willing to entertain the project, there might be still time to pass it into law. At all events, it should be laid upon the table with as little delay as possible, and an opportunity of considering it afforded before the Session closed.

Mr. SELWYN said, the hon. and learned Gentleman, in his narrative of the reasons which induced the House to reject the former proposal, had overlooked one or two great difficulties which were felt at the time. He had also been very much surprised at the description which he gave of the Suitors' Fee Fund as a fund that belonged to nobody, and was the property of the public. Without discussing that question, he would assert that if the origin of the fund were considered, the purposes to which it was devoted, and the numerous claims continually made upon it, it would be impossible to maintain that view. Moreover, if the total expenditure of the court were placed on one side and the total receipts on the other, it would be seen that instead of an enormous surplus of a million and a half there was really but a balance of £200 or £300 a year; and this was obtained by taxation upon every stage of a cause,—the bill, the answer, the evidence, and the decree of the judge being all taxed. It was idle to talk of £1,500,000 being available. Proposals had been made to the Government to provide some of the requisite courts without any expense whatever to the State. It was only with regard to two out of the six Equity Courts that complaints were really tenable, and the Society of Lincoln's Inn had offered to erect the buildings requisite upon receiving from the Suitors' Fund an annuity of 4 per cent for the money they expended. The society made an alternative proposal to give the ground and to allow the Government to build courts for themselves. Therefore the reasons why the House rejected the original proposal were, among others, because they believed upon economical grounds that it was right to do so. It had been stated that the plan had been brought before the Earl of Derby's Government and rejected by them; thus, so far from having been rejected, it was in 1859 embodied in a Bill which was read a second time in the House of Lords, and backed with the official title of the then Lord Chancellor. He denied that the benchers of Lincoln's Inn had any personal influence whatever in the decision of the question. If the whole revenues of the Inn were confiscated, they would not be a sixpence the poorer; and they would gain nothing if those revenues were doubled or trebled. The idea of a gigantic building in which all the courts could be assembled was only an idea which could never be realized. Would the House of Lords, for instance, sitting in its judicial capacity, be removed to that building? Would the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council hold its sittings there? Was it proposed that all the Committees of both Houses of Parliament should institute their inquiries within its limits? If the Government were really in earnest in the matter, let them at once introduce the measure of 1859, which would pass without opposition, and before that time next year the courts which it contemplated would be built. The arguments in the Treasury Minute, which had been moved for by the hon. Member for Lewes, were conclusive against the proposed gigantic scheme. They showed the vast expenditure which would be necessary in order to buy up the houses between Carey Street and the Strand, the small surplus existing as between the income and expenditure of all the funds under the control of the Court of Chancery, and the large increase which was sure to take place between the estimate and the actual outlay. These arguments were just as applicable now as they were when the Minute was framed, and the Government would, therefore, do well to settle the question of the Courts of Equity at once and without delay, and afterwards it would be much more easy to find a site for the rest of the Law Courts, which possibly might be formed on the new Thames Embankment. He would therefore urge upon the Government the propriety of discarding their present scheme, as it had alone prevented a practical measure from being adopted, and to carry forward the Bill to which he had alluded.

MR. COWPER said, the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman was a good illustration of the difficulties which beset the question, and which had caused a delay that most persons deplored. The hon. and learned Gentleman spoke with great authority, and he entirely repudiated the general grounds upon which the whole of the legislation in the matter proceeded. Nothing, he said, was wanting in respect of accommodation for the Equity Courts, except two or three Vice Chancellors' Courts. But, from what he (Mr. Cowper) had been able to gather, the hon. and learned Gentleman's proposal was totally insufficient as regarded even the Courts of Equity; and with respect to the Law Courts, the wants of the profession and of the public quite prevented the Government from acceding to such a wretched piecemeal proposal. Why not, he said, adopt the scheme suggested in 1859 by Lord Chelmsford, by which two Vice Chancellors' Courts and certain chambers were to be erected? But, in that matter, he (Mr. Cowper) was content to walk humbly in the footsteps of the Earl of Derby's Government. In 1859, instead of adopting the scheme proposed by Lord Chelmsford, they appointed a Royal Commission upon the question of concentrating the Law Courts. The Report of that

Commission met with such general approval on the part of the public, that it became the duty of the Government to endeavour to give effect generally to the recommendations contained in it; and the Government would not be doing what was expected from them by the profession and by the public, were they to abandon a great scheme which would be received as a boon by the profession at large—by solicitors as well as by counsel — for the sake of meeting the inconveniences felt by learned gentlemen practising in these two Vice Chancellors' Courts. Although the delay which had taken place had not mitigated the opposition of the hon. and learned Member, he was glad to say that some other persons thought better of the proposal, and the important aid of his hon. and learned Friend opposite, encouraged him to think that there might be a probability of obtaining the assent of the House to a scheme which was not open to the objections formerly urged against the proposal of the Government.

LORD HOTHAM said, he wished to know whether the Government had decided as to the choice of an architect?

MR. COWPER said, that he had stated from the beginning that the Government did not intend to select any particular architect, but meant to have a general competition.

BRITISH TROOPS IN CANADA.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. ADDERLEY, who had given notice to move—

> "That in the opinion of this House it is inexpedient that detachments of British troops should be stationed upon exposed posts on the Canadian frontier unless adequately supported by Canadian Forces"—

said, that when he mentioned that there were at this moment along the North American frontier 9,000 British troops, it would be seen that the subject was not one of slight importance. Still, in the present state of the House, he could not expect to raise a debate; he would content himself by making a brief statement, which he hoped would induce an expression of opinion from the Government. These British troops were scattered in battalions, half-battalions, and companies, along a frontier of about 1,000 miles, with little power of communicating with each other, still less of communicating with the mother country. That was a hazardous position for British troops to occupy, and it endangered also the honour of this country should any emergency arise. These troops were not placed in Canada to guard against a rebellion. Canada could no longer rebel—for this simple reason, that she had nothing to rebel against. In common with most of our other colonies, she was now her own mistress almost completely; and this country was very little more than her tributary in respect of soldiers and money. The northern frontier was safe, for it was bounded by the Hudson's Bay territory, and was only liable to the invasion of polar bears. The western frontier along the sea was also free from danger. The southern frontier was in reality the only part where forces were needed for the defence of the country. That frontier embraced a territory 1,000 miles in extent, and it could not be imagined that such an area could be defended by troops from England further than in aid of the Canadians themselves. He might fairly presume that both parties desired to maintain that frontier. He believed that England was desirous of maintaining her connection with Canada from the fact that the noble Lord opposite was sanctioned by the opinion of this country in sending reinforcements to the rescue of the Canadians in 1861, when it was supposed that the *Trent* affair might possibly involve us in hostilities with America. Parliament approved his sending troops across the Atlantic at the most trying period of the year, and he believed he might conclude from that fact that we had no intention of allowing that frontier to be invaded with impunity. On the other hand, he believed he might conclude that Canada was equally desirous of maintaining that frontier and her relations with us from the way in which she had lately raised Volunteer and Militia forces. The question, however, was whether the present state of things was safe in spite of the precautions that had been taken; whether the precautions were at all sufficient. It had been maintained by some that there was no danger; but, if such were the case, they were hardly warranted in incurring the expense which they had already sanctioned. If there were no danger, we ought to withdraw our troops, and not leave 9,000 soldiers scattered needlessly through the country. But would anybody maintain that there was no danger in the present state of the American continent? A perusal of the publications of the country would suffice to dispel such an illusion, and show how strong was the feeling against England. Anybody who observed the preparations which America was at present making must perceive that such preparations were dictated by the anticipation of a rupture with this country. It was maintained by some that even if there be danger, it is wholly the affair of England, but that was a position which he entirely disputed. Apart from the fact that it would be impossible for us to defend the country alone, he believed that the affair was far more theirs than ours; the Canadians were much more likely to involve us in a war than we to inflict one upon them. They had as free a constitution as ourselves, the Executive represented the same Sovereign power of peace and war, and their legislative action was as likely to lead to war as ours, and as capable of refusing or granting supplies. It was again urged that allegiance and protection were reciprocal duties, but military service was part of the British allegiance. The English could not undertake the defence of all their fellow-subjects over the world, relieving them of raising troops of their own for that purpose. The noble Lord had said only a few minutes before, in reference to the Danish question, that England could not adopt the course to which her natural impulse might prompt her, because she had not the force sufficient to hazard a European war; and if England were involved in an European war, she certainly would have to withdraw her troops from Canada. Canada must look to her own defence, for the very situation rendered the protection of the Canadian frontier by England impossible. Out of the 1,000 miles of frontier 600 miles were along the lakes, and these lakes were largely covered with an American mercantile marine ready for warlike use. A large extent of the remainder of the frontier was composed of a river averaging two miles in width, but studded with islands, while the river during a considerable portion of the year was so severely frozen as to allow of the carriage of the heaviest artillery. For the rest of the distance the boundary was merely imaginary. He wished also to point out the fact, that though it might be desirable to have a few British troops stationed in Canada as a nucleus for the defence of the country, it would be very dangerous to have them scattered in distant positions. They ought to be concentrated in one spot, and that spot ought undoubtedly to be Quebec. And yet Quebec at that moment was utterly insecure. The right bank of the river was, he believed, wholly unfortified, and the fortifications of the place generally were in such a state that a well-disciplined army with present means of war would, he believed, find little difficulty in making themselves masters of it. The duty of the local troops was to drill and to acquire something like training and organization, which, at present, they did not possess. Their basis of operations ought to be either Montreal or Toronto, which places should be immediately put into a state of defence, but that should be clearly stated to be their own affair. Sir Francis Head, some years ago, had recommended Toronto as the real military basis for Canada, and had also recommended the fortification of Montreal as a connecting link with Quebec. With respect to the navy, although the English fleet could render valuable support to Canada, yet it could not act in the interior, and by treaties we were debarred from keeping gunboats upon the lakes. Sir Francis Head had stated that in the event of a contest the Americans would be able to wage war at a cost of a shilling where it would cost us a guinea. When the antagonists were equally matched in courage and skill the elements of additional cost was not to be overlooked. It was true the English navy might retaliate on the seaboard for any injuries done to Canada, but it would be very unsatisfactory to have to trust to that kind of warfare whilst the interior of the country was ill-defended. He would say that before any emergency arose the troops of England should be placed in garrison at Quebec, leaving the Canadian troops to defend all the rest of the frontier; and if the Canadians were not disposed to take measures for the defence of their own country, then he would recommend the withdrawal of the English troops; but as those troops were now placed it would be impossible for them even to withdraw in case of sudden war without disaster or disgrace. With respect to the navy, he would observe that in these days of iron-clads it was much better to build ships of war on the spot than to have to transport them 3,000 miles across the Atlantic; and if we undertook the naval defence of Canada against the United States from this country the

Americans would have a great advantage in this respect in the proximity of their resources. It was often put as a reason why the connection between this country and Canada should be maintained, that if Canada was annexed to the United States she would become the nursery of a great marine for that Power. He would ask why Canada should not now become a nursery for seamen for us? Why should we not develop her naval power? Reverting to the troops in Canada, he found that they numbered about 9,000, of whom 6,000 were at Montreal and Quebec, 1,000 at Kingston, and the remainder at Toronto, London, and other places. The Volunteer militia amounted to 35,000 men, the number having been raised under recent Acts from 5,000, which was the original proposal. That circumstance, he thought, showed that Canada, if properly called upon, was willing and able to develop her own resources. Nothing prevented that development but the ill-defined relations existing between Canada and the mother country. We allowed indefinite and deceitful expectations to paralyze their action. If England undertook to garrison Quebec and to maintain a certain amount of naval force, leaving the remaining defences to be provided by Canada, there was no doubt that there was sufficient spirit in the Canadians to insure these defences being provided as soon as they saw clearly that the responsibility rested with them. The Volunteer militia were now distributed—15,000 in the west, 5,000 in the central districts, and 15,000 in the eastern, but the drill was only for six days in the year—an amount of training that was obviously insufficient. In addition there was the ordinary militia, which amounted upon paper to 150,000 men, but which force, at present, was nothing but an abstract liability existing only upon paper. The results of such a system had been seen in the United States at the beginning of the present war, when an enormous militia, upon paper, afforded neither officers nor men. Lord Monck had shown his usual good sense in applying the small sum voted by the Canadian Parliament for the militia to the instruction of officers, who were even of greater importance than men. He trusted that the emergencies to which he had alluded would never arise, but it was neither safe nor prudent to close their eyes to possible dangers. He wished the Government to remove from the minds of hon. Members a feeling of anxiety as to the position of the troops in Canada, and to assure them that our troops in that important colony, and at that critical period, should not be left in a position which would expose them to the risk of a discreditable withdrawal.

Mr. CARDWELL said, he entirely agreed in the statement and language of the Motion—

> "That it is inexpedient that detachments of British troops should be stationed upon exposed posts on the Canadian frontier, unless adequately supported by Canadian Forces;"

and with respect to the observations made by his right hon. Friend, there was really much in which he was also enabled to concur. He began by paying a just tribute to his noble Friend at the head of the Government for the decision and vigour he displayed in sending, at a moment of emergency, a large reinforcement of British troops to Canada. His right hon. Friend also admitted that the main defence of Canada must ultimately rest in the spirit, vigour, and determination of the people of Canada, as must be the case in every country. He therefore held with his right hon. Friend that a nucleus of British troops, supported by the energy and determination of the Canadians, was the natural and just defence of Canada; and such he believed to be the feeling of the Canadians themselves. His right hon. Friend had paid a just tribute to the Governor of Canada, and did justice to the improved spirit of Canada itself. In all these points he entirely agreed with his right hon. Friend. Perhaps, however, it would not be uninteresting to the House if he were to state the changes which had recently been made, leading in the direction of insuring the defence of Canada by the Canadians. In October last the Canadian Legislature passed Acts for the new organization of the Militia and the Volunteers, declaring that the public defence was a duty binding on every member of society, providing the machinery for insuring the performance of it by each individual; making provision for securing the thorough education in military duty of all militia officers, and compelling all candidates for commissions to attach themselves for instruction to British regiments. Provision was made for additional pay from provincial resources for the officers and men of Her Majesty's forces who should assist in this training. Lord Monck, in one of his despatches, described that legislation as

> "Sound in principle, calculated to have a most beneficial effect on the present efficiency of the militia force, and to create and foster in the future a taste for military pursuits among the population."

The general effect of these measures will be to give us in the province service battalions of militia to any amount the Commander-in-Chief may from time to time think desirable, with a machinery constantly in existence for the indefinite increase of their numbers; a body of thoroughly well-trained officers attached to the service battalions of militia, living among men of their battalions, and competent to train them in their drill, and command them when called out for exercise or duty. For the purpose of training officers the House would be glad to learn that schools had been established at Quebec and Toronto for the reception of candidates for the militia, and the attendance had been as large as was considered desirable. Writing in the month of April last, Lord Monck said—

> "The schools for the instruction of the militia officers are working well. The officers of Her Majesty's army who have charge of these schools appear to me to work with great energy and judgment, the candidates for commissions are coming forward in larger numbers than we can at the moment admit to the schools, and display great industry and intelligence in the acquisition of military knowledge; and I am very sanguine in my expectations that we shall have, before long, scattered over the entire colony, a body of well instructed men capable of commanding the provincial militia should their services be required."

He entirely agreed with his right hon. Friend that the first and foremost object was to provide trained, energetic, skilful, and spirited officers; but his right hon. Friend spoke of the numbers of the Volunteers without any allusion to the number fixed for the Militia. That number had been fixed at 88,000. There was, therefore, now an organization usefully existing in Canada which contemplated the provision of a body of trained officers—a body of Volunteers to which his right hon. Friend had referred, and a body of Militia capable of indefinite extension according to the discretion of the Governor General, but at the present moment fixed at 88,000. That was only a preliminary organization; but it proved that at least the Canadians were alive to their duty and interest, and he hoped they would soon see existing in Canada a Native force capable of rendering efficient aid to the Queen's trained soldiers, which, in the opinion of both sides of the House, was the proper mode of providing for the defence of Canada. He entirely agreed with his right hon. Friend that, without entertaining any special fear as to any danger to the foreign relations of this country with our neighbours in that part of the world, the dispersion of British troops in small numbers in distant parts of Canada was not a policy wise in itself or expedient under the circumstances. That was his opinion, and it was also the opinion of his noble Friend the Secretary of War. When the Guards were withdrawn from Canada, an opportunity occurred for greater concentration, and he would read an extract from a despatch written by his noble Friend to Lieutenant General Sir F. Williams, dated May 25, 1864—

> "This decision will render it possible to concentrate the troops remaining under your command by the withdrawal of those now stationed to the westward of the very extended line of the Canadian frontier; and I am directed to inform you that Lord De Grey requests that you will take the earliest steps to effect such a concentration, as Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that it is highly desirable to retain the troops in Canada in two principal masses at Quebec and Montreal, and to diminish as far as possible the number of scattered stations in that colony other than the small posts occupied by the Royal Canadian Rifles for the purpose of checking desertion."

His right hon. Friend, indeed, went further, and would concentrate the troops exclusively at Quebec. That was an opinion in which he could not entirely concur. The Government thought that Montreal and Quebec were the natural points for the concentration of Her Majesty's forces in Canada. He also thought it might be very wise and expedient that a clear and definite policy should be laid down by Her Majesty's Government, and communicated to those in Canada who were responsible for the well-being of the province; and that the co-operation of the Canadian people should be invited in any measures which they thought it expedient to provide for the defence of the country. It was an important question. It had engaged the serious attention of Her Majesty's Government, and he had stated the principles on which it ought to be conducted. He cordially agreed in those views, and he cordially concurred in thinking that this country, in directing the foreign policy of her colonies, ought to furnish the nucleus of the force for the defence of those colonies, but that their main defence must turn upon the spirit and energy of their own people; and he thought that a frank communication between the Imperial Government and the Government of Canada would suggest the best mode of arranging the just proportion of the burdens to be borne by the Home Government and the dependencies of this country.

Lord ROBERT CECIL said, that the House and the country would be disposed to concur in the principles which the right hon. Gentleman had just laid down, and to be of opinion that the line of policy which he indicated that it was his intention to take was the safe one for this country to adopt. But his fear was, that the right hon. Gentleman and the Canadian Government were not sufficiently alive to the exigencies of the period in point of time. No doubt if they all lived long enough, and if peace should last as long as they hoped it would between the United States and this country, the measures which he had sketched out would bring a satisfactory solution of the difficult question of the local defence of Canada. But his fear was, that the right hon. Gentleman's plan contained the germs of great delay, and the right hon. Gentleman's tone made him fear that he was not sufficiently alive to the great promptitude necessary, and the imminent risk of dangers which no one liked to contemplate. The right hon. Gentleman began by describing the preparations which the Canadians were making for defence. As he understood the right hon. Gentleman, the Canadians were contemplating a training college and a militia.

Mr. CARDWELL: I said that the training schools are actually in progress, and are training so great a number as to lead the Governor General to express a hope there would shortly be a sufficient number of trained officers to lead the Militia.

Lord ROBERT CECIL said, it appeared that, as soon as the schools had trained the officers, and as soon as the Canadian Government had got round them the organization of the militia, and as soon as the Canadian Parliament had proceeded to vote sufficient supplies, then by that time the militia would be in existence. But his fear was, that the emergency would be a little too pressing for such a lengthy process. The right hon. Gentleman and Earl De Grey agreed that our forces ought not to be scattered, but that with the exception of a certain number of posts they were to be massed in Montreal and Quebec, in neither of which cities he believed were any fortifications that would enable a small number of troops to hold their ground against a large force. They all hoped that hostilities would not break out with America; but still they were possible, and they ought to look to the dangers that awaited them if war were declared. They knew the dangers which they had to face. They knew that the Northern army in the field was estimated by hundreds of thousands, and that it had been able, in spite of the resistance of another army almost equally large, to force its way through an extended frontier, and, at all events, to occupy a considerable portion of territory. There was no force in Canada equal to that of the Confederates. Suppose that at the end of the year there should be a termination of hostilities between the North and South —suppose the exigencies and existence of a large armed force, the pressure of political difficulties, and the confusion consequent upon the termination of a civil war, should lead the Northern statesmen to find an issue from their difficulties in making a raid upon Canada. He would not say that was likely, but it was possible, and then we should have to defend that enormous frontier, partly without natural defence and partly consisting of lakes upon which we were forbidden to have warlike ships, but which the warlike ships of America might reach. The British Government and the Canadians would in that case have to defend that enormous frontier against the army which had crushed the heroic army of the South. That was a very serious danger; but if the Canadians did not choose to make preparations, and allowed their territory to be overrun, it was their affair and not ours. If the result of the neglect and delay, after the warnings they had received, should be that their country was overrun, then, although of course the people of England would be sorry for what might happen, yet he did not think we could cast any great blame upon ourselves for the result. But the terrible thing would be if any considerable body of British troops were surrounded and made prisoners. The feeling which such a disgrace would occasion would be very humiliating; it would stimulate us to enormous exertions; it would embitter the war between the two countries, and make us feel that we had contracted a stain on our escutcheon, which it would require some very extraordinary military achievements to wipe out. He thought the right hon. Gentleman's measures were perfectly sound, but he was not sufficiently alive to the imminence of the danger of our position—namely, that while the British troops were slowly massing in Montreal and Quebec, the whole of the coast would remain unfortified and exposed to the attacks of any such army as the Northern States might bring against them. While that was going on, and while the Canadians would be going through these dilatory preliminaries and these measures of rudimentary self-defence, some great disaster might fall on our arms which no one would regret more than the right hon. Gentleman, but for which regrets would be a vain and idle remedy. Perhaps it might be owing to the suavity with which the right hon. Gentleman habitually conveyed everything to the House that he had misunderstood the tendency of the right hon. Gentleman's remarks. [Mr. CARDWELL. The orders have already gone out!] Yes, but what he doubted was whether the orders were sufficiently prompt for the occasion. He should be happy to hear that orders had been sent out to fortify immediately the two posts of Quebec and Montreal, or, if that was not possible, that one only should be occupied, and that not one post should be held except what British troops might safely hold with such aid as Canada might furnish. Anything short of that would expose the British army to the risk of almost irreparable disgrace. The House could not hope for a more detailed account of the right hon. Gentleman's policy, but he would venture to press upon him the suggestion that precautions of that kind ought not to be left until the moment when danger arose. The requisite concentration which the military policy of the Government would require would then wear an aspect of fear, and it would look as if we were deserting our colonists. Promptitude in these matters was requisite above all things, and if he might refer to the debate of that day week he thought the right hon. Gentleman would recognize that if the virtue of promptitude had been more thoroughly exercised; and if, in the moment of security, something more of forethought had been shown in regard to the impending dangers, the disgrace and the disasters which were then discussed would never have occurred. He trusted that no such disgrace and disasters would occur to our army in Canada.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, he would remind the noble Lord that in his estimate of the dangers to which Canada was exposed and her means of protection, he had omitted one of the most important elements of her safety. The noble Lord seemed to have forgotten that war with Canada on the part of the United States meant war with England also, and that the United States in deciding upon an invasion of Canada, would have to take into account not merely the preparations made for the defence of Canada, but the serious and tremendous consequences to herself, her coasts, and commerce, consequent upon engaging in war with England. With regard to the arrangements made for the improvement of the militia of Canada, he believed them to be of a very valuable character, although still imperfect. The whole province of Canada would now be covered by a military organization, and would be defended by militia of a certain class, containing no soldiers above the age of forty-five. Every man would know the battalion to which he belonged, where he must resort for purposes of drill and muster, and the officers under whom he was to serve. They would be drilled for a period of the year which, he would admit, was not sufficiently long, but still drilled so as to give them such a knowledge of soldiering as would in a short time turn them into good troops. Lord Monck and his Government were engaged in providing a number of first class-officers, and the result, it was expected, would be a highly efficient militia in Canada. In Toronto and Quebec, where two of the finest regiments in Her Majesty's service had been placed, there were military schools in which as large a number of officers as there were means of instructing were undergoing military training. With respect to another question, which was now one of great importance, the House, as the right hon. Gentleman knew so well, had long looked with great suspicion upon the subject of colonial fortifications, and those who had charge of colonial affairs in this country had been very shy indeed in proposing to the House any expenditure for that purpose. It was admitted, however, by the right hon. Gentleman, and would be allowed by the House, that Quebec was an exception to the general rule, and there was hardly a place within our colonial dominions in which Parliament would see with less jealousy the expenditure of money for making the place fit for the reception of Her Majesty's troops. The Government had recently received a

Report from a skilful officer on the defences of Canada, and especially with regard to Quebec and Montreal. With regard to the concentration of the troops, he believed they were actually, or with a slight exception, in Quebec and Montreal —that exception being small parties of the Canadian Rifles, who were sent to certain parts of the colony to prevent desertion. Preparations had thus been made to prevent future danger. Some of them were already in progress, and the remainder were under the serious consideration of Her Majesty's Government.

UNITED STATES—CLEARANCE OF BRITISH SHIPS AT NEW YORK.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. CAVE said, he wished to call attention to a subject which was of considerable importance to a branch of colonial trade—that, namely, between New York and Jamaica. A New York firm, Messrs. Cordova and Co., had been in the habit for a considerable time of shipping provisions to Messrs. Levy and Co., a mercantile house in Jamaica, to the extent of £100,000 a year. These provisions were disposed of by Messrs. Levy in the ordinary course of business in Jamaica. These gentlemen had informed him (Mr. Cave) that they had no trade whatever with the Southern States, and it was, of course, extremely unlikely that they would ship contraband of war from the port of New York. The trade, in fact, was of a most legitimate and ordinary character. However, a short time ago, Mr. Levy, the head of the Jamaica firm and a member of the House of Assembly in that island, now in England, received a letter from his New York correspondent, dated May 28, informing him that the ship *Leonard Berry*, consigned to his firm, together with the *Perilia*, another ship loaded for the same destination, and all other vessels clearing for Jamaica, had been stopped by the Collector of Customs, under a regulation requiring captains and shippers to furnish bonds to the United States, not that the vessels would sail for the port named in their papers, which would be right enough, but that the cargoes were intended for the consumption of Jamaica, and would never be used for the benefit of the Confederate States; that three bonds were required, with sureties qualifying in real estate to the amount of twice the value of the cargo, or in the case of the *Leonard Berry* to 100,000 dols., or in round figures to £20,000, and that there was no provision for cancelling these bonds, even upon the certificate of the United States Consul in Jamaica that the cargo had been landed, but the bonds were to insure for all time, subject to the production of some evidence which might lead to their forfeiture. The writer probably did not exaggerate when he called this an embargo on Jamaica ships; and it must be a prohibition to the trade, as no trade could exist under such restrictions. It seemed, however, that a novel trade in bonds had sprung up under this regulation, and that people were willing to run the risk of being sureties at a price of 2½ per cent on the value of the cargo. The same regulations applied to Nassau, Bermuda, and Matamoras with more reason, perhaps, because those places had notoriously imported far more than their population warranted, but still contrary to international law, or, at any rate, to the comity of nations. Jamaica, however, had a population of 400,000 to be supplied, and had always carried on a considerable trade with New York; and if it was argued that blockade runners had sailed from Kingston, the same might be said of Liverpool, and fifty other ports. Similar restrictions had been placed on the trade to Halifax and St. John, New Brunswick, but they had been removed, as contrary to the Reciprocity Treaty. They had also been applied to Havannah, but had likewise been withdrawn on the Captain General of Cuba threatening that he would refuse clearances to American vessels in every port of Cuba. In this case the British Consul tried in vain to obtain a relaxation of the rule, and an appeal had been made to Lord Lyons. Since the letter of May 28 was written, intelligence had arrived that in this special case the security of the shippers had been received, and so the 2½ per cent payment had been saved, but the regulations remained unchanged. He (Mr. Cave) had no sympathy with those who, in defiance of the Queen's proclamation, supplied munitions of war to either belligerent. Those who carried contraband of war must also run their chance, but it seemed unjust that fair traders should be subject to these arbitrary restrictions, and certainly unworthy and impolitic in the British Government to submit to them. The letter to which he had referred stated that our quiet submission to such arbitrary conduct had excited anything but respect on the other side of the Atlantic. He therefore wished to know whether any information on this subject had been received from Lord Lyons, and whether instructions had been sent, or, if not, whether they would be sent to him to protest against a system so injurious to an important branch of our colonial commerce?

Mr. LAYARD said, the subject which the hon. Gentleman had brought before the House had given considerable trouble to Her Majesty's Government and to Lord Lyons. He was not aware that the particular case described by the hon. Gentleman had been reported to the Government; but Lord Lyons had informed them that those restrictions had been imposed upon vessels going to Jamaica and the West Indies. The opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown had been taken on the subject, and it was to the effect that the restrictions were illegal and vexatious. As for requiring that goods which had been landed at a neutral port should never find their way to the Confederate States, there was no doubt that those terms were altogether beyond the competence of the United States Government to impose, and in consequence of the representations of Her Majesty's Government those restrictions had in many cases been removed. One or two of those cases were under the consideration of the Law Officers of the Crown, and instructions would be sent to Lord Lyons to make strong representations to the United States Government on the subject.

RECRUITING FOR THE ARMY.

OBSERVATIONS.

Colonel DUNNE said he rose, pursuant to notice, to call attention to the subject of Recruiting for the Army. The question was one of the highest importance and demanded the utmost consideration of the military authorities, inasmuch as the fact was notorious that enlistments had been gradually decreasing for the last few years, and if something were not done to check the downward course it was obvious that the efficiency of the army would be seriously impaired. He held in his hand a Return, which showed that a great falling off had taken place within a few years in the number of men enlisted. In 1860 the number enlisted in the United Kingdom was 21,664, but in 1863 the number was only 6,924, and in the year before that the number was 4,642. In 1859, on the Motion of the then Secretary for War, a Commission was appointed to examine the subject, and that Commission, which was presided over by a distinguished officer, made several recommendations, all of which, he believed, were carried out, though not to the full extent; but there were several causes which tended to prevent an increase in the number of men enlisted. One of those causes was the high wages generally received in England by the class of men from whom the recruits for the army were taken. That cause did not operate in Ireland, but on the other hand the vast immigration which was carried on from that country and the consequent diminution of the population made it difficult to get recruits there. Then there were certain proceedings which acted on the feelings of the people, and discouraged them from joining the army. There was, too, great uncertainty in the service, the army being sometimes increased to a considerable extent and then suddenly reduced. Then there existed great uncertainty in reference to pensions. Men who had become soldiers were frequently thrown on the world without a pension, because, if they were disabled by disease, they were told that they had the seeds of the disease in them when they enlisted. He thought that when a man passed the medical officer he ought not to be subject to the contingency of losing his pension by an attack of heart or other disease. Another cause which deterred men from enlisting was the concentration of troops in large camps, such as had been formed at Aldershot and at the Curragh. Formerly, when a regiment returned from foreign service, it was quartered in some town where the men had an opportunity of meeting their friends, or, at all events, of mixing with persons of their own class and obtaining some relaxation; but in these camps the drill was so constant and severe that many men regarded foreign service as a relief. Other objections arose out of the method of reckoning service, and the deductions which even after the improvements that had recently been introduced were still made from the nominal pay of the men. The pay of an infantry soldier was 1*s.* 1*d.* a day, including the 1*d.* beer money. From even that small sum there were many deductions, leaving him only about 4*d.* a day for himself. Another cause of difficulty arose from the limitation of the period of enlistment. According to the evidence of Sir George Wetherall, when examined before the Commission, the diminution of the period of service to ten years would render it necessary that we should, exclusively of the men required for India, enlist annually, instead of from 10,000 to 12,000 men, 23,000. He doubted whether our population would supply us with enough men to meet all our wants. The standard had been lowered from 5ft. 7in. to 5ft. 5in., but we had not got the number of recruits that were needed. He knew that recruiting had lately very much increased, but that arose from the circumstance that the militia had recently been out for their annual training, and we could not anticipate any continuous flow of men from that source. He now came to the encouragements to men to enlist, and to the changes which he thought ought to be made. One great encouragement, that of promotion from the ranks to commissions, had singularly failed. The Commission stated, that although, in ten years, 570 men had been promoted from the ranks, recruiting had during that time been more active in the Indian service and the artillery, in which no such promotion was offered. One great reason why men did not enter the army was the insufficiency of the pay, and it was necessary that both that and the marching allowances should be increased. When men were on the march they often suffered much from the insufficiency of their pay and the want of food. When men were fed well they drank less. As to the time of service, in the cavalry men were enlisted for twelve years, and in the infantry ten years. He confessed he could never understand the distinction. It was, he thought, most desirable that men should, if they chose, be allowed to enlist in the infantry for a longer period than ten years. If a man entered the army at the age of sixteen or eighteen years, he was, after he had served ten years, fit to go into any other business, and had great inducements to leave the service; but he was then at his prime as a soldier, and it was most desirable to retain him in his regiment. Sufficient inducements were not, in his opinion, held out to lead men to re-enlist in India. Many men who took their discharges there and came home no doubt afterwards re-enlisted; but the State was put to the expense of paying their passages to this country and out to India again, and it would, therefore, be good economy to hold out inducements to them to continue their service in that country. The best thing, in his opinion, that could be done was to raise the pay of the soldier as his period of service increased. He believed that would prove more efficacious than adding to the bounty as an inducement to men to enter the army.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, he was glad the hon. and gallant Member had called the attention of the House to the subject, as it would give him an opportunity of removing the misapprehension which seemed to prevail in the public mind regarding it. The Returns of men enlisted at the various recruiting stations to which reference had been made no doubt showed that a considerable decrease had taken place since 1860. These Returns, however, were confined to the recruiting stations, and did not embrace the number of men who were enlisted at head-quarters. If in 1861, 1862, and 1863 the number enlisted at the stations was extremely small, it was because more men were not wanted, as the strength of the army was being gradually reduced. There was, therefore, as far as these Returns were concerned, not the smallest ground for alarm. That was the first year since 1860 in which there had been any pressure whatever in supplying the demand for recruits. A large body of men would be entitled to their discharge, and it was no wonder if the recruiting machinery, which had during the last year or two become rather rusty through disuse, should not be capable all at once of meeting the requirements of a sudden emergency. It therefore became necessary for the Horse Guards to issue fresh instructions on the subject; but there was nothing in the Horse Guards' Circular at all of a novel character. It was intended only to remind officers in charge of recruiting parties of various things which were formerly well known, but which had been somewhat forgotten of late years, owing to the limited operation of the system. He did not think that there was the slightest ground for apprehension as to the number of men required for the army that year not being obtained, as the increased efforts consequent upon the issue of the Circular had proved entirely successful. In the end of the last and the beginning of the present year the Commander-in-Chief and the military authorities in charge of the recruiting department were rather afraid that there might be difficulties in raising the establishment to its proper figure. The number of recruits, however, for whom levy money was asked did not exceed 21,300, including the Indian service and all the men entitled to take their discharge. Of that number a little over 10,000 were the men entitled to their discharge; but from past experience it was calculated that between 50 and 60 per cent of those men would re-enlist; and if only 5,000 out of the 10,000 should realize that expectation, the actual number of recruits required during the year would only be 16,000. But during the last three weeks, when recruiting had been commenced with increased activity, there had been obtained an average of 353 men each week, which would give 18,356 for the year. There was no reason to fear that that rate of recruiting could not be kept up, because this was the worst season of the year for it. It was the period of the hay harvest, which would be followed by the corn harvest, and there was more abundant employment throughout the country than at any other time during the year. Under these circumstances, it was scarcely necessary to follow the hon. and gallant Member through his remarks as to the means which ought to be taken to induce men to enlist. He had shown that recruits were not at present deterred from joining the army. The hon. and gallant Member had alluded to the recommendations of the Commission appointed by the right hon. and gallant Member for Huntingdon. Some of the recommendations of the Commission had been adopted, but some of them—such as that in regard to increase of pay for increased service—had not yet been carried out. The Ten Years' Act ought to have a fair trial before any alteration was made. It was quite possible that after further experience of the measure it might be found necessary to re-arrange the terms of service, but it was extremely undesirable to adopt a new system when there was no pressure, and the existing plan had not been fully tested. He was sorry the hon. and gallant Member had spoken of the 1*s.* a day as if it represented the soldier's pay in the same way as the 1*s.* 6*d.* or 2*s.* earned in other employments. Everybody must, he thought, admit that so far as food, clothing, and pocket-money went, our soldiers were in a much better position than almost any class of labourers in the country. He did not, of course, mean to compare the position of the soldier with that of the skilled labourer. In seeking for recruits the Government did not pretend to compete with the demand for skilled labour; all they could do was to enter into competition with the ordinary labour-market, and a minute investigation of the pay and allowances which a soldier enjoyed would, he felt assured, be sufficient to convince any man that his position was superior to that of the unskilled labourer. He received good rations and his clothes and lodgings for nothing, besides other advantages. The only other point in the speech of the hon. and gallant Member to which he thought it necessary to refer was that in which he stated that men in the regiments serving in India and the colonies were brought home, at great expense to the nation, only, perhaps, to be re-enlisted in this country. Now, with respect to that point, he could only say that a sum was taken in the Estimates for increase of bounty to men re-enlisting in the colonies. In India a man received a considerable sum for re-enlisting on the spot, instead of putting the country to the expense of bringing him home. He did not know what other plan could be adopted in order to attain the object which the hon. and gallant Member seemed to have in view, because a soldier naturally wished to come home at the expiration of his ten years' service. The only way of preventing him from doing so was to offer him a sum which he would be likely to consider it worth his while to accept. In conclusion, he had simply to observe that he felt obliged to the hon. and gallant Gentleman for having brought the subject forward, because from certain letters which appeared in the newspapers it would seem as if a general impression prevailed that recruiting had come to a stand-still, whereas, as he had stated, it was progressing at a rate which if kept up, as there was every reason to hope it would be, would more than meet the wants of the service.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £94,222, to complete the sum for Establishments in China, Japan, and Siam, *agreed to.*

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £27,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for the Extraordinary Disbursements of Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad."

Mr. DODSON said, he wished to call attention to the inconvenient form in which the Votes for the diplomatic service were submitted to Parliament, and to the inadequate information as to the real cost of that service afforded to the House. All that hon. Members generally knew on the subject was that there was a sum of £180,000 a year charged on the Consolidated Fund for the purpose of paying diplomatic salaries, which sum was entirely at the disposal of the Foreign Office, and over the expenditure of which the House had no control. He held in his hand, he might add, a Return which showed that in the year ending the 31st of March, 1863, there was spent on the diplomatic service a sum of £111,000 — the actual sum voted, he believed, being £157,000 — in excess of the £180,000 to which he had alluded. In order, however, to find how that money had been disposed of, it was necessary to hunt over five different classes of Estimates, while the expenditure of some of it was to be found under the head of Consuls, some under that of Consular Compensations, and some under the head of Miscellaneous Expenditure. Now, the various items of the outlay for the army and navy were presented to the House in a consecutive manner, and he should like to know why the same course should not be pursued with regard to the diplomatic service. He objected, too, to having any portion of that expenditure withdrawn from the cognizance of the House of Commons by being charged on the Consolidated Fund, and should wish to see the whole of it annually submitted to the House for its approval. If not, the information with respect to it ought, at all events, he contended, to be supplied in an intelligible manner. The hon. Gentleman concluded by moving the reduction of the Vote by £10,000.

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £17,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for the Extraordinary Disbursements of Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad."—(*Mr. Dodson.*)

Mr. LAYARD said, his hon. Friend had brought the question forward during several Sessions, but he begged his hon. Friend to bear in mind that while many other Votes showed an increase, the Vote for diplomatic salaries had remained stationary, with the exception of the charges for China and Japan; and the missions to these two countries were of a mixed political and commercial character, our minister in China being ambassador and superintendent of trade, and our representative in Japan being both envoy and consul general. The confusion in the accounts which the hon. Member seemed to think existed arose from the arrangement made some years ago for charging the cost of the diplomatic service upon the Consolidated Fund. It frequently happened that diplomatic officers under the Foreign Office were employed as consuls, and whenever that occurred their salaries appeared under two different heads. The embassy houses were under the direction of the Board of Works, for what precise reason he could not tell, but he supposed that arrangement was adopted with the view of securing economy.

Mr. AUGUSTUS SMITH stated that the diplomatic expenditure, so far from having remained stationary, had been increased under every head. The present Vote, for example, had been raised since 1851 from £16,800 to £37,000. It would be far better to give our representatives abroad a fixed sum for house rent than to provide them with embassy houses. He was of opinion, moreover, that many embassies, particularly in Germany, might be suppressed with advantage; and he complained that our Minister Plenipotentiary in Prussia had been elevated to the rank of an Ambassador with a corresponding increase of salary. In these days of railways and telegraphs it was no longer necessary to maintain large diplomatic establishments in all parts of the world. At the smaller courts all we wanted was a mere chargé d'affaires instead of large and expensive diplomatic establishments. The cost of the embassy at Wurtemberg was £3,000; Saxony, £3,300; Hanover, £4,000; Bavaria, £5,000. It was high time that there should be a reduction in this expenditure. He would support the Motion for the reduction of the Vote.

Mr. LAYARD thought the hon. Member was mistaken in his view as to the increase of expense on account of the embassy houses. The practice of taking these establishments for a series of years was found to contribute both to convenience and economy. He hoped the Amendment would be withdrawn, the money being required for actual expenditure.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON said, the Vote did not bear on the argument of the hon. Gentleman. It was a Vote for the contingent expenses of the different missions, which expenses were regulated by certain rules, and depended upon services performed. It did not touch salaries, but was for messengers, postages, and other things, expenses that must be incurred. The only effect of curtailing the Vote would be to deprive the department of what was required for carrying on the service of the country. The estimate in one year was founded upon the expense of the year preceding. The amount of the expenses was examined at the Foreign Office, so that no expense should be incurred that was not in accordance with some standing regulation, and for some service performed. The only result of the proposed reduction would be to prevent the service being carried on.

MR. AUGUSTUS SMITH said, the only result would be that the Government would be obliged to economize and husband that sum of £180,000, and pay the expense of the diplomatic service out of it. This was the only way in which they could prevent this large increase of expenditure.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: The hon. Member is entirely mistaken. We have no authority to misapply to this service money which is voted for a different purpose. That is for salaries, pensions, and allowances, and for nothing else. The Government would be acting against the law if we were to apply it for this purpose.

MR. DODSON said, he thought that the explanations of the noble Lord and the Under Secretary were most unsatisfactory. He would divide the Committee on the question, and hoped to be supported.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON said, the only effect of curtailing the Vote would be to starve these different missions, and prevent their performing work essential to the public service.

Question put,

The Committee *divided*:— Ayes 37; Noes 113: Majority 76.

MR. VANCE: While we are upon the subject of our embassies, I should be glad to know who conducts in this country the relations between his Holiness the Pope and the Government of Great Britain? We had a long discussion the other night on the conduct of the diplomatic relations between this country and the Papal States, and it was admitted that the responsibility of carrying on these relations at Rome was divided between Mr. Odo Russell and the Consul at Rome. We all know who protect the interests of the Pope in the House of Commons, but I wish to know who in this country conducts the relations between the Pope and the Government?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: I can only answer the question which has been put to me in the negative. There is no person accredited in this country to carry on diplomatic relations between the Government and the Pope.

MR. VANCE: But there is no one accredited in Rome; and yet Mr. Odo Russell conducts the relations. Who in this country has a corresponding position?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: No one that I am aware of.

MR. F. S. POWELL said, he wished to ask for an explanation of the items for board wages and servants' wages at the embassies in France and Turkey. He also remarked that the Vote contained items for chapels and chaplains in France, Turkey, and Greece; but not in Russia and Spain. How was it that in a country where the Protestant religion was proscribed, no sum for Divine service was included in the Votes? When travelling abroad he found that in some places there was no Church of England. He hoped that the Roman Catholic Members of that House, who spoke so much about religious liberty and freedom of conscience, would express their disapprobation concerning the manner in which those principles were ignored in Spain.

MR. TORRENS said, he thought that some explanation was required as to the expenses of the embassy at Constantinople.

MR. LAYARD said, that the sums allowed for chapels depended upon the number of British residents in the different places. The charge at Constantinople was rather large for diplomatic services, but he believed that the expense for the year following would be decreased by nearly £2,000.

Original Question put, and *agreed to*.

(3.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £20,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for Special Missions, Diplomatic Outfits, and Conveyance and Entertainment of Colonial Officers and others."

MR. BUTT said, he wanted to call attention to an item of £52 in connection with the mission of Commodore Wilmot to the King of Dahomey; and to express his opinion that no British officer should have consented to or sanctioned by his presence the horrible massacre which that gallant gentleman had witnessed, and which had been ordered by the King as a sacrifice to the spirit of his Majesty's father. The proceedings of Commodore Wilmot had outraged the feelings of a great number of persons in this country; and in asking Parliament to vote the money for the mission they really asked it to be a party to these barbarous practices. Thinking that Parliament should assert the principle that no prospect of gain from trade ought to have induced the representative of the Queen of England to sanction such a scene by his presence, he moved the reduction of the Vote by this sum.

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Item of £52 4*s.* 4*d.*, for Seamen's Clothing supplied to Commodore Wilmot from the *Rattlesnake* in January, 1863, for presentation to the Chiefs, &c., at the Court of the King of Dahomey, be omitted from the proposed Vote."—(*Mr. Butt.*)

MR. LAYARD said, that Commodore Wilmot was an officer of the greatest humanity, who had devoted a great part of his life to the welfare of Africa, and had undertaken a perilous journey to Dahomey for the express purpose of getting the King to give up the slave trade, and put an end to the barbarous "customs." Unfortunately, he arrived at a time when the great annual ceremony was performed, at which human beings were sacrificed. His object was not to break with the King, but to obtain a personal influence over him; and in this Commodore Wilmot had succeeded. His (Mr. Layard's) impression was that Commodore Wilmot was not present at any of those scenes, and he would certainly have looked with horror on anything of the kind. His visit had some result, for the King released some unfortunate captives who were taken by the Commodore down to Lagos, and there had their liberty given them. Commodore Wilmot had received no remuneration in respect of this mission, and he was entitled to every praise for the courage, humanity, and devotion he had exhibited in Africa.

MR. KINNAIRD said, he had understood the hon. and learned Gentleman not to reflect on Commodore Wilmot's conduct so much as to wish to protest on the part of the House against scenes which had shocked the whole kingdom.

COLONEL DUNNE said, he wished to refer to an item of £1,796, being the "balance of expenses of the special mission of the hon. H. G. Elliot to Greece," and another item of £1,000 for an outfit allowance to the "hon. H. G. Elliot, Her Majesty's Minister at Turin." The initials were the same, but those two items occurring in one year could hardly refer to the same person. He wished to know whether the Dromio of Athens and the Dromio of Turin were the same persons?

MR. LAYARD said, that Mr. Elliot was sent to Athens on a special mission, and was afterwards appointed to Turin. These items contained the necessary expenses, and referred to the same person.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(4.) £3,649, to complete the sum for Third Secretaries to Embassies, &c.

(5.) £123,280, to complete the sum for Superannuation and Retired Allowances.

(6.) £728, Toulonese and Corsican Emigrants, &c., and American Loyalists.

(7.) £325, Refuge for the Destitute.

(8.) £1,959, to complete the sum for Polish Refugees and Distressed Spaniards.

(9.) £50,700, to complete the sum for Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions.

(10.) £25,400, to complete the sum for Relief of Distressed British Seamen.

(11.) £2,607, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Charges, formerly on Civil List.

(12.) £1,272, to complete the sum for Public Infirmaries, Ireland.

(13.) £1,600, to complete the sum for Westmoreland Lock Hospital.

(14.) £700, Rotunda Lying-in Hospital.

(15.) £200, Coombe Lying-in Hospital.

(16.) £5,600, to complete the sum for House of Industry Hospitals.

(17.) £1,500, to complete the sum for Cork Street Fever Hospital.

(18.) £600, Meath Hospital.

(19.) £100, St. Mark's Ophthalmic Hospital.

(20.) £300, to complete the sum for Dr. Steeven's Hospital.

(21.) £245, for Board of Superintendence of Dublin Hospitals.

(22.) £5,693, to complete the sum for Concordatum Fund, and other Charities and Allowances, Ireland.

(23.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £29,670, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for Non-conforming, Seceding, and Protestant Dissenting Ministers in Ireland."

Mr. HADFIELD remarked that the Vote had increased 60 per cent, although the number of the Presbyterian ministers who received it had diminished 20 per cent in the course of as many years. It was a curious fact that the only body of Nonconformist clergy who received aid from the State had diminished in number, while all other Dissenters in the United Kingdom who received no aid from the State had increased in number. He should move the reduction of the grant by the sum of £29,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £670, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for Non-conforming, Seceding, and Protestant Dissenting Ministers in Ireland."—(*Mr. Hadfield.*)

Mr. DAWSON said, that the Presbyterians of Ireland were not a rich body, as, except in the case of a few places, the great bulk of Presbyterians consisted of persons whose means were too limited to enable them to provide for themselves the means of religious instruction. The grant was in accordance with a compact and a practice long established, since James I. induced a number of Scotch families with their ministers to emigrate to Ireland.

Mr. COX said, that from his experience, he was not of opinion that the Presbyterians of the North of Ireland were too poor to support their own clergy. He, as a member of the Church of England, always voted against church rates, because he did not think it was right to tax a Dissenter for the support of his Church. Therefore, he objected to being taxed himself for the support of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.

Major STUART KNOX complained that the hon. Member for Finsbury had again insulted the Presbyterians of Ireland. He wished to know from the noble Lord at the head of the Government whether he had given a favourable consideration of the application for an increase of the grant?

Mr. COX denied that he had insulted the Presbyterians of Ireland. He had only stated that they were a wealthy and well-to-do body.

Viscount PALMERSTON said, an application had been made for an increase of the grant, but he had not given any encouragement to the suggestion.

Mr. HADFIELD remarked that more than 4,000,000 Catholics in Ireland supported their clergy without State aid.

Sir HERVEY BRUCE observed, that the Motions for withdrawing this grant from the Protestant Nonconformists in Ireland originated not with Irish, but with English Members. It was said no other class of Dissenters received an endowment from the State. The Presbyterians in Ireland, however, stood on a different footing from other Nonconformists. The three denominations in Ireland received national grants; why should not the religious body in question? He should support the Vote.

Sir FRANCIS CROSSLEY said, he objected to grants of public money for the support of any man's religion. He believed the endowment, instead of doing good, was doing harm in Ireland. The Protestant Nonconformists in that country were able to support their own ministers, and he hoped the House would stand by his hon. Friend in resisting the Vote.

Question put,

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 21; Noes 127: Majority 106.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*
House *resumed.*
Resolutions to be reported *this day.*
Committee to sit again on *Wednesday.*

INLAND REVENUE (STAMP DUTIES) BILL—[Bill 159.]—CONSIDERATION.

Order for Consideration as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be taken into Consideration this day."

Mr. HENNESSY said, he had an Amendment to propose.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The Motion is to postpone the order.

Mr. HENNESSY said, he was quite aware of the fact, but being anxious to move that its consideration be postponed to that day week, he desired to give reasons in favour of that course. The Bill had been introduced on the 17th of June, and until it arrived at the stage of Committee no conversation took place in the House upon its provisions. It was introduced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and was founded upon three Resolutions, none of which authorized a very important portion of the Bill relating to the brewing and sale of beer. He would not discuss the regularity of the mode in which it was sought to deal with a very important trade in Ireland; but he thought it very desirable that an opportunity of considering the scope of the measure should be given to that trade. On Friday last the right hon. Gentleman, in reply to a question, intimated that the Bill, so far from imposing greater penalties upon brewers in Ireland, was a relieving measure. What was the fact? Section 9 repealed a number of Irish Acts, for which others in force in England were substituted by Section 10. Among these was the 7 & 8 *Geo.* IV. c. 52, s. 54, requiring brewers to make entries of all their brewing utensils, vats, &c., under a penalty of £100. For that section the English Act, 1 *Will.* IV. c. 15, if substituted, would impose a penalty of £200. The 7 & 8 *Geo.* IV. c. 52, s. 50, as to the entry of quality of malt, contemplated a penalty of £100 for infringement. That was to be done away with, and the 1 & 2 *Geo.* IV. c. 22, s. 1. substituted, by which in like manner the amount of penalty would be doubled. With reference to washed malt, in the same way the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to double the present penalty. Every Irish Member present would corroborate the statement that not a brewer in Ireland could be aware of the nature of the Bill before the House. He therefore moved that its consideration be postponed to that day week.

Amendment proposed, at the end of the Question, to add the word "week."—(*Mr. Hennessy.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'week' be there added."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he would not follow the irregular example of the hon. Member in discussing the details of clauses on a Motion to postpone the consideration of the Report—a very unusual Motion, he must add. The usual practice was to allow the Member in charge of a Bill to name a time, and then, if disapproved of, to object at that time to its being proceeded with. But his object in pressing the Bill was to obtain a decision of the House upon a clause which, for the convenience of hon Members, he had delayed for some time—namely, that relating to an Act under which prosecutions for illicit distillation were conducted in Ireland. If the Report were agreed to he had no objection to postpone the third reading of the Bill, which would, in fact, be giving every opportunity for consideration. If thought desirable the recommittal of the Bill might be moved as an Amendment to the third reading. The hon. Member for the King's County was entirely wrong in the view which he had given of the effect of the Bill. He should be prepared on the next occasion to make good his statement, that the alterations introduced were in favour of the brewing trade in Ireland.

SIR HUGH CAIRNS said, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had spoken of irregularity, but it would be found that the irregularity rested wholly with himself. There would be another opportunity of considering the grave question, whether the Resolutions adopted by the House warranted the propositions contained in the Bill; at present, all he desired to say was that the Bill had been exactly one week before the House, and from its title was not at all likely to attract the attention of the brewing trade. The right hon. Gentleman had, on the introduction of the Bill, not vouchsafed any explanation which would show to those interested in the brewing trade what the real intention of the measure was; nay, more, two or three nights ago, when explanations were asked, there was very great difficulty in getting any at all, and the explanation ultimately given was that the Bill would have no operation at all upon the brewing trade, or if it had, that it would be solely for their advantage. The Chancellor of the Exchequer shook his head, but he had heard him repeat the statement only a moment before. He had only been able to look very hastily into the Acts which were quoted in the Bill, but he undertook to say, that in one instance certainly, and he believed in a considerable number, the statement of the hon. Member for the King's County was perfectly borne out. The very first penalty dealt with in the Bill was doubled by being increased from £100 to £200. The Chancellor of the Exchequer evidently was not aware of the effect of his own Bill, or he would not have made his former statement and repeated it that evening. A cloud of statutes were dealt with in what he must call a most slovenly way, the whole English law as to brewing being extended to the Irish trade in a space of three or four lines. It was a matter which required serious consideration by the trade. Nothing had dropped from the Government to direct attention to it, and it was only that day and the day before that hon. Members had been able to send copies of the Bill to the persons whose interests it affected. He thought the postponement asked for a very fair one. On the third reading Amendments could not be moved or a particular clause struck out, if that should appear desirable, and to recommit a Bill at such an advanced period of the Session would be a perilous proceeding.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he would consent if the particular clause to which he had referred were sanctioned on the following day to defer the consideration of the rest of the Bill.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Ordered, That the Bill be taken into Consideration *this day.*

GREEK LOAN BILL—[BILL 144.]

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Commitee.)

Clause 1 *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Power for Treasury to relinquish £4,000 a year).

COLONEL DUNNE said, he wished to move, at the end of the clause, a proviso to secure the payment of certain pensions due to British subjects. The pensions to which he referred were charged as an offset against the remission of £4,000 under the Bill, and his Amendment provided that the sum should not be remitted until the salaries were paid.

MR. LAYARD said, there was no practicable mode of effecting the object which the hon. Gentleman had in view. The treaty was in specific terms, and the Bill merely ratified the treaty. It was not possible to add the present proviso to the treaty, as it would be a breach of good faith.

COLONEL DUNNE said, that if the Government made an improper use of their power that House was not bound to ratify it. He hoped the Committee would be no parties to such dishonesty, and he asked them to condemn the conduct of the Government with regard to it. Those gentlemen had subscribed for years to a fund; they had served the Ionian Republic, and Her Majesty's Government were bound to guarantee these pensions.

MAJOR HAMILTON said, this country was bound to give these officers security for their pensions. The pensions were granted under a stipulation that these officers should not be employed by the English Government, and that had been carried out. He hoped the Committee would be no party to such a fraud.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he did not know an instance in which such liberal care had been taken of the private interests of individuals. After a short term of service they found themselves in possession of incomes which were by no means applicable to such a case in this country. Assuredly the hon. Member could not intend that the private interests of those gentlemen should be mixed up with our diplomatic engagements. Her Majesty had made an engagement with other Powers to surrender a certain sum, and that was a matter entirely distinct from the case of those pensioners. Perhaps the hon. Member would say that it was only in case of breach of faith that the proviso would come into operation; but we had no right to make that a ground for not fulfilling an engagement on our part. We had solemnly engaged to give the King of Greece £4,000 a year, and any breach of faith on the part of the Greek Parliament would not in the slightest degree relieve us from the obligation of paying this personal dotation.

LORD ROBERT CECIL said, if he understood the right hon. Gentleman he asked the House to consent to a treaty, when the Crown of England was already so unconditionally pledged that if the consent of the House was refused a breach of faith would be incurred. He could not understand how any decision of that House upon a question proposed to it by the Government could be determined in one way or another by the argument of a breach of faith. With regard to the liberal provision made for those gentlemen, it might be a liberal provision if the money were paid; but if not paid it could not be called a liberal provision. If the faith of England were pledged to the payment, it would, indeed, be a liberal provision; but with the faith of Greece pledged it was quite another thing.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, if the noble Lord had been in his place in the early part of the evening he would have heard a discussion of the whole question, and would have learnt that the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government was in entire accordance with precedent. Whether that was a proper course or not was a question which it was quite competent for the noble Lord to raise. Twelve months ago he explained to the House that the grant would be founded upon diplomatic arrangements which would be made on the responsibility of the executive Government, who would then appeal to the House for its approval, and that explanation was received as perfectly satisfactory. The course which had been taken was in conformity with established practice, and the effect of it undoubtedly was that the Crown had entered into an unconditional engagement. The noble Lord might make it an occasion for censure if he pleased.

MR. AYRTON said, the discussion which had just taken place would illustrate the state of things which he had endeavoured to bring under the notice of the House, when hon. Members were too absorbed in another matter to attend to anything else. The House found itself in this ridiculous position, that when anyone got up to express his opinion he was told it was most impertinent to do so. The Chancellor of the Exchequer exhibited an instance of Chinese politeness. He offered a Bill for the consideration of the House, with the clear understanding, however, that the House was not to consider it at all. That was evidently an unsatisfactory state of things, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, knowing it to be so, had said he hoped it would not occur again, and he was good enough to suggest that there were precedents—which were very bad precedents—in accordance with which the Government had acted. But if the Government had acted as it ought to have done, in fulfilment of the pledge given by the right hon. Gentleman, he would venture to affirm that the House of Commons would never have consented to pass the Bill before them without some provision by which the money to be paid to the servants of the Crown would be made an antecedent charge. But in the position in which the House was placed he believed they had no alternative but to pass the Bill, as Her Majesty had entered into a treaty by which her faith was pledged.

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON said, he would suggest that if his hon. and gallant Friend would leave out the last line of his Resolution the National Treasury would have to pay, in default of that of Greece, and there would be no occasion to make any deduction from the £4,000 a year.

COLONEL DUNNE said, he differed from the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to the length of time those gentlemen had served. Many of them had passed half their lives in our service. We were parties to the seizing of the fund which guaranteed their pensions, and should now take care that they did not suffer through our neglect.

LORD ROBERT CECIL said, he would move that the Chairman report Progress.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Lord Robert Cecil.*)

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 48; Noes 58: Majority 10.

COLONEL DUNNE said, he would move the addition of the first part of his Proviso only, namely—

> "Provided always that certain sums for pensions and compensations, payable to British subjects and others who were employed in the service of the Ionian Republic when under British protection, and guaranteed by the said treaty, shall be regularly paid."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that the alteration would not remove the difficulty.

COLONEL DUNNE said that what he desired was, that the King of the Hellenes, as our pensioner, should not be paid unless he paid our pensioners.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that such a proposal would be most inequitable. The claims of these persons was not against the King of the Hellenes in his personal capacity, but against the Greek State and Government, and it was under the custody and charge of the British Government to see it satisfied. The arrangement, however, was not with the Greek Government or the Greek State, but was an arrangement for the benefit of the King of the Hellenes personally, and attached to him irrespective of the Greek State, or of his being at the head of it. If he were to cease to be King of the Hellenes, his right would remain the same, and if the Greeks were to put him out and then refuse to pay these pensioners it would be very hard that he should not receive the money.

LORD ROBERT CECIL said, that after what had just fallen from the Chancellor of the Exchequer he should recommend his hon. Friend to withdraw his proviso. The right hon. Gentleman said that there was a charge upon the Greek Government, and that it was under the custody and charge of the British Government to make the Greek Government pay it. That was a pledge from a Minister of the Crown to go to war if it was not paid. Those who were present would remember the pledge, and he thought that his hon. and gallant Friend might safely withdraw his Motion.

COLONEL DUNNE said, that he should take the advice which the noble Lord had given to him. The arrangement was for a remission of the debt to the Greek Government, and he thought that if the King was kicked out he would be very clever if he ever got his pension.

MR. HENNESSY said, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had rebuked the hon. Member for Stamford for not understanding the Question; he would show how little the right hon. Gentleman knew of his own Bill. The right hon. Gentleman said that the money would be paid to the King, not only during but after his reign. The words of the Bill, however, were—"It shall be lawful to pay the said sum to George I., King of Greece, during his reign."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that he was speaking from recollection on the diplomatic arrangement, and his impression and belief was that the remission was intended as a personal dotation to the King individually. The words "personal dotation" were employed in the treaty, and the essence of the matter was that the dotation should be independent of his retaining the throne of Greece.

MR. AYRTON said, that the treaty made it a personal dotation, and gave it to the King for his life. Her Majesty's Government had confined it to his reign, and had put an interpretation upon the treaty which the King would not have placed upon it.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, it did so appear from the Bill itself, and therefore by the next stage of the Bill the error could be remedied.

MR. LONGFIELD said, then in that case the Government ought to consent to the Chairman reporting Progress. He should therefore move, That the Chairman report Progress.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. LYGON asked, what course the Government intended to take to bring the Bill into harmony with the treaty?

Lord Robert Cecil

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that the question was, whether or not he was right in his construction of the words "personal dotation?" The terms of the Bill as they stood were against him. His hon. Friend the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs would ascertain before the next stage of the Bill came on what was the construction that ought to be placed upon these words.

Clause *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read 3° on *Thursday.*

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, June 28, 1864.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Railways Construction Facilities* (No. 160).

Second Reading—Valuation of Rateable Property (Ireland)* (No. 147); Cathedral Minor Corporations* (No. 157) [H.L.]; Pilotage Order Confirmation* (No. 150); Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation* (No. 151).

Committee—County Constabulary Superannuation* (No. 140); Coventry Free Grammar School* (No. 153).

Report—Coventry Free Grammar School* (No. 153).

Third Reading—Army Prize (Shares of Deceased)* (No. 106); Countess of Elgin and Kincardine's Annuity* (No. 149), and *passed.*

BROKERS BONDS AND RENTS BILL.

SECOND READING.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2^a.—(*Lord Taunton.*)

LORD KINGSDOWN moved that it be read a second time that day six months. He had no connection with either the promoters or the opponents of the Bill, and made his Motion solely on public grounds—namely, that it would perpetuate a great injustice upon the City of London, and that it ought to come before the House as a Public and not as a Private Bill: on that point, however, he was prepared to accept the decision of his noble and learned Friend on the Woolsack, and the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees. The Bill proposed two things. The first proposal was to repeal so much of an Act of Queen Anne as required all brokers in the City of London to be admitted and sworn before the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen; and the other was to repeal another Act which imposed certain securities upon brokers as the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen might from time to time think it right to adopt. His objection was mainly founded upon the fact that the Act which it proposed to repeal was an Act passed for the regulation of brokers in the City of London, with a view to the public benefit and the security of commerce within the City of London. It was a great mistake to suppose that the jurisdiction was introduced in the reign of Queen Anne, for the principle was established 600 years ago, in the time of Edward I., in whose reign an Act was passed, which Act provided that no broker should be admitted to practise unless he had been sworn in before the Lord Mayor and the Court of Aldermen. The reason for that regulation was obvious, because it prevented improper persons from exercising those privileges. Whether the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen were a good tribunal for regulating a subject of so much importance it was not necessary to consider, but whether it should be dealt with by public or private legislation. This was nothing but an attempt to deprive the City of London of an income which they purchased for a large sum of money, and which they had enjoyed for many centuries, and the only ground for depriving them of it was that the Corporation received from this source too large a sum of money. He trusted he had shown sufficient grounds for the Amendment which he proposed.

Amendment *moved,* to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Six Months.")—(*Lord Kingsdown.*)

LORD TAUNTON said, that the abuse against which the Bill was directed was one that loudly called for removal. It had in its favour the recommendation of the Commission appointed to inquire into the state of the Corporation of London, on which Sir George Lewis and Sir John Pattison were his colleagues, and it had been thoroughly examined by a Committee of the House of Commons and passed unanimously, and was warmly approved of by the commercial interests in the City. His noble and learned Friend had been supplied with all his arguments by the Corporation of London, who were interested parties, as it was they who benefited by the abuse. The Corporation levied the tax on the most respectable brokers, whilst whole hosts of interlopers passed scot free. Sir Robert Carden had given evidence against the present system before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, and the late Mr. Charles Pearson, the City solicitor, and an exceedingly shrewd man, had advised his clients to get the tax when they could, never to enforce it, and above all things never to raise discussion as to its merits. It appeared that the case of the Corporation having broken down before the Committee of the House of Commons, in which there were many friends of the City, they had gone round to their Lordships' House, and were at last fortunate in finding an advocate in his noble and learned Friend. A Committee of their Lordships' House might inquire whether anything in the way of a compromise might be effected, and he was sure that any suggestion coming from such a source would be received with great respect by the promoters. He believed there never had been a Bill which had undergone a more searching or scrutinising inquiry in the House of Commons, and it would be a great misfortune if the two Houses of Parliament should come to separate views upon such a subject.

LORD REDESDALE said, he had always been particularly careful to keep private legislation within its proper bounds, so that it should not interfere with public legislation; and the first thing he found in this Bill was that it is proposed to repeal a Public Act, and secondly that it sought to bring about a great measure of municipal reform by indirect means. Now, nothing would be more dangerous than to allow a municipal reform to be made by private legislation. On these grounds he thought the Bill ought to be rejected.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY hoped that their Lordships would pause before they rejected the Bill, which had been passed unanimously in the other House of Parliament, and which had passed through its several stages hitherto with the full conviction of those promoting it that it could not be objected to as a Private Bill. The promoters asked that the Bill should be considered by a Committee of this House; and it would then be competent for their Lordships, acting upon the Report of the Committee, to reject the Bill if they thought fit so to do. But he submitted that it would be an objectionable precedent to reject the measure in its present stage.

LORD CHELMSFORD said, he should

not object to the sending of the Bill to a Select Committee if he did not think it contained a dangerous and destructive principle. It was the most undisguised measure of confiscation ever submitted to Parliament. No good reason had been shown for taking these revenues from the corporation, to whom they had been secured by successive Sovereigns for many centuries, and the only ground for doing so was that they amounted to a considerable sum. He should therefore cordially support the Amendment.

On Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion? *Resolved* in the *Negative;* and Bill to be read 2^a on *this Day Six Months.*

BRAZILIAN SLAVE TRADE.

OBSERVATIONS.

LORD BROUGHAM rose to call the attention of their Lordships to the subject of which he had given notice — he meant the state of the Brazilian slave trade—and it gave him the utmost satisfaction, having so often complained of Portugal rather than Brazil for the increase of that trade, to be able to state—as he did most confidently—that that trade had entirely ceased. Would he could say of the Cuba or Spanish slave trade, as of the Brazilian slave trade, that there remained of it not a vestige! He might be excused for stating the particulars of the cessation, because he meant on these particulars, and on the clear proof that the trade had ceased, to ground a recommendation to his noble Friend opposite for the repeal of what was called the Aberdeen Act, passed in 1845. They were all of opinion at the time of the passing of that Act that it was, he would not say a most violent, but an extreme measure, and only to be justified by the absolute necessity of the case. There was a Committee of the House of Commons in 1853 moved for and presided over by Mr. Hume. That Committee collected a great mass of evidence respecting the Portuguese and Spanish slave trade, and in that Committee there was also given the most complete proof of the entire abolition of the Brazilian slave trade. It had been increasing very much in 1845. In 1842 the number of slaves imported into Brazil was 17,000. In 1846 it increased to 50,000, and in 1848 it was no less than the enormous number of 60,000. In consequence of the nature of the Brazilian coast and its numerous small bays, our squadron, notwithstanding the zealous efforts of our gallant officers, had not succeeded in extirpating the traffic; nevertheless, in 1849, the number had fallen from 60,000 to 54,000. In 1850 it fell to 23,000; in 1851 to 3,000; in 1852 to 700; and in 1853 there were absolutely none. The Emperor on all occasions showed the most determined resolution to effect the abolition of this trade, and, by the employment of additional steamers and the adoption of other regulations, he took measures both to put an end to it and to prevent its revival. In 1850 a law passed both Chambers without opposition which made the slave trade piracy and established a special court for the trial of such offences, which had a most admirable effect. The fact was that the general public feeling of Brazil was adverse to the slave trade, as was shown by the fact that at the elections for both the general Parliament and the provincial ones the successful candidates were persons who had been most active in the suppression of the trade, and the detection and punishment of offenders; and it was only supported by a few planters. The Government gave great encouragement to the immigration of free labour, and it was found that while the profits upon plantations cultivated by slaves amounted to only 8 per cent, those obtained from plantations where free labour was employed reached 14 per cent. The result was that the Committee of the House of Commons to which he had referred reported that the Brazilian slave trade had entirely ceased, and that there was no reason to apprehend its revival. The Aberdeen Act was always acknowledged to be an extreme measure, justified only by the extreme necessity of the case, and the refusal of the Brazilian Government to renew the convention which had then just expired, and Lord Aberdeen himself in his correspondence with our envoy at Rio spoke of it as only a temporary measure intended to meet a special occasion, and authorized him to assure the Government that as soon as the slave trade ceased it would be repealed. Since 1853 the slave trade with Brazil had entirely ceased, and the necessity for that Act must, therefore, have been removed. He could not, he might add, say so much for Spain as he had for Brazil. Spain had entered into a treaty with us, by which we agreed to give her a large sum of money in consideration of her abolishing her slave trade and taking actual measures for that purpose; but the only part of the stipulations of the treaty which she had performed was to receive the money, leaving undone that for which it was to be given. He was afraid, indeed, that so long as Cuba was under the Spanish Government it would be found impossible to procure the passing of good local measures for the abolition of the infernal traffic. The result of the distribution of gold by the slave dealers, and the large profits which they made by the trade, was that they were able to corrupt the Governors of Cuba who, with but few exceptions, were thus made partners in the guilt. What was once said by a Roman orator against one whose name was chiefly known in connection with that of his illustrious accuser was equally applicable to the Spanish Governors of Cuba, *Nihil tam sanctum quod non violari ; nihil tam munitum quod non expugnari pecuniâ possit.* As he had said before, the conduct of Brazil was different, and he was happy to find from a despatch of Mr. Christie, who bore no particular goodwill toward the Brazilian Government, to the noble Earl, that there was no probability of the slave trade being resumed in that quarter.

EARL RUSSELL was happy to say that the slave trade in Brazil had been abolished by law, and did not in practice exist ; at the same time he could not state that in his opinion the abolition of the slave trade was entirely owing to the change in policy in Brazil, and the laws passed in that country on that subject. The Aberdeen Act was a very severe Act, and the operation of it was severe, because while the slave trade was going on and that Act was in operation, his noble Friend Lord Palmerston, then Foreign Secretary, gave orders, through the Admiralty, by which slavers were captured in the waters of Brazil. The execution of those orders gave great alarm to the slave traders in Brazil, and they soon found that it was not any longer a profitable traffic. At the same time he readily confessed, that under the policy which Brazil had adopted and followed for many years, the Aberdeen Act had become inoperative. But if any party were to come into power who should endeavour to restore the slave trade, they would have the opportunity of doing so if this Act were repealed. His noble and learned Friend said the present was a favourable time for the repeal of the Act ; he (Earl Russell) did not think so. The Brazilian Government had chosen to suspend diplomatic relations with this country upon a ground that could mean nothing more than objection to the measures taken merely for the protection of the lives of British subjects in Brazil. He could not think that they were entitled under those circumstances to any great favour at the hands of this country. He regretted, with his noble and learned Friend, the continuance of the slave trade in Cuba.

LORD BROUGHAM said, that if his noble Friend would read the evidence taken by the Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1853, he would be convinced that no squadron on the coast of Brazil could ever put an end to the slave trade. He ought to have mentioned that the conduct of the Brazilians to the free negroes was an example to our kinsmen in America.

LORD HOUGHTON said, if the Brazilian Government were so anxious to get rid of the Aberdeen Act, they ought to make some arrangement, as the Portuguese had, for the establishment of Mixed Courts. They had always refused to do that, and had insisted on standing on their extreme right. It was true that the slave trade to Brazil had lapsed—[Lord BROUGHAM: Ceased altogether]—but it was quite as much owing to the Brazilians finding it to be their interest to drop it as from any other cause. He could hardly understand his noble and learned Friend's laudation of a Government which had persisted more absolutely than any other Government in refusing any approximation to a measure of emancipation of their slaves. Something was due to Mr. Christie for the persistent manner in which he had done everything in his power to improve the condition of the liberated Africans, and to induce the Brazilian Government to take some steps towards emancipation, and his perseverance in this line of conduct had gained him no little illwill there.

LORD FORTESCUE believed that Mr. Christie's conduct during his mission had obtained the approbation of two successive Secretaries of State, and he did not see any reason for introducing his name into the debate.

LORD BROUGHAM denied that he had introduced Mr. Christie's name unnecessarily into the debate—he had quoted Mr. Christie as the very best evidence of the discontinuance of the slave trade, and the impossibility of its revival. He had not a word to say against Mr. Christie. Quite the contrary.

House adjourned at half past Seven
o'clock, till to-morrow, half
past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, June 28, 1864.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered*—Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension; Election Petitions Act (1848) Amendment.

Select Committee—Weighing of Grain (Port of London)* [Bill 172] *nominated.*

Committee—Lunacy (Scotland) [Bill 146]; Administration of Trusts (Scotland) [Bill 95]; Elections Petitions [Bill 17] (*count out*); Thames Conservancy (*re-committed*) [Bill 135].

Report—Lunacy (Scotland) [Bill 146]; Administration of Trusts (Scotland) [Bill 95].

THAMES CONSERVANCY (*re-committed*) BILL—[BILL 135.]—COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 69 *agreed to* with verbal Amendments.

Clause 70 (Power to take Tolls for Moorings and for Lighters and Steam Tugs).

MR. ALDERMAN SALOMONS said, that by this clause the conservators had power to levy a tariff and dues on all vessels from a boat up to a ship of the largest size. He objected to the lighters and steam tugs being made liable to a tax of this kind; and he therefore begged to move the omission of the words "lighters and steam tugs used on the river Thames."

MR. HUTT said, he could not agree to the Amendment. The subject had been carefully considered by the Committee, and they determined that the clause should remain as it at present stood. The Committee appointed last year to inquire into the subject of the navigation of the Thames said, that no craft were more indebted to the labours of the conservators than the barges and lighters, and this clause had been introduced at the suggestion of the Committee.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to,* as were also Clauses 71 to 74.

Clause 75 (Prohibitions of deepening or altering Sewers or Drains discharging into the River).

MR. ALCOCK moved to insert proviso—

"Provided always, that nothing herein contained shall be deemed to apply to any legally authorized sewers, drains, or works, now in course of construction by the Local Board of Health for the district of Kingston-upon-Thames, and the connection of the houses in such district with the said sewers, drains, and works."

Amendment proposed,

In page 25, line 4, after the word "condition," to insert the words "Provided always, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to apply to any legally authorized sewers, drains, or works, now in course of construction by the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses of the borough of Kingston-upon-Thames, and the connection of the houses in such borough with the said sewers, drains, and works."—(*Mr. Alcock.*)

MR. HUTT said, he had promised to agree to the Amendment, because it had been urged that the operation of the measure would act very unfairly upon the district, but he could not but confess he had done so with regret.

MR. LOCKE said, he must resist the insertion of the proviso, because he regarded it as legalizing a nuisance. It was of little use to attempt the cleansing of that part of the Thames which ran through London, if towns above the metropolis were to be permitted to empty their filth into the river. If he went into the lobby alone, he would vote against the insertion of the proviso.

MR. LOCKE KING reminded the House that when the Bill was introduced the clause before the House was not in it. He thought such a clause ought not to be placed in a Thames Conservancy Bill, but ought to be embodied in a general Act dealing with the drainage of the towns upon the Thames. There was nothing in the preamble which warranted the insertion of the clause.

MR. THOMSON HANKEY said, that as the Bill was one to protect the Thames from pollution, this clause was a reasonable one, and the insertion of a proviso which would have the effect of sanctioning the creation of a nuisance at Kingston-on-Thames was not at all justifiable. He should go into the lobby with the hon. and learned Member for Southwark (Mr. Locke).

MR. LOCKE reminded the House that the Bill allowed Kingston-upon-Thames to go on with its present pollution of the Thames, and only enacted that no increased sewage was to be discharged into the river. He thought the proposition was a monstrous one, and not founded in justice or right.

MR. HEADLAM thought that sewers legally in course of construction should share in the same exemptions as those already made, however objectionable the discharge of sewage into the river might be.

MR. DOULTON said, the adoption of

this Amendment would entirely upset all their past legislation in reference to the Thames.

Mr. ALCOCK thought it would be a good thing if all the towns on the Thames were forbidden to make use of the river for the purposes of sewage; but it was unfair to come upon Kingston-on-Thames so suddenly when they had just entered into a contract which would cost them £10,000.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 9; Noes 45: Majority 36.

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

LUNACY (SCOTLAND) BILL—[Bill 146.]

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Mr. SMOLLETT said, he objected to going on with this Bill at all. He did not think the Lord Advocate could have taken any course more calculated to prove the truth of what has been said, that the business of Scotland was conducted in this House in a most unsatisfactory manner. The Bill was first introduced in the middle of June, they were now in Committee upon it on the 28th; and neither upon the first nor the second reading, nor upon the present stage of the Bill, had there been any explanation given of the necessity of introducing it at all. The Bill itself was a very short and a very unpretending Bill, and might have been introduced at the commencement of the Session if the Lord Advocate had been attending to the Scotch business as sedulously as he had represented himself to have done. The Bill purported to amend an Act passed about two years ago. The Bill then passed was a sort of continuance Bill. The Lunacy Commission in Scotland was constituted about the year 1857; it was to expire in five years; so that in 1862 it became necessary to introduce a Bill to continue it. The Board consisted of an unpaid chairman and of the Commissioners—medical men—with salaries of £1,200 a year each, and the Secretary of State had power to appoint two Deputy Commissioners of Lunacy at salaries of £500 a year each; there was a secretary with a salary of £300 a year, and a clerk with a salary of £150 a year. This was the Board; but it really consisted of the two medical gentlemen and the unpaid chairman. The Board, so constituted in 1857, soon made itself peculiarly obnoxious. They were armed with large powers, and they speedily came into collision with almost all the parochial boards in Scotland. Their proceedings were very unpopular; but there was no escape from them. If any person objected to the proceedings of any particular Commissioner, he might appeal to the Board; but inasmuch as the Board consisted only of that Commissioner and another, and of the chairman, they confirmed each other's proceedings. Therefore, when in 1862 a Bill was brought in to continue this Lunacy Board, considerable opposition was made to it by the parochial authorities in Scotland, and who, with that view, sent up deputations to London. The main objections to the measure were directed against the powers of the Commission and its constitution; but ultimately the Bill passed. One clause was, however, inserted in the Bill, to the effect that the Deputy Commissioners appointed by the Secretary of State should continue in office only until 1864. Now, what was the object of that clause? The object was to enable the Lord Advocate, during the two years that the Bill was to continue in force, to see whether a Board might not be constituted in a different and less objectionable form to the people of Scotland than the existing Board. The present Bill proposes to continue in office, two gentlemen with a salary of £500 a year each, whose term of office would have expired in August of the present year. The Bill ought to have amended the constitution of the Lunacy Board. It should have been re-constituted in some manner less objectionable to the people of Scotland; and it ought to have been introduced at the beginning of the Session, so that it might have been considered by the county meetings on the 30th April. But, instead of this, the Bill was introduced in the middle of June. It was on the face of it a very unpretending and simple Bill. It consisted, indeed, of only two clauses and the preamble, and the first clause enacts that

> "The provisions of the first recited Act in regard to the appointment of Deputy Commissioners shall be and are hereby continued until Parliament shall otherwise determine."

That was to say, that the two Commissioners whose power was limited to August 1864, in order that the matter should this Session be re-considered, are to be made permanent until Parliament shall otherwise determine. That is one way of redeeming the pledge under which these Commissioners were appointed until August 1864. The second clause is another very strange performance. It provides that these two Deputy Commissioners, who are now to be continued until Parliament shall otherwise determine — or, in other words, until the Lord Advocate shall determine, because Scotch business in Parliament is in the hands of the Lord Advocate for the time being. That was the way in which the pledge given two years ago—that the subject should be reconsidered with a view to reconstituting the Lunacy Board—had been redeemed. Such was always the way in which Scotch business is managed in this House. He had already stated his opinion that Scotch business was conducted in a very unsatisfactory manner, and he thought the way in which this Bill had been conducted was a proof of that assertion. He had made these observations with a view of giving the Lord Advocate an opportunity of making what statements he might think fit on the Bill; but he gave him notice that, if this was the way in which Scotch business was to be conducted in future, he must expect to meet with very considerable opposition.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON said, he agreed very much with what had fallen from his hon. Friend (Mr. Smollett), and particularly as to the prevalence of a feeling in Scotland against the continuance of the Lunacy Board as at present constituted. When, however, the objections to the Bill were made known to the Lord Advocate, his hon. and learned Friend had frankly promised that the Bill should really be a continuance Bill for two years, so as to allow time for the consideration of the question. With that understanding, he hoped his hon. Friend (Mr. Smollett) would allow the Bill to pass, in order that, before the two years should have expired, there might be an opportunity of considering the footing on which the Board should continue. He must say that though the existence of such superintending Boards was looked upon with great jealousy by many persons in Scotland, yet he was not one of those who thought that parishes should be left to deal with their own lunatics in the way which they think best; for although there might have been many matters in the Report of the Royal Commissioners on this subject some years ago, yet the fact could not be denied that the manner in which the custody of lunatics was carried on in Scotland was a disgrace to the country. He should much fear that matters would relapse into their former state if there were not in Edinburgh authorities empowered to see that the custody and treatment of lunatics were consistent with the civilization of the age. He did not think it would be practicable to keep lunatics in private houses; and it must be evident that an authority must exist to see that these unfortunate persons are kept with due care, and in a proper manner. How this superintendence should be provided for was a matter for future consideration.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, that this was a mere continuance Bill. He would not on this occasion dilate on the general management of Scotch business in this House, but he entirely denied that there was any ground for the general complaint which the hon. Member for Dumbarton had made in regard to it. He thought it would have been much better if, instead of making large criticisms upon the outside fringes of this question, he had applied himself to consider whether, during the time the Lunacy Board had been in operation, there had not been a very marked and beneficent change produced in the management of lunatics throughout the country. He was far from saying that the present machinery was perfect; but he was satisfied that no one who had taken an interest in the question would deny that they had set on foot an improved system for the treatment of lunatics which, although it might be susceptible of improvement, had put an end to a state of things which the hon. Member for Ayrshire (Sir James Fergusson) had justly said was a scandal to any civilized country. There was a good deal still to do; but much had been done. The fact was, that the Board had not powers enough under the first Act, and they were therefore extended under the second Act. It was quite true that parochial boards made their representations, and that they came up in a joint body to protest against the two medical members of the Board; but he (the Lord Advocate) was not at all prepared to say that he altogether agreed with those representations; neither did he think that the opinions of such Boards

—who are to be superintended, checked, and controlled in the management of lunatics by the authorities—are to rule in this matter; but at that time I was perfectly willing to consider the propositions they made to provide for a paid chairman and two paid lay members of the Board by parochial assessment made by the parochial boards themselves. In the end all parties were satisfied that the project was impracticable. The hon. Gentleman had spoken of pledges. Now, he (the Lord Advocate) begged to say, in the first place, that two years ago he came under no obligation whatever; and, in the second place, that, although this Bill, as far as the continuance of the Deputy Commissioners was concerned, was limited to two years, he came under no obligation to adopt at a future time any particular course in regard to the constitution of the Board. In regard to the hon. Gentleman's opposition, he hoped he would not persevere in it, for this reason—that, if the Deputy Commissioners should cease to exist, the whole machinery of the Lunacy Board would come to an end. He (the Lord Advocate) thought the continuance of the Commission absolutely necessary. In regard to the increase of salaries, there was a proposition to increase the salary of the chief clerk. That he believed to be a useful addition. In regard to the Deputy Commissioners, he did not think it could be fairly said that £600 a year was over pay, considering that the whole of their time was spent in visiting lunatic asylums throughout the country, and that they had thrown upon their shoulders very heavy and grave responsibilities. It was a position in which they ought to have—and, indeed, he was happy to say they had—medical science and ability of the first class. But the fact that they had been able to obtain first-class medical ability at £500 a year was no reason why the proposed addition should not be made. Under these circumstances, he hoped the Bill would be allowed to proceed.

Mr. BAXTER hoped the hon. Member for Dumbarton would not persevere in his opposition. He thought that the proposition was quite fair, and that the present system should be continued for two years, and probably in the course of that time either his hon. Friend, or some other person, would be prepared to submit to the Lord Advocate some plan for the re-construction of this Board, if any re-construction should be deemed necessary.

Mr. SMOLLETT said, he would not persevere with his Motion; but he thought the statement of the learned Lord ought to have been made on the introduction of the Bill or on its second reading.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Continuance of Deputy Commissioners).

The LORD ADVOCATE moved to omit the words, "until Parliament shall otherwise determine," and to insert the words, "until the 1st August, 1866."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Mr. LESLIE said, after the explanation of the Lord Advocate, he would not proceed with the Amendments of which he had given notice.

Clause 2 (Treasury to regulate Salaries of Secretary, Clerk, and Deputy Commissioners).

Mr. CAIRD desired to ask the Lord Advocate whether the duties of the officials, to whom it is proposed to give an increased allowance, have been augmented; and whether it is on that ground that the increased allowance is to be made?

The LORD ADVOCATE, in answer to the question of his hon. Friend, begged to say that this Board was originally fixed on a low scale of remuneration. Of late years the annual expenses of the office had increased, and he thought the additional allowance now proposed was in every respect just and reasonable.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON said, that as some surprise might possibly be expressed in Scotland at the increased allowance which it was proposed to give, it might be well that it should be clearly understood that it was given on the grounds stated by the Lord Advocate. They had now on the Board gentlemen of the highest position in their profession, and it was desirable to retain them, for if they were to have such a Board, it should be composed of the best men, and of those in whom the public have confidence. The chairman of the Board is Sir John Don Wauchope, and, although he was unpaid, his office was by no means a sinecure. He had done an immense deal of service; and if the Board was to be continued with such a man at the head of it, he ought to be paid. If the Board was to be settled on a permanent footing, he could not understand why public services of the most valuable character should be performed without any remuneration; and if no provision for that was made in this Bill, it ought to be understood that it was not because Sir John Don Wauchope's services were not appreciated.

THE LORD ADVOCATE wished to add his testimony to the zeal and ability with which Sir John Don Wauchope had performed his duties.

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

ADMINISTRATION OF TRUSTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

[BILL 95.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 7 *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Trustees desirous of purchasing the Trust Estate may apply to the Court for permission).

MAJOR HAMILTON said, he did not think they ought to pass this clause in silence. It allowed trustees and guardians of wards to acquire the property of these wards themselves, and with the leave of the Court of Session. It might happen that trustees or guardians of wards, in acquiring their property even with the consent of the Court, might do so for a fraudulent reason. He did not mean to insinuate that this would be the case, but he thought that some explanation of the clause was desirable.

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, this power was to be granted simply upon an application to the Court. He thought that there ought to be some protection, that it ought to be done in the most public manner, because everything ought to be done to prevent collusion on the part of the persons interested. He quite agreed that this was a very questionable power to be given, and one which ought to be guarded in every way possible.

MR. CAIRD also objected to the clause, and hoped the Lord Advocate would be able to give them some reason why it was proposed. It did not appear to him that there was any good reason for introducing such a novel principle as that of giving powers to trustees to become themselves purchasers of the trusts which they had been appointed to administer.

Sir James Fergusson

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, that no doubt this power ought to be watchfully exercised. He thought, however, that the cases in which it would be most generally exercised were family trusts, and where the trustees were generally interested in the property. Very often a much greater price could be obtained from a person who was a trustee. Sometimes the only man who cared to purchase was a trustee, and it would be often far the best arrangement which could be made. He believed that a power of this kind could be exercised on application to the Court of Chancery; and it was intended to give the Court of Session the same power. The general rule that no trustee should become the purchaser of a trust had been found to cause great inconvenience and embarrassment in many cases, and he thought there was a general impression that this power ought to be given. As far as he was aware, he thought it would be of great advantage.

MR. CAIRD said, the question was whether this power might not be used for an improper purpose, and he thought some clauses should be inserted providing that property which it was proposed to deal with in this way should be offered for public sale, so that the public would come in as a check. There might be advantage in giving the power which it was now proposed to give, but it should be so guarded that the trustees should not be able to take any advantage of the trust.

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON said, that he knew that great jealousy existed with regard to this clause as it originally stood. At that time, there was no provision that the sanction of the Court should be necessary; and he did not think it would have been possible to agree to it as it then stood. The Committee would remember how jealously the Court of Session guarded the rights of wards, and he did not think there was any reason to fear that the Court of Session would not very carefully exercise the right which it was now proposed to intrust to them. Some cases had come within his own knowledge in which it would have been advantageous if trustees could have exercised this power; and, as it would be exercised under the authority of the Court of Session, he thought no fear need be entertained.

MR. BUCHANAN said, that if he were not misinformed, the practice had been, at judicial sales by the Court of Session, to offer the property by public auction.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, the object of the clause was merely to authorize the purchase of property by trustees. It did not interfere with the power of the Court of Session in regard to selling. He had no doubt that in ordinary cases the Court would not consent to a sale except by public auction; but he was quite willing to consider whether the clause could not be amended in any way before the Report came on.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 9 (Court may authorize Trustee to enter into Transactions with the Estate).

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON said, he thought this clause ought not to be passed even in its amended state. It authorized a trustee to hold an office of profit under the trust. He knew that legal authorities in Scotland of the highest kind—including the late Lord Justice General—entertained decided feelings against such a proceeding. There were decided objections to a professional gentleman being a paid trustee; and, without any imputation, he did not think that was a position in which they ought to be placed.

COLONEL SYKES thought it was a dangerous conjunction to have an agent and trustee combined in the same person.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, that formerly there was no such rule as that which now existed, and it was a very ordinary thing for the family agent to be made a trustee. It was considered that it would be of great advantage to have his knowledge and experience. Now, however, the family agent could not be appointed a trustee, without surrendering the agency of the trust. That has been found very inconvenient. He agreed that the general rule was a salutary and wholesome one; but there were many cases in which it would be extremely convenient to have the benefit of the knowledge and experience of the family agent as a member of the trust.

MR. FINLAY suggested that the clause should be postponed till the Report.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, that as there seemed to be considerable difference of opinion, he would have no objection to postpone the clause till the Report.

Clause *withdrawn.*

Clause 10 (Extension of the Powers of Trustees in relation to Investments).

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, the clause gave a very considerable extension of the powers of trustees, and enabled them to invest not only in Parliamentary and East India stock, but in the railway debentures of any railway company paying a dividend. He thought it was a question whether such a power should be exercised without the authority of the Court.

MR. BUCHANAN said, the same objection had occurred to him, but he had been given to understand that the wording of the clause was borrowed from the English Act—the 24 & 25 *Vict.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

Then, on Motion of The Lord Advocate, New Clauses added.

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered on *Monday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 179.]

COLONIAL GOVERNORS.

PAPERS MOVED FOR.

MR. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, he rose to move for an Address for a copy of any Correspondence which had passed between any Departments of the Government with respect to the granting pensions to Colonial Governors. Having on a former occasion had the honour of addressing the House on this question, which was of very great importance to a large class of public servants, he would not trouble the House at any length; but before the close of the Session, and after the answers which had been given by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, he believed the House would consider him justified in pressing the Government for a distinct understanding of their intentions on the subject. He would recal to the House one fact, and that was, that the only class of public servants who were precluded from receiving pensions or superannuation allowances for long services were the Colonial Governors. Their omission from the benefit of the Act of 1859 had been attributed to one of two causes. Either there were most important reasons for their exclusion, or else it had been an oversight, and, on the whole, he was inclined to believe in the latter solution. Three or four reasons had been given why those Governors should not be placed in the same position as other public servants. It was said they were not continuously in the service of the public; but he would ask the House if the service of our diplomatists and other public officers was continuous? Why, the very service of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not a continuous service. He (Mr. Cochrane) did not know, indeed, how long it might continue, but it was not continuous. There were hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on the opposite Bench, and also on his own side of the House, who were entitled to pensions. It was also said there would be inducements to retain officers after they became unfitted for service merely with a view of securing their pensions; but he did not see that Colonial Governors were liable to such a charge in an exceptional manner, and did not believe any weight attached to the suggestion. The third objection was that it would open the door to the bestowal of pensions upon a new class of public servants. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer could point out any other class of public servants who were in the same position and who did not receive retiring pensions, he would concede to him the whole argument. When they considered the position of the Governors of colonies, the importance of the station they held in the colonies, and the fact that they were frequently very distinguished public servants, it must be admitted that it was unjust to bring them home from stations where they represented the dignity and honour of the Crown, and to leave them in this country without, it might be, the means of subsistence. It might be said that a Colonial Governor was not the servant of the Crown, but of the colony. He did not believe, however, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would maintain this assertion. The Governor was often the only direct servant of the Crown in a colony, except the officers in command of the troops. The Judges and other gentlemen holding situations in the colonies were, on the other hand, colonial servants, and in many of the colonies they were in the receipt of superannuation allowances. The Governor was, however, the direct servant of the Crown. He was appointed by the Crown, and could be recalled only at the will of the Crown, and he had no one to look to but the Crown for justice and support. The Governor was, indeed, so directly the servant of the Crown that he might occasionally be called upon to take a course opposed to the wishes or interests of the colony. If the colony desired to carry out a policy objectionable to the Home Government, the Governor was compelled to follow the instructions from home. A Correspondence had been laid on the table from which it appeared that the opinion of the Duke of Newcastle, Mr. Labouchere, and all the other Colonial Secretaries, had been favourable to the granting of pensions to Colonial Governors. It also appeared that the only opposition proceeded from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was very hard, when the opinion of all those interested in the colonial service was one way, that the single opinion of the right hon. Gentleman should prevail against those of the Secretaries of the Colonies. It was not a matter of generosity, but of justice. The salaries of the Governors had been greatly reduced of late years. He believed the reduction was nearly one-half, and their salaries were not large enough to enable these gentlemen to insure their lives or to save money enough to live upon in their old age. Mr. Merivale, a great authority in that House, in his admirable work on *Colonization,* said that the functions of a Governor of a colony were particularly difficult and arduous. He often formed the only political link between the colony and the Home Government. To execute well the double functions that devolved upon his office demanded a man of no common ability. The occasion usually called forth those abilities, for England, Mr. Merivale added, was in no public department better served than by the higher class of her Colonial Governors. He contended that it was a monstrous thing that these gentlemen who discharged their high duties, according to Mr. Merivale, in this satisfactory manner, should, after thirty or forty years' public service, be declared undeserving of retiring pensions. Without troubling the House at greater length he would ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer to give the subject a fair and impartial consideration. It was not a mere question of economy. No one would contend that, for the sake of saving a sum which would not exceed a few thousands a year, these gentlemen should give the best years of their lives to the service of the public without the prospect of a retiring pension. He would conclude by simply moving the Address.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of any Correspondence which has passed between any Departments of the Government, with respect to the granting of Pensions to Colonial Governors."—(*Mr. Baillie Cochrane.*)

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he was unable to accede to the Motion of the hon. Member for the correspondence with regard to granting pensions to Colonial Governors, and for reasons which the hon. Member would admit were to a certain extent satisfactory. It was not necessary nor desirable that he should follow his hon. Friend in the argument he had used in favour of granting these pensions; but he might state that he agreed with him that the subject should not be considered simply as a question of money, because it involved very grave considerations of a public character. The reason for not producing the Correspondence was this:—It was the desire of the Government to give the subject that full and impartial consideration for which his hon. Friend had asked. Of course it would be understood that he spoke without prejudice to the judgment at which they might arrive, but he could readily give the assurance for which his hon. Friend seemed most anxious, namely, that this subject would not be looked at as a simple question between the Colonial Office and the Treasury, in which the Colonial Office had a natural leaning towards the interests of its own servants, and the Treasury had a natural leaning towards the interests of the Exchequer. The Government would consider the case as a whole, and with all the matters bearing upon it. His hon. Friend would, therefore, see why they could not produce the Correspondence, which he might add was incomplete. He could not say that he regarded the question from exactly the same point of view as the hon. Gentleman. The Duke of Newcastle had submitted his views to the Treasury, but the state of the Duke's health had been the cause of some little delay. His right hon. Friend (Mr. Cardwell) had taken the matter into consideration, and had addressed two communications to the Treasury, the latter of which he had not yet seen. When his hon. Friend said that the Colonial Governors were the only public servants who were not in the enjoyment of pensions, it should be observed how very broad was the distinction between the two cases. The Colonial Governors were not for the most part paid out of the British revenues, but out of the revenues of the colonies, and, indeed, many of those who were disposed to advocate the system of pensions for those Governors considered it as part of a larger measure—namely, that of paying their salaries in all cases out of the Imperial revenues. He did not deny that there was much to be said in favour of that view, but it was not the view of Parliament, for the tendency of late years had been to reduce as rapidly as they could all payments connected with the Colonial Governments. However, he would give the assurance which his hon. Friend had asked, that during the recess every effort should be employed on the part of the Government to prosecute an inquiry into the matter to a satisfactory conclusion, and that whatever decision might be arrived at should be arrived at when they were in possession of all the facts of the case. He trusted, therefore, his hon. Friend would not press his Motion.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he entirely agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that there were political considerations of very grave importance involved in the question, but he thought that those considerations pointed very decidedly to the policy of holding out fair inducements to men of ability to enter the service of the Crown as Governors of the colonies. Those considerations pointed to the reasonableness of the conclusion, that when the best years of a man's life had been devoted to the performance of duties of so important a character he should not find himself on his return to the country without that compensation which the other servants of the Crown obtained. Entertaining those opinions, he thought that, after the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, his hon. Friend would do well not to press his Motion to a division. Though he could wish that the language of the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been more encouraging, still he understood him to have given a pledge that during the recess the question should receive ample consideration. They had some reason to complain that it had not received consideration earlier. He had hoped that a decision upon it would have been come to during the present Session. But now that they had a distinct promise that that interesting subject should receive the serious attention of the Government, he earnestly hoped it would meet with a favourable consideration at their hands.

Mr. MALINS said, he was happy to hear that the question should receive the careful consideration of the Government, which in this case, he presumed, meant the careful consideration of his right hon. Friend himself, for, as he understood, there was no other Member of the Government who had any doubt upon the propriety of making the allowances. The speech made by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies on the last occasion was most encouraging to the hopes of the Governors. When it was admitted that they were the only class of public servants who had no retiring allowances, when it was considered that they were at once the direct representatives of Her Majesty in our colonies, and exercised the most important functions, and that many of them, after long years of service, were reduced to live in obscurity and penury, as he knew well, the question arose upon what grounds this anomaly could be sustained. None could be alleged except in regard to the public purse. But on the highest grounds of policy it was essential that men who had filled such important positions should be provided for on their retirement. It had been stated that Colonial Governors were frequently paid out of the colonial revenues. The very utmost that would be required for the purpose would be £10,000 or £12,000 a year. Civil and military officers and Ministers of the Crown all received pensions, and why should the Governors of our colonies be the only exception ?

Mr. CARDWELL said, he only wished to repeat now the pledge which he had given before, and which had been redeemed as far as time had allowed. Her Majesty's Government had carefully considered the subject, it was still being considered, and, he would add, would receive their best consideration.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

OPEN SPACES (METROPOLIS).

RESOLUTION.

Mr. DOULTON, in moving a Resolution on the necessity of preserving open spaces in and around the metropolis, said, few questions were more interesting to the mass of the industrial population, not only to those in the metropolis itself but to those residing in the suburban districts which were fast becoming connected with the metropolis. The importance, and he would say the absolute necessity, of preserving open spaces for the recreation of the people would not be denied by any one; but, in order to prove it, he would call attention to some very striking facts connected with the large increase of population in the metropolis. In 1851 the population of what was termed the metropolitan district was 4,700,000 ; in 1861 it was not less than 5,600,000, or an increase of 900,000 in the short space of ten years. In the same period there was an increase in the number of houses to the amount of 103,000 ; that increase was still going on, and he questioned whether at any time during the ten years it advanced at a greater ratio than at this moment. But the important point was this—that while the necessity for open spaces was increasing, the difficulties of obtaining control over them were increasing also. That was not the first time that the question had been brought forward, though not in the same form as that in which he submitted it to the House that evening. But whenever it had been considered, whether in reference to Hampstead Heath, or to the places to which the hon. Member for Maldon (Mr. Peacocke) had called attention, there had been almost an unanimous expression of opinion in favour of the preservation of those spaces. A very few years ago London might be said to have been belted with these natural parks. Many of the commons on the south and north sides of London had become entirely extinguished, being appropriated for building purposes ; and others were in process of extinction. In dealing with this matter there were two questions—the question of the forests and that of the commons and open spaces in the neighbourhood of the metropolis, and those questions ought to be kept distinct. The question of forests had already been dealt with by Parliament, which had decidedly expressed its opinion by addressing the Crown, praying that the forestal rights of the Crown might be preserved. Subsequently a Committee was appointed, which reported that it was absolutely necessary, for purposes of recreation, to preserve these forests. The Government, however, had taken no action in reference to the matter until within the last few days, when a communication was sent to the Metropolitan Board of Works by the Secretary to the Treasury, asking that Board whether they were prepared to purchase the rights over Epping Forest, with an ultimate view to the cession of the rights of the Crown. He would presently show that the Metropolitan Board of Works had no power to deal with the matter, but, if they had, there was no necessity for throwing that duty on them. The commons rested on a different tenure, for the rights over them belonged, not to the Crown, but to the lords of the manors, the copyholders, and the commoners. With respect to the inclosure of commons, application was generally made to Parliament through the Copyhold Commission, but there were some startling exceptions to that rule, and Wandsworth Common, one of the largest and best on the south side of the metropolis, was being appropriated for building purposes, though no application to inclose it had been made to the Copyhold Commissioners, and, consequently, the case had never come before Parliament. Therefore, the fact that lords of manors were able to inclose commons showed the necessity of Parliament to deal with the question. The Secretary to the Treasury had suggested, in a letter, that the Metropolitan Board of Works should take up the matter; but, as he had already intimated, it was neither in their power nor was it their duty to do so. The best proof that it did not possess the power was that whenever it had considered it desirable to carry out the construction or formation of any park it had been under the necessity of applying to Parliament for powers for that express purpose. It was true that the Act of Parliament constituting the Board authorized them to form Public Parks by purchasing land by agreement, but nobody who knew the nature of the negotiations for the purchase of land would dream of the Board forming a park in the neighbourhood of London, unless they had such compulsory powers as they did not possess. The Metropolitan Board of Works were told to maintain Epping Forest for the purpose of public recreation, but, as that was beyond their jurisdiction, the forest must be preserved at the expense, if the Board determined to undertake the task, of the inhabitants of the metropolitan districts; and the inhabitants of the neighbourhood of the forest beyond the jurisdiction of the Board, while enjoying great benefit from the preservation of the forest, would not contribute one farthing towards the expense. He would also take the cases of Mitcham and Wimbledon Commons, and he asked what would be the result if the Metropolitan Board of Works undertook to preserve them as places of public recreation. With regard to Mitcham Common, the inhabitants of the healthy and increasing town of Croydon would derive great part of the benefit, and would not contribute in any degree to the expense. So with regard to Wimbledon Common, the inhabitants of Richmond and other large towns would receive great advantage from the common being preserved, but would not be called on to pay one farthing. The Metropolitan Board of Works had already incurred liabilities for improvements to the extent of between £8,000,000 and £9,000,000. That very large expenditure was to be defrayed by the metropolitan ratepayers, and it was impossible to go on imposing fresh rates on the metropolis, the Metropolitan Board having no other means of raising funds except by direct taxation. If that Board were to be called on to preserve these open spaces—a duty which he thought more properly belonged to the Government—the House ought not to be so chary in giving the Board the same powers to tax the metropolis as were exercised in provincial towns. In bringing the question forward, he did not wish it to be understood that he was desirous that these open spaces should be transformed into neatly trimmed and laid out gardens and parks. His object was to have them preserved in all their wild and uncultivated condition, and it would be a pleasant sight to see the boisterous enjoyment of the working people in places where there did not exist those restrictions which were natural and proper enough in well laid-out gardens. He did not wish that the money for this purpose should be taken out of the Consolidated Fund, but he asked the Government to introduce a Bill giving the necessary taxing powers to the Metropolitan Board of Works to carry out the object. He concluded by moving the following Resolution :—

Moved,

" That it is the duty of Her Majesty's Government to provide for the preservation of open spaces in and around the Metropolis within the limits assigned by the 14th section of the Inclosure Act of 1845."—(*Mr. Doulton.*)

Motion made, and Question proposed.

MR. PEEL said, it would be a cause of much regret if none of the open spaces around, and, more especially, those in the metropolis, should be preserved ; and he owned that it was the duty of the Government, more particularly in those cases where the intentions of Parliament had been expressed, to attend to those things. In an ordinary case, where there was an open space in which different persons had an interest, as commoners, tenants, or lords of the manor, the inclosure of such land, if it was within a certain radius of the metropolis, could not be effected without an Act of Parliament. On such an application being made, therefore, Parliament could either refuse it or grant it under certain conditions, as, for instance, with regard to the reservation of so much ground for the recreation and health of the public. When an inclosure was recently authorized in Chigwell parish, fifty acres were allotted for the use of the public. It was a mistake to suppose that there had been any very considerable diminution in the open spaces in and around the metropolis. It was nearly twenty years since the Act in regard to inclosures within the metropolitan radius of fifteen miles was passed, and during that time not more than about 1,500 acres had been inclosed, the greater part of which was upwards of ten miles from town. On the part of the Crown there had certainly been no disposition to deprive the inhabitants of London of any rights to which they were fairly entitled in that respect. He was willing to admit that in the administration of Crown property regard should be had to the effect of open ground on the public health, even in preference to the benefit which the public might otherwise derive from the disposal of the land. In Epping Forest the Government did not feel at liberty to convert the Crown's forestal rights of sporting and hunting as an instrument for virtually depriving individuals of their property. As a proof of the anxiety of the Government to give due consideration to the claims of the public in regard to open spaces, he might refer to the parks of London, and especially to the new ones, Victoria and Battersea, which had in recent years been added to the number. With respect to the commons, which were the property of private persons, it was not the duty of the Government, and it would be quite impossible for them, to deprive the owners of the right to use the ground in the same manner as other owners of private property were entitled to do. At any rate, it could not be done without giving compensation to the owners, many of whom, moreover, having only a limited interest, could not sell if they wished. The Government would also require to be armed with special powers for the purpose. The chief, and crowning difficulty, however, was the source from which the expense of preserving the open spaces should be derived. He could not admit that it was the duty of the Government to provide the means out of the public purse. There ought to be no difference in that respect between the metropolis and the other large towns of the country. As to the suggestion that further powers should be given to the Metropolitan Board of Works, it would receive the consideration of the Government. As to the Resolution he did not see how it would advance the object the hon. Member had in view, and he could not agree to it on the part of the Government.

Mr. LOCKE said, he could not agree that the Government had carefully guarded the rights of the public with regard to Epping Forest, because a number of houses had been built, and gardens and grounds attached to them, upon and from land taken from the forest, and over which the public previously had a right to roam. Therefore, he said, the Government had not sufficiently performed their duty. The object of the Motion was to make the Government more careful for the future. There might be some difficulty in providing parks and open spaces in the metropolis—from what source the necessary funds should be furnished for the purchase of the land and for compensation to those whose property was interfered with; but he did not think there was any analogy between the metropolis and large towns in the provinces, because the metropolis was spread over a vast space, and comprised within a certain area between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 of inhabitants; besides, the whole country had an interest in the capital, to which all were from time to time attracted either for business or pleasure. For these reasons it was most essential that its health and ornament should be provided for by the nation. Parliament was in the constant habit of legislating specially with respect to improvements in the metropolis; and that was a further reason why a portion of the funds should be furnished by that House. From time to time there had been encroachments round about the metropolis, which could not occur in Dublin, for instance, where the people had the Phœnix Park, and could get into the country almost immediately. A railway had been carried through the centre of Wandsworth Common, and when that had been done he presumed any other nuisance might be introduced. Tooting and Streatham had also been subject to encroachments. The Resolution was intended to promote the desirable object of preserving those open spaces which were so essential to the public health; but it would not embarrass the Government by pledging them to any particular mode of doing so. He thought the Resolution deserved the support of the

House, and hoped his hon. Friend would press it to a division.

SIR WILLIAM FRASER said, it was much to be regretted that the open spaces in the neighbourhood of the metropolis had been allowed to be cut up by railways. When those railways were constructed, if there had been a public officer to protect the interests of the public, in all probability they would either have been stopped altogether or forced to take another direction. Until such an officer were appointed he was afraid the recreation grounds around London would continue to be encroached upon.

MR. TORRENS observed, that persons claiming to be lords of the manor were in the habit of laying hold of hundreds of acres in Epping Forest and elsewhere, without any steps being taken on the part of the Government to protect the rights of the Crown and of the commoners. It was high time that the Attorney General should be instructed by the Treasury to interfere in such cases.

MR. COWPER said, he entirely agreed with his hon. Friend that it was most desirable that some means should be taken to preserve the commons round London from inclosure at the rate that was going on. Wandsworth and Mitcham Commons, to say nothing of Epping Forest, had been largely encroached upon; but he thought his hon. Friend would not be advancing his object by the Resolution which he had proposed. The Government was not obliged or required to suggest a solution for the difficulty which was felt in the matter. Last year an Act of Parliament was passed which threw on the Metropolitan Board of Works the duty of looking after open spaces within their jurisdiction; but he believed they had not yet done anything in the matter, and he suspected that the present Resolution, if passed, would not remedy their failure. It would be far better to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into the whole subject, and endeavour to ascertain how the difficulties now experienced could be overcome.

Question put.

The House *divided* :—Ayes 79 ; Noes 40 : Majority 39.

QUEEN'S PLATES.—RESOLUTION.

MR. PERCY WYNDHAM said, that the attention of the country had lately been called to the alleged fact that the breed of our horses had greatly deteriorated in stoutness, soundness, and structural formation. On that point he begged to read to the House a portion of the letter addressed to the Speaker, and subsequently published in the Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society by Mr. Dickenson, a successful breeder of horses, and a high authority on the matter. Mr. Dickenson said—

> "Great advances have been made in the breeding of cattle, sheep, and pigs, in every part of the United Kingdom during the last forty years. What is the case with regard to horses? Have they not retrograded in the same degree? Can the present race of horses be compared with those bred forty years since? The cart-horse, perhaps, is the only class that can bear the comparison. There is a cause for this which I shall mention hereafter. Formerly, Royal Plates of £100 each were given for competition all over England, for four-year olds, 10st. 4lb.; five years, 11st. 6lb.; six, and aged, 12st.; decided in four mile heats. Our horses were then the envy of the whole of Europe. These Royal Plates, for high weights and long distances, brought up our horses to this point of excellence; so long as they were so given so long we kept our supremacy; but, by some unfortunate influence the conditions were altered, and lighter weights and shorter distances allowed. From this point I date, under my own observation, the commencement of the deterioration of our thorough-bred horses, and consequently those in everyday use."

Mr. Dickenson's experience extended back for a period of forty years, but Lord Redesdale, in introducing a Bill on that subject in the other House, said he had come across complaints as long ago as seventy, eighty, and ninety years, of the decreasing stoutness and soundness of our horses. The noble Lord the President of the Council thought he had reduced the argument of those who were constantly lamenting the deterioration of our breed of horses to an absurdity, when he quoted the opinion of a livery-stable keeper, who had told him that as long back as he could remember anything, he could remember these periodical complaints about the deterioration of our horses. How were they to account for that deterioration? He thought Mr. Dickenson hit only a part of the reason for it. The real reason, he believed, lay in the undoubted fact that the object of those who had the command of the turf always had been, and always must be, to entice as many persons as possible to come upon the turf—an object inconsistent with such a system as would maintain for us the breed of stout horses. He was aware there were many who utterly denied the statement that a deterioration had taken place; but there was evidence enough left to show that in former times horses ran six mile distances and four mile heats, carrying even twelve and sometimes thirteen stone, and remained five and six years on the turf, performing tasks which if they were to try to impose on a racehorse of the present day would kill the animal, and bring the owner within the penalties of Martin's Act. It was the fashion with some to say that our horses were never finer than they were at present, and that the accounts of the racing in olden times were not to be relied on. But he found it easier to believe that there had been a deterioration in the stoutness, soundness, and structural power of our horses, than to believe that all the feats as recorded as done by horses in the last century were a sham, and that pretending to run four-mile heats the jockeys had cantered the greater part of the way. The stamp of our horses had undergone a change. The modern racer stood over more ground than his predecessors, and had a longer stride; but that elongation was purchased by flatness of side, weakness of loin, and less capacity of chest. What was the remark that would at once be made by any one who looked at the pictures of our racehorses by a great artist fifty years ago? Why, that they looked more like hunters than racers, combining higher stuctural power, soundness, and stoutness, with the same amount of breeding. In a very interesting correspondence which had recently taken place between the Chief Secretary for Ireland and Admiral Rous, the gallant Admiral said—

> "A racehorse which can run three miles is worth £3,000—a half-mile horse's value is £100, which is a sufficient bribe to exercise our ingenuity to produce stout runners."

And he also observes that—

> "It is not to be supposed that a sane person will risk a horse worth £3,000 to run four miles under heavy weight, for a miserable prize of £100."

He was aware that Admiral Rous said he did not object to the modern system of handicap. He (Mr. Percy Wyndham) thought, however, that that system was regretted by almost all who were connected with the turf; and he had reason to believe that the opinion of Admiral Rous had undergone a change, for in a letter written after the debate in the House of Lords in 1860, he had said that "no man was a greater enemy to handicaps than himself," and that "the system encouraged trickery of every description." In the same letter the gallant Admiral used one of his very terse and expressive phrases—namely, that racing was "a game of weights." One thing to be deprecated was the running of horses at a too early age. The Earl of Derby, speaking in the House of Lords against the Bill of Lord Redesdale, said, that in 1829 the proportion of two-year-olds to three-year-olds on the turf was as two to eight, and that in 1859 it had increased to eight to seven. The proportion was still increasing, and that spring it had reached rather more than eight and a half to seven. It was beginning to be discovered that they could not with impunity play such tricks with nature as they had been doing for the last half century, and he maintained that a greater change had taken place during the last fifty years than during any other period. The system of Queen's Plates was most unsatisfactory. They occupied a sort of intermediate position. The weights were not heavy enough or the distances long enough to please those whose eyes were fixed on having good horses for practical purposes, and not for mere racing. Whilst, on the other hand, their rules had not been modified in such a way as to meet the requirements of modern times. One of the most recent alterations introduced was the allowing three-year-olds to run for Queen's Plates, and he regretted to say that the majority of our racehorses disappeared altogether from the turf at the end of their third year, when they were still in a state of infancy. He should not be at all sorry to see the old weights gone back to, though he admitted the difficulty there would be in having such an arrangement with the present system of running horses. When they found that of thirty-eight Queen's Plates run for in England, seventeen had been won by one mare, which had six or seven walks over, and that of seventeen Queen's Plates run for in Ireland, eight had been won by one animal, which had the appropriate name of Tourist, he thought they might arrive at the conclusion that some change was required. He rather agreed in Admiral Rous's opinion that we should have free trade in the matter; but if free trade meant an absence of State interference with the rules and regulations of the Turf, it also meant an absence of State subsidies. If the Queen's Plates were given not for a great public object, but for the mere purpose of encouraging sport, the Government ought to give some of the public money as prizes for cricket matches, or as subscriptions towards some of the fox hunts, which were much in want of funds. With regard to prizes, Mr. Dickenson makes these observations—

> "When a prize of £100 was given by the Royal Agricultural Society at Battersea, the best six stallions were brought from all parts of the country, even a Derby winner, to whom was awarded the prize. Nevertheless, the object of the society was not obtained. It is not the winner of the Derby or St. Leger, a horse that will never be taken from his own stable door, that should come to an Agricultural Show, exhibit himself there, and walk off with the prize; but it is a good strong thoroughbred country stallion, that is available for the use of the ordinary mares of the country."

The fact was, we did not possess horses which were so useful for general purposes as those possessed by our forefathers. He had brought forward views which might be new to some and opposed to the preconceived ideas of others; but he felt certain that they would bear investigation, and find an echo in the opinion of many country gentlemen, farmers, and yeomen in this country. He thought that the present system ought not to receive any subsidy, however trifling, from the public funds. And he, therefore, begged to move that, as the annual grant of sums of money voted by that House for Queen's Plates no longer encouraged the breed of good horses, the object for which it was originally given, it should for the future be discontinued.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That, as the annual grant of sums of money voted by this House for Queen's Plates no longer encourages the breed of good horses, the object for which it was originally given, it should, for the future, be discontinued."—(*Mr. Percy Wyndham.*)

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he thought that the hon. Member (Mr. Wyndham) who had just sat down, and who was entitled both by descent and from personal knowledge to offer an opinion on the matter, had done good service in bringing the subject under the notice of the House. He (Mr. Newdegate) had taken a great interest in the breeding of horses for the last twenty-five or twenty-six years, and he thought there was a great change in the character of our horses; but he did not believe that that change was entirely attributable to the character of our racing or our racehorses. The fact was that some few years ago, before railways were introduced, few hon. Members thought it a surprising feat if they had ridden twenty miles upon the road. Hon. Gentlemen would, however, bear him out that very few gentlemen now took a ride of twenty miles, and the truth was that unless a man was upon his horse for a considerable time and over a considerable space of ground he never found out what the animal was made of. To that circumstance was to be attributed the want of substance and power of endurance which was observable in many horses, and the fact that the ordinary horse or hack was not as useful as formerly because so much less used. Then railways had superseded the demand for second and third class horses. The roadster was not in demand as formerly, except for exportation. It would be a very sad thing if the breed of our horses were to deteriorate seriously; and he thought if public money was to be given in Queen's Plates for the purposes of improving the breed, it was well worthy the consideration of the Government whether such a change might not be adopted in the conditions as should give encouragement to the retention in this country of horses of substance and stoutness, such as really would improve the breed. He felt convinced that a mere change in the conditions of the Queen's Plates would not effect that; but he thought the advice of Admiral Rous, that the distance for Queen's Plates should never be less than three miles, was well worthy of consideration; and he was further of opinion that £100 for a Queen's Plate should not be given unless the private subscriptions were added to double or treble the amount of the public contribution. He believed the effect of such a regulation would be the retention in this country of an enduring, stout, weight-carrying class of racers for breeding purposes on terms available for the farmers. By this system of economy, the not giving the Plate unless a subscription was added, the Government might obtain a fund from which the value of the Plate, where given, might be gradually increased, without increasing the aggregate Vote for this purpose, and thus also secure the distribution of the prizes among horses of the character which was requisite for ordinary breeders. There was no doubt that the £100 was often won by inferior animals; and that in other cases a first-rate animal monopolized a number of plates for want of competition. Admiral Rous was right in saying that we should have larger prizes in order to secure the services of a requisite number of horses of the class which he had described.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, there was no doubt the amount of money given in Queen's Plates did not afford the same inducements to gentlemen to run their horses as it did when Queen's Plates were first established. That was the practical object for which those plates had been established; but he believed that since they were established the breed of horses in this country had in no way deteriorated. In Ireland there was a universal complaint of a want of good stallions; and Admiral Rous fairly put it, that if gentlemen would club together in Ireland and this country to keep good stallions there would be no reason to fear a deterioration of our stock of horses. But he differed from the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) in one particular. That hon. Gentleman said that no one would think of riding twenty or thirty miles now. Why he himself, only so late as the previous Saturday, rode thirty miles, and his horse displayed both ability and endurance. After the ride he probably felt much better than the horse, but yesterday the horse came out of the stable perfectly fresh. He believed that his noble Friend at the head of the Government was frequently in the habit of taking long rides, and there were other gentlemen also who preferred that sort of exercise to the railways. A sum of about £3,500, divided into thirty-six or thirty-eight prizes, was at present given in Queen's Plates; and though it was true that one horse in Ireland and another in England had won a great number of these prizes, and that in some cases there had been a walk over, that was not a reason for making a great alteration, which would entirely do away with that enjoyment, to maintain which he thought public encouragement should be given to race meetings. His noble Friend at the head of the Government authorized him to say the Government would consider the matter with the Master of the Horse, who, he believed, regulated the weights. His noble Friend did not authorize him to say that the weights would be increased, but that the Government, with the Master of the Horse, would consider whether an alteration might not be made as regarded the weights and distances in races for Queen's Plates, with a view of testing to a greater extent the capabilities of the horses. For himself, he did not share the opinion that those heavy weights and great distances were as desirable as some Gentlemen appeared to imagine. However, that was to be considered. He hoped his right hon. and gallant relative (General Peel), who was very conversant with the subject, would inform the House whether, in his opinion, the breed of horses in this country had deteriorated. He knew that the Government of France and other Governments had purchased some first-rate sires in this country. The Baron and other stallions had been purchased here by the French Government; but in this country we did by private enterprize what in France was done by the direct action of the Government and by other means. In his opinion the English breed of horses was able to compete with any that could be brought against them; but his noble Friend at the head of the Government was ready to assure the hon. Gentleman that with respect to distance and weight the question would be considered, in order to see whether any improvement could be made in conducing to the objects for which these plates were originally established.

General PEEL: Sir, I disagree with the opinion that the breed of horses in this country has deteriorated. I have been for at least forty years a breeder of this class of horses, and if my authority is worth anything it is certainly opposed to that of Mr. Dickenson, for I believe that we have never before bred such horses for endurance and speed as now. The hon. Member's proposal is that the grant for Queen's Plates should be put an end to, "as it no longer encourages the breed of good horses." Now, I requested the hon. Gentleman to postpone his Motion, and I did so because on the 1st of next month there is a show of horses in this town, and I believe there will be 300 hunters, forty-two thoroughbred horses, with hacks and horses of every description. I wanted the House to judge for itself whether the breed of horses had fallen off or not. In the Easter vacation I went to see two studs of horses — one belonging to a noble Lord who unfortunately did not run first but ran second for the Derby. He had thirty-six horses in training and I think eighteen of them would have carried me. I do not think I can give better proof of the quality of the present breeds of horses.

My other visit was paid to the hon. Member for Hythe (Baron Rothschild), who possesses as fine a stud of horses as can be seen anywhere. So far from the breed of horses having fallen off, I believe there never was a time when thoroughbred steeds were more surely going back to that size and power which formerly distinguished them. Objection is taken to the racing of two-year-olds. And what is proposed? Why, to do away with all the races for old horses, all the weight-for-age races, and to abolish the Queen's Plates. I say it is impossible to tell to what degree these Queen's Plates encourage the breed of horses. You cannot judge of this at all by the number of horses which run for them. After horses have passed their third year, a man is inclined to ask, "What can I do with them?" "Oh!" he thinks, "I can run them for Queen's Plates;" and this attaches a value to these horses which otherwise they would not possess, and without which they might go out of the country. But then it is said, "These horses ought to run longer distances and with heavier weights." Well, I say in reply that Admiral Rous is quite right, and that if you do so you will have none but common hacks running for Queen's Plates. No man would run good horses in four-mile heats with heavy weights for £100. At the same time, horses now-a-days are as capable of running four-mile heats with ten stone on their backs as they ever were. Forty years ago I recollect it was thought a miracle when a two-year-old won the Feather Plate at Newmarket—three miles. Now, nothing else wins. I had much rather that the two-year-olds did not run in these races, but the fact I mention shows how the breed has improved. If the breed of horses has fallen off, buyers must certainly be extraordinary people, because they now give higher prices for thoroughbred horses than they ever gave before. Look at the prices fetched for yearlings at sales during the present year, including that of the Royal studs at Hampton Court. Depend upon it, the public do not give these higher prices for brutes. Among the starters for the last Derby there were four or five of the finest horses that have run for many a year—certainly as fine as have run during my recollection. In my opinion there is nothing in the world like a thoroughbred English horse; and if you tried to produce large coach-horses you certainly would not improve the breed. I recollect the famous match of 200 miles in ten hours that Mr. Osbaldeston won at Newmarket. Did he choose great hunters or strong half-bred horses? Not at all. Every horse he rode was thorough-bred, and he did not care what they were; he took any horse which was in training, and never varied in this choice. He rode each horse four miles, his riding weight being ten stone. One horse carried him four times. It went sixteen miles in thirty-two minutes, and no half-bred horse would ever have done that. Well, then, hon. Members say, "Why should the public give this money for Queen's Plates?" Now I am prepared to make this proposal to the Government:—They give £3,300 a year in Queen's Plates. But they take £7,000 a year in an extra tax levied on racehorses. Why put an additional tax on racehorses? Why not pay the exact tax that other horses pay? If this is done, owners of racehorses do not want the Queen's Plates. There is no class of people who enter more into the free trade spirit than racing men. We have not sought to shut out foreign horses. We have always upheld free trade for the turf; we have challenged foreign horses to come over here and compete with ours; and we have even given them weight because it was thought that they hardly stood upon equal terms with English horses. It is true that in France at present they have better horses than they used to have, but these horses are every one of them of English blood. There is not a single country abroad where country bred horses run—all of them are English bred, and buyers come to England for them. I can only say again that I think the hon. Member is quite wrong in holding that our breed of horses has deteriorated, and is still more at fault in the manner in which he seeks to rectify this supposed deterioration—that is to say, by doing away with Queen's Plates, the only races left for old horses to run in. If the Government have determined to reconsider the question of weights and distances, I only hope that they will consult those who are the best judges of what is likely to promote the interests of racing. I should not have ventured to express these opinions if I had any interest in the question; but, as I no longer own a racehorse, I have no personal interest in the matter whatever, except what arises from my great desire to assist in any measures that may improve the breed of English horses.

Mr. GREGORY said, he was also of

opinion that the breed of horses had not deteriorated, and that it would be unwise to adopt the recommendation of the hon. Member. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman who had last spoken had comprehended the whole question in the observations he had made. He (Mr. Gregory) maintained, however, that the Queen's Plates might be better arranged in Ireland. At present, of the fifteen Queen's Plates run for in Ireland, eleven were run for at the Curragh, and the result was that one horse came over for one week to the Curragh and swept away all the prizes. He proposed that about three more Queen's Plates should be run for in the provinces in Ireland, and over any proper racecourse, whenever a sufficient sum of money was forthcoming. He thought that such additional prizes would have the effect of keeping the old horses in the country.

Mr. FOLJAMBE believed that the exportation of the finest young mares, which was now carried on to a great extent, had something to do with the deterioration of the breed of horses. Fifty mares had been taken from one district alone. That was indeed killing the goose that laid the golden eggs. It would be very desirable if some means could be devised for putting a stop to this export, consistently with justice to the breeders and with the principles of free trade.

Viscount PALMERSTON: I entirely agree with my hon. and gallant Friend opposite, and utterly differ from those who contend that the breed of English horses has deteriorated. I believe, on the contrary, that the horses bred in this country are better as to size, substance, and endurance than they ever were. Any man going into a racing stable, and seeing their size, their bone and substance, must ask himself what he could wish to have better in the shape of a four-legged animal. The fact is that greater pains are taken now than used to be taken formerly to force on the young horse, and bring him to a greater size at two years old than used to be the case. There is one very good test. If the breed were deteriorated, foreigners would not come to England to buy English horses. But the complaint is that more and more persons come every year from different parts of the Continent to buy English horses; and I say that is a proof that the English horse is a good one. The other day I had a deputation from gentlemen connected with the Royal Agricultural Society of Ireland, complaining of deterioration in the breed of horses there. But in the course of conversation, it was stated that from one port in Ireland—namely, Dublin—5,000 horses were shipped in the course of last year. That, at least, is a proof that the Irish horse is worth buying, and worth carrying elsewhere. There can be no doubt that the laws of supply and demand exercise the same influence over the breed of horses as over the manufacture of any other article. If there be a demand, depend upon it that somehow or other there will be an adequate supply. With regard to the particular Motion of the hon. Gentleman opposite, I have no objection to say that the question shall be considered by the Master of the Horse in connection with those who are the best judges of the turf, to see whether a return to greater weights and greater distances would be advisable, with a view of improving the breed of horses. But I think there is great force in what fell from the hon. and gallant Officer, that to abolish prizes applying to horses of greater age than the usual sweepstakes, so far from doing any good, would, on the contrary, do harm. The hon. Gentleman will probably not think it necessary to take the sense of the House on this Motion.

Mr. PERCY WYNDHAM said, he had to thank the noble Lord for the promise which he had given, and he would withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

ELECTION PETITIONS ACT (1848) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Bill to amend "The Election Petitions Act, 1848," in certain particulars, *ordered** to be brought in by Sir Colman O'Loghlen and Mr. Adair.

ELECTION PETITIONS BILL—[Bill 17.]

COMMITTEE.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [1st June], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

And which Amendment was,

> To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words, "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the expediency of amending the Election Petitions Act (1848), and the Act for the better discovery and prevention of Bribery and Treating at Elections,"—(*Mr. Ayrton,*)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

Sir FRANCIS GOLDSMID was proceeding to address the House, when—

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at half after Eight o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, June 29, 1864.

Their Lordships met; and having gone through the business on the paper, without debate,

House adjourned at Four o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, June 29, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee Resolutions* [June 27] *reported.*

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension* [Bill 181]; Election Petitions Act (1848) Amendment* [Bill 182].

Second Reading — Poor Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment [Bill 51] *negatived.*

Committee—Tests Abolition (Oxford) [Bill 18]: Street Music (Metropolis) [Bill 90] — r.p.; Gaols* [Bill 93].

Report — Tests Abolition (Oxford) [Bill 18]; Gaols* [Bill 93] (*re-committed*).

Considered as amended—Thames Conservancy* [Bill 135]; Lunacy (Scotland)* [Bill 146].

Third Reading—Weights and Measures (Metric System)* [Bill 165]; Settled Estates Act Amendment* [Bill 142] (*Lords*), and *passed.*

POOR LAW (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL—[Bill 51.]

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. HENNESSY, in moving the second reading of the Bill, said, he would show that the principal objection which would probably be urged to the measure—its expense—was unfounded. Very exaggerated estimates had been formed as to the results of the clause introduced at his instance into the Poor Law Act two years ago, enabling Poor Law Guardians to place out deserted and orphan children to nurse until the age of eight years. It was said that the effect of the clause would be to entail an enormous additional expense upon the ratepayer. But the Irish Poor Law Commission in their last Report showed that, instead of the additional expense being of a serious nature, the number of children relieved under that clause for the half year ending September 1863 was 169, which, at an average cost of £5 for each child, gave a total cost of about £800. From that amount must, however, be deducted the cost that would have attended their rearing in the workhouse, so that the increase was scarcely perceptible. The measure he was about to ask the House to read a second time, proposed to deal not with children, but with the ablebodied poor; it was purely a permissive measure, and in proof of the feeling of the people of Ireland in regard to the suggestion he would point to the fact that not a single petition had been presented against the Bill, while in that and former Sessions numerous petitions in favour of conferring on the Poor Law Commissioners additional powers had been forwarded. The measure consisted of but a single clause, and with the exception of such verbal alterations as were requisite to make its provisions applicable to Ireland was copied *verbatim* from the English Act. He desired to take that opportunity of acknowledging the courtesy with which the secretary to the English Poor Law Board had facilitated his labours in drawing up the Bill by enabling him to consult the legal adviser of that Board. The English system had been recommended by competent authorities; the people of Ireland asked for it; and upon what grounds would its extension to the sister country be denied? If the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, or his noble Friend the Member for Cockermouth (Lord Naas), intended to argue that a harsher Poor Law was indispensable for Ireland, upon them would rest the duty of proving its necessity and of justifying the anomaly. There were three considerations in favour of the measure. The first was that of economy, for the Bill would have the effect of reducing the rates. The House could not fail to be struck with the remarkable fact mentioned in the official Report, that while 4½ per cent of the population in England, and 4 per cent in Scotland, were relieved, in Ireland the average daily number of those whose necessities were relieved was under 1 per cent. Was Ireland, then, so much a richer country than England or Scotland? If not it was clear there was something wrong in the Irish Poor Law. The outdoor relief in England and Scotland was shown to cost very nearly the same—namely, about 1*s.* 6*d.* per head per week on the average daily number. In Ireland the cost of workhouse maintenance and clothing alone amounted to 2*s.* 3*d.* per head per week, and, adding that to the other expenses, the total amount was about 3*s.* 10*d.* per head per week. Thus it appeared that by adopting the English system, more than double the present number could be relieved and an actual saving effected upon the present rates. No doubt, it would be said that if the English system were extended to Ireland more than double the present number would claim relief. But his answer was, that the Bill being only permissive, the Commissioners would at all times have power to check excessive demands; they might, if they chose, relieve double the present number, and then stop short at that point. He did not quite concur with those who thought the North of Ireland the most progressive portion of the country, but, taking one or two unions there for the purposes of comparison with England, he found that in the union of Drumfanahy, county of Donegal, £333 was expended on the maintenance of the poor, £209 in salaries and rations to officers, and £123 in other expenses, making a total of £332 for establishment charges as against £333 spent upon the poor. Sixpence out of every shilling contributed by the ratepayers, therefore, went for staff and expenses. In Stranowar £502 was laid out upon the poor, and no less than £590 on establishment charges, salaries, &c. What was the case in England? Taking that part nearest to Ireland with which hon. Members were best acquainted, he found that in Holyhead no less than £9,300 out of £10,000 collected from the ratepayers was spent upon the poor, £156 of the balance even being devoted to the maintenance of lunatics. The proportions were stated to be that in England and Scotland six-sevenths of the applicants were relieved out of the workhouse, while in Ireland only one-thirtieth of the relief afforded was given out of doors. There was another consideration well worthy of attention—that of public policy. The English Commissioners in their Report gave a very interesting account of the outdoor relief which it was found necessary to give at Birkenhead for a few weeks during the prevalence of excessive frost. The cost was exceedingly moderate, the men were well conducted; and, as soon as the temporary pressure was removed, the men returned to their labour, again to increase the wealth of the community. Many of those dock labourers so relieved were Irishmen. Had a similar frost happened in Dublin the same men would have been obliged to go into the workhouse or starve. The law was clear on that point. They must either have gone with their families into the workhouse, to become, perhaps, hereditary paupers, or else, having once incurred the workhouse brand, they would have fled from the country the moment they got out of doors again. A Member of that House told him he met not long ago a party of Irish emigrants, a servant girl was with them, and as domestic servants were wanted in Ireland he asked her why she was going to America. She told him she had been forced in a moment of temporary distress to ask for relief. She had been driven into the workhouse, and having the stain of the workhouse upon her she could do nothing but emigrate. The same feeling prevailed among the working population after they had been forced into the workhouse. The people of Ireland were well aware that a different law existed in England. Professor Ingram, of Trinity College, Dublin, said on the subject that one of the greatest evils of Ireland was the disaffection to the Government which undeniably existed, and which it was the duty of the Government to remedy. The Professor asked what must be the feeling of the Irish working man when the law dealt more liberally with the English than the Irish labourer; and he added that it could not be pretended that Irishmen and Englishmen lived under the same law when such a difference existed. The vast majority of the Irish people concurred in opinion with Professor Ingram. Was this a United Kingdom? What was the meaning of a United Kingdom? It was not a mere geographical expression, but indicated a union of laws and institutions, and especially the laws affecting the poor. If the poor of Ireland were more harshly treated than those who live nearer the centre of Government, the loyal attachment to the Government that should exist in Ireland was necessarily disturbed. There remained to be considered the question of morality. He contended that any measure that would substitute outdoor relief for indoor relief would tend to promote morality. He had a mass of evidence in his possession from guardians, and taken before the Committee on the Irish Poor Laws on the subject. He might remind the House of the evidence of Colonel Latouche, of Dublin, who described the horrible treatment that the women and children received in the Irish union workhouses. When he alluded to the subject in the debate of last March he was told that a system of classification existed in most of the workhouses of Ireland. It was not, however, a moral but a physical classification. Young girls who were driven to the workhouse were not forced to associate with women suffering from contagious diseases, but they associated with women of bad character and having illegitimate children with them. He might read replies of the Boards of Guardians to the Sanitary Commission, but it would be enough to note that classification did not exist in the workhouses of Ireland, and that it was operating against the morality of the people. He contended, therefore, that economy, public policy, and morality alike required the measure. But there was a further consideration. There had been debates on the loss of population by Irish emigration, and, although the Government would not consent to express their regret at the decline of the population, the general feeling of all enlightened and sensible men was that the decline was to be regretted. He was convinced that the laws in operation in Ireland for the so-called relief of the poor greatly tended to promote that emigration. The labouring man knew that if he crossed the Channel he would receive outdoor relief if he were sick and out of work. It was the natural right of the poor man to solicit arms, but there were laws in England and Ireland to prevent him from exercising that right. To ask alms was not opposed to the law of God, who told us that we should give alms and that almsgiving was a good deed. But our laws were opposed to the law of God, and they punished the poor man who asked for alms. A certain mode was prescribed in which alms, if they could be so called, were to be given, namely, money was collected in the shape of rates, and they were administered by a Board, and the poor were to receive relief only in the way prescribed by such Board. Upon those, therefore, who enacted those laws was thrown the onus of providing the administration of relief, that should, as far as possible, be consistent with the social and moral interests of the poor. The very reverse, however, was the case in Ireland. They compelled the poor to receive relief by entering a prison, and to live on a diet far inferior to that which he would receive in a common prison. Some of the Irish Judges had remarked that the workhouses must be dreadful places, when offences were committed by prisoners for the purpose of being transferred from the workhouses to the gaols. In May, 1829, the noble Lord (Viscount Palmerston) speaking of an Irish Poor Law, said that if Parliament established a Poor Law in Ireland it would give a right to ablebodied men out of employment to be supported in the same way as in England, namely, by means of outdoor relief. A Commission was appointed in 1834 to inquire into the Poor Laws, and the expediency of extending them to Ireland. Lord John Russell was then at the head of affairs, and his Government, unfortunately for Ireland, reversed the recommendation of the Commission and determined not to extend the English Poor Law to Ireland. Mr. Nicholls, the Poor Law Commissioner, was sent to Ireland, and his Report, written after nine weeks' inquiry, was allowed to upset the recommendation of Irish gentlemen who had known the country all their lives. Lord John Russell, who never touched Ireland but to damage it, passed the present Poor Law, and he would not venture to say how many hundreds and thousands of persons it had driven from the shores of Ireland. That Act was amended by another passed in 1847, and the principle of outdoor relief had been slightly extended in 1862 upon his (Mr. Hennessy's) Amendment relative to orphan and deserted children, which had proved highly beneficial in its operation. He trusted he had shown the House that his measure was recommended by economy, policy, and morality, and he therefore asked the House to give a second reading to his Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Hennessy.*)

Lord NAAS said, he very much regretted that his hon. Friend had thought fit to revive a question which had been amply discussed in an early part of the

Session, when it was shown to the satisfaction of the House that the subject had also been very fully discussed and considered by the Committee on the Irish Poor Laws two years ago. That Committee expressed what might be fairly regarded as an almost unanimous opinion against the views and principles which the hon. Member had laid down. He would not detain the House at any length, because in the early part of the Session he had expressed a conviction that nothing had happened in connection with the operation of the Poor Law system to contradict or invalidate the opinion so authoritatively expressed by the Select Committee. The hon. Member tried to make the House believe that he merely wished to assimilate the law of England and Ireland. The whole spirit and working of the Irish Poor Law was essentially different from that of England. The English law was intended, in the majority of cases, merely to assist in the relief of the poor, and did not pretend actually to support the person. But the relief given to the poor of Ireland was absolutely complete; it extended to their clothing, lodging, food, maintenance, and went even to the education of the children of the paupers. It was not fair, therefore, to compare the English with the Irish law. But was not the hon. Gentleman aware that complaints were made every day of the working of the English system? Were there not paragraphs and letters in the public papers complaining of the insufficiency of the relief given in this city? It was true the hon. Gentleman had copied part of the words of a clause found in the English Act, the 4 & 5 *Will.* IV. That clause, however, was passed, not with the view of establishing, but with the entirely different object of limiting and arresting the evils of outdoor relief in England. The Poor Law Commissioners also issued a prohibitory order, which positively arrested, in four-fifths of the unions of England, the operation of the clause which the hon. Member wished to make general throughout Ireland. This order declared that every ablebodied person requiring relief should be, in the unions named in the schedule, wholly relieved in the workhouse of the union, together with his wife and family. A few classes of applicants were alone excepted—the sick and infirm, those suffering from accidents, and widows with one or more legitimate children. Therefore the hon. Gentleman's measure would, if it were adopted, have a far wider operation than the English Act, unless it were accompanied by a like prohibitory order. The hon. Member, however, had not disguised his object, for he had distinctly contended that the poor had a right to relief, and he would acknowledge that right without any limitation whatever. He wished, therefore, to extend the powers of his Bill to every union in Ireland. He had also endeavoured to show that the Irish Poor Law was harsh and unsuited to the wants of the poor. The allegation was strongly urged before the Irish Poor Law Committee of two years ago. It was stated that there was no doubt a great dislike on the part of the labouring man to go into the poor-house, but the charge of harshness in the administration of the law was not proved in the slightest degree. It was shown, on the contrary, that the poor who came under the operation of the Poor Law were as well and as kindly treated as the circumstances admitted. Still a Poor Law must of itself be somewhat uninviting, and it behoved those who were intrusted with its administration to take care that no encouragement should be given to idleness, and that persons who could support themselves were not induced to claim relief from the rates. The Boards of Guardians in Ireland possessed, in fact, certain limited powers of granting relief, but they were seldom exercised from the feeling that they would lead to danger and waste. He believed that it would be impossible to carry out any system of outdoor relief in Ireland without great risk. The evils of such a system would be, in fact, so great that they would have the effect of rendering the Poor Law system unworkable. The whole system would come to a dead lock, and the poor would ultimately become the victims of the attempt made to promote their welfare. The hon. Member had spoken of public opinion in Ireland being on the side of his Bill. He believed, on the contrary, that it was almost entirely arrayed against such a proposal. The Poor Law Guardians already had the power of extending the system of outdoor relief to widows with two or more children, to the sick and infirm, and those who were disabled by accident and temporary illness. The guardians, however, in the interest of the ratepayers as well as the poor, rarely availed themselves of the powers they possessed under the present law. The elected guardians shared the opinions of the *ex officio* guardians on the subject, and as a class they were almost unanimous in their indisposition to extend outdoor relief to the poor. The hon. Member had referred to Scotland in support of his Bill, but an extraordinary number of abuses and malversations had been shown to exist under the system of relief as it existed in that country. Hundreds and thousands of persons were receiving relief who were in no wise entitled to be considered paupers. Workhouses were now rising in every direction in Scotland, and attempts were being otherwise made to remedy the evils arising from indiscriminate outdoor relief. The hon. Gentleman asserted that every man had a right to ask alms, but that was a principle which was not likely to command the assent of Parliament, which had always enforced the operation of the mendicity laws. The Legislature was always threatened with disaffection in Ireland as the penalty for passing or for not passing this or that measure. He did not believe that the Irish Poor Law system had been the cause of disaffection in that country. The Irish people recollected the magnificent grant of £8,000,000 voted by Parliament for the relief of the famine, and the action of the House towards Ireland could never be quoted as a justification of disaffection. He believed, indeed, that no such feeling existed in Ireland. Believing that the Bill would be injurious to Ireland, he had therefore to move, That it be read a second time that day three months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Lord Naas.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. BAGWELL said, if his hon. Friend were as well acquainted with the condition of Ireland as he was with the forms and proceedings of the House of Commons he would never have brought in that Bill. If passed into law, its effects would be disastrous to the small farmers of Ireland, and most injurious to the class whom it was the object of the hon. Gentleman to benefit. The small farmers holding some only four acres and others about sixteen, or on average ten acres, would be destroyed by the Bill. The poor in Ireland were, on the whole, very well taken care of. In 1862 the total sum raised for their support was £779,682 on a valuation of £12,000,000. The dreadful occurrences which happened every day in England could not possibly occur in Ireland from the way in which the Poor Law there was managed. They never heard in Ireland of whole families dying of starvation, such as might be read of in *The Times* of that day, as happening in this country. And the reason was because the Irish Poor Law gave the poor man in distress, no matter whether he came from the extremity of the earth or was an inhabitant of the district, a right to immediate relief; he was not bandied about from one workhouse to another, but the relieving officer was bound to see that relief was given without stint, and that everything was done which could and ought to be done. There were, no doubt, many unions in Ireland in which the system was not well carried out, but that was not the fault of the law, which established local administration, supplemented by Government supervision. The law, if properly administered, was humane and just. There was a great difference under the present system in the rates as they fell upon the towns and upon the country districts. When the town was taxed 4*s.* or 5*s.* in the pound, the adjacent country district might have to pay only 5*d.*, 6*d.*, or 7*d.* In the county of Tipperary, which might be considered as an instance of good management, where, for the most part, the proprietors were resident, and which he believed might be looked upon as a fair sample of what Ireland in the course of years might be expected to be, Clonmel paid in one part 4*s.* in the pound, in another 3*s.*, while an adjoining district, which threw a large proportion of the paupers into the town, paid only 7*d.* But, if outdoor relief were to be given, it would be the entire destruction of the property of the towns, which, in Ireland, from the fact that they had newsrooms and mechanics' institutions, were the nucleus of civilization. His hon. and learned Friend had argued that the effect of giving outdoor relief would be to diminish the expense. But that could not possibly be the result, because the establishments of the workhouses—medical officers, masters, relieving officers, &c., would have to be kept up. Any Irish gentleman who recollected 1848 must know that while the people hated the workhouses, they delighted in outdoor relief, whether they wanted it or not. And when a magistrate remonstrated with one of them, and said, "Is it not a shame for you, a man who has money in the bank, to look for outdoor relief?" the reply was, "Oh! your honour, why wouldn't I get it as well as another?" In fact, they thought they had a right to get a portion of that to which they themselves had contributed. A gentleman in Cork had called his attention to the fact that some of his own tenants were applying for relief—men who did not want it, but got it for their aunts and other relatives, and he put a stop to the practice. But he knew cases of men who had £1,000 in the bank receiving relief. That feeling was as strong as ever, and he should oppose the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. POLLARD-URQUHART said, he thought that both the last speakers had very much exaggerated the dangers of the measure. The principle of the Bill was purely permissive—it gave the Commissioners power under certain circumstances to order outdoor relief to be given to persons who under the present law would not be entitled to obtain it. The debates which they had had night after night in that House were sufficient to show that the Poor Law as at present administered was not capable of meeting the distress. The chief objection to the Irish Poor Law system was, its undue severity of operation, and strict adherence to the rigid rules of political economy. He would ask what would have been the state of England if in some periods of severe distress, such as had occurred in 1841 and 1848, no relief was to be given except in the workhouses? Would it not have required a large standing army to prevent outbreaks? There were many parts of Ireland where the poor were suffering severe hardships, but where there were no resident landlords or wealthy charitable people to relieve them, and where, therefore, the want of some such law as that proposed by the hon. Member was felt. There was very much less to fall back upon in Ireland in times of distress than in England. The noble Lord the Member for Cockermouth had adduced the case of Scotland as furnishing an example of the abuse of outdoor relief. But such abuse occurred chiefly in places where there were no workhouses, and therefore no means of applying the workhouse test. In Ireland, on the other hand, there were ample facilities for the application of the test. When it was first proposed to introduce the Poor Law system into Ireland there were the greatest objections to it, and the greatest fears

were expressed as to its probable working. He believed that in the old times more landowners in Ireland were ruined by the indiscriminate charity they had to bestow in consequence of there being no Poor Law than were ruined by personal extravagance, and he was convinced that it would have been far better for Ireland if she had got the Poor Law system 100 years before, and, holding that the fears which were entertained of the effect of the introduction of outdoor relief were equally unfounded, he was prepared to give his cordial support to the Bill.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, the feeling of the House seemed to be so adverse to the Bill that he trusted the hon. Gentleman would not press the Motion to a division. It was quite evident that it was the opinion of the House that, after the recent legislation with regard to the Irish Poor Laws, it was inexpedient to proceed as the hon. Member now desired. The hon. Gentleman's complaint was, that the administration of the Poor Law in Ireland was not sufficiently elastic, and he wanted, therefore, to assimilate the law of the two countries and to give power to the Commissioners to issue orders to the guardians to give outdoor relief. But that would be a fundamental change in the Irish system. The hon. Gentleman, referring to the Act of 1862, which he (Sir Robert Peel) had the honour to get passed, said that it was only a trifling modification of the system. But could that be called a trifling modification which had raised the numbers who received relief under it from 3,000 to 10,000. It had been well pointed out by the noble Lord the Member for Cockermouth, that the 4 & 5 *Will.* IV. c. 56—which the hon. Gentleman cited in support of his present Motion—was intended to check the abuse of outdoor relief. When the hon. Gentleman said that public opinion had expressed itself strongly on the question, and that a number of petitions had been presented in support of the principle of his measure in 1861, 1862, 1863, and 1864, he (Sir Robert Peel) took the liberty of saying that during 1863, after the passing of the Act of 1862, no petitions had been presented on the subject. And the petitions which had been presented during the other three years did not ask for an assimilation of the laws of the two countries, but had been mainly with respect to the payment of certain salaries, the superannuation of Poor Law Officers, and the re-adjustment of Poor

Law taxation. The hon. Gentleman referred to a petition presented in 1862, signed by the Roman Catholic bishops, and insinuated that he (Sir Robert Peel) told the House that it was not competent for them, that it was out of their province, to petition Parliament on the subject. The hon. Gentleman must have misinterpreted what he said, because, considering the position of the Roman Catholic bishops with respect to the poor in Ireland, they, of all others, were the persons who ought to petition. He certainly had not intended by any word which he used on that occasion to convey a different opinion. With regard to the superannuation of the workhouse officers, as his right hon. Friend (Mr. C. P. Villiers) had passed a Bill with respect to English officials, he (Sir Robert Peel) trusted that next Session the House would give him an opportunity of passing a similar measure for Ireland. Out of forty-three petitions presented from Ireland this year on the subject of superannuation allowances, &c., there was only one from the county of Wexford — and that had been going the round of all the unions of Ireland—which prayed that the English Poor Law might be assimilated to the Poor Law in force in Ireland, which was the entire reverse of the system which the hon. Gentleman wished to introduce. The present law was, in fact, quite sufficient to meet the wants of the people of Ireland. As to the charge that the system was not elastic, when he could show that, in 1849, 1,210,482 persons had received outdoor relief in Ireland, that in 1859 the number was reduced to 5,455, and that in 1864 it was 10,000, he thought he was fairly entitled to call the system elastic. He trusted, therefore, the House would not concur in the Motion of the hon. Gentleman. The first clause of the Bill would give the Commissioners power to issue orders to the guardians to give outdoor relief. But the Commissioners did not want that power, for they believed the local guardians did their duty, and it would be an invidious thing to impose on them the task of making such orders. The hon. Gentleman had referred to the dietary in Ireland as lower than in England or Scotland. But, from an interesting Return moved for by the hon. Baronet the Member for Coleraine (Sir Hervey Bruce), it would be seen that the quantity and the quality of nutriment, as ascertained upon analysis, allowed to each pauper was superior in Ireland to what it was in England. The hon. Gentleman had said that the introduction of outdoor relief would be productive of economy. But how did the case stand? The population of Scotland in 1862 was 3,062,294, and the total expenditure for the relief of the poor for the year ending May, 1862, amounted to £726,517. In Ireland the population in 1862 was 5,798,564, and the expenditure for the poor, inclusive of medical relief, was £685,647, or £40,870 less than in Scotland, although the population in Ireland was nearly double. Therefore they had in Ireland a much more economic system than in Scotland. The hon. Gentleman endeavoured to show that the workhouse system was productive of emigration, and that it did not pay sufficient regard to the social and moral wants of the poor. But every one who knew the interest which that question had excited in the House also knew that they were desirous to work the system with as much humanity, efficiency, and at the same time regard for the rights of property as was consistent with the wants which it was sought to relieve. He trusted, therefore, the House would not pass the measure.

MR. BLAKE said, the hon. Member for Clonmel (Mr. Bagwell) had stated if his hon. Friend knew as much about the condition of Ireland as he did about the forms and proceedings of the House he would not have brought in that Bill. But he begged to say that his hon. Friend was in constant communication with the bishops and other dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, who, of course, knew the condition of the Irish people perfectly well, and therefore he was quite sure that his hon. Friend was as well acquainted with the state of Ireland as he was with the forms of that House. The hon. Member for Clonmel had argued that the Bill if passed would lead to a vast increase of expenditure. But it appeared while the Union expenses in Clonmel amounted to 2*s.* in the pound, in Tipperary, where the amount of outdoor relief was considerably greater, the poundage was only the same, and in the whole of Munster the average was only 1*s.* 3¼*d.* That showed that if more outdoor relief was given in the Clonmel Union the expenses probably would be less. He denied altogether the justice of the statement of the hon. Member, that the disposition of the Irish people was to take relief, and that respectable families would get relief for their aunts and other relatives. The hon. Gentleman also said that he knew a man who had £1,000 in the bank who yet took relief. But, though there might be an exceptional case, any person who knew anything of Ireland must know that to take poor relief was the very last thing an Irishman would consent to do, because from that moment he would feel himself degraded. His only regret with regard to the Bill was that his hon. Friend had not proposed to give to the Board of Guardians themselves that permissive power in regard to outdoor relief which he proposed to give to the Poor Law Commissioners. He trusted that the Chief Secretary for Ireland would not persist in his opposition to a Bill the object of which was to place the Irish poor on the same footing as the English poor.

MR. O'REILLY said, that he had on a previous occasion dissented from the proposition for a total assimilation of the Irish Poor Law to the English Poor Law, yet he admitted that crises might frequently occur in which a more extended power of giving outdoor relief, or a means of adapting the mode of relief to peculiar circumstances which might arise, would be desirable in Ireland. The Bill before the House went to that extent only, it being a measure simply to invest the Poor Law Commissioners with a discretionary power to make modifications in the prescribed mode of relief. If the Bill should go into Committee, he would move an Amendment giving to the Boards of Guardians a discretion to carry out those modifications or not, for he thought that to the local administrators should be left the power and responsibility of administering such a law.

MR. GEORGE said, he had at first experienced difficulty in understanding upon what principle the Bill was founded, and how it was to be carried out. Some light, however, had been thrown upon the Bill by the speeches which had been made on that occasion. It appeared that the Bill had been blindly copied from an English Bill which was passed under totally different circumstances. The intention of the Bill was to extend outdoor relief in Ireland, while the intention of the English Bill was to limit the powers of Boards of Guardians in certain cases. The hon. Member for the King's County sought to give to the Poor Law Commissioners power to make orders to extend the system of outdoor relief in Ireland; but the power given to the Boards of Guardians to suspend those orders for thirty days amounted to a complete suicide of the Bill itself. The only cases he could conceive in which the Poor Law Commissioners should be expected to make provision to extend outdoor relief were cases of severe famine, pestilence, and general fever; and it certainly appeared a mockery that the guardians should have the power of suspending, under such circumstances, the orders of the Commissioners for a period of thirty days. It had been stated that there was a universal desire in Ireland to extend the system of outdoor relief. He respectfully denied that there was even a general desire for this change; on the contrary, the Boards of Guardians were at the present time unwilling to act upon the powers they had in that respect. By the original Poor Law Act, every destitute person, wherever he might happen to be in Ireland for the moment, was admissible into a workhouse; and by the amended Poor Law Act very large and extended powers were vested in the Boards of Guardians to give outdoor relief in cases where that mode of relief was most required. The extension of outdoor relief would greatly deteriorate the habits of the people, would destroy the small class of farmers by increasing the rates to a degree impossible for them to bear, and would thus tend to compel many persons to quit the country.

MR. MONSELL said, he regarded the present Bill as intended to introduce the small edge of the wedge with the view of ultimately assimilating the Poor Law in Ireland to the Poor Law in England. If it were desired to destroy the Irish farmer and to increase emigration tenfold, all that was necessary was to follow the course which the hon. Member for the King's County called upon the House to pursue. Mr. Senior, one of the Poor Law Commissioners, had stated that to introduce the English Poor Law into Ireland would increase the rates to an enormous extent, and be a great national calamity. The evidence of all experienced men was to the same effect, and he contended that the course recommended by the hon. Member for the King's County was not in accordance with the wishes of the intelligent classes in Ireland. The hon. Member had startled him by declaring that the authority of the noble Lord at the head of the Government was in favour of the present proposition; but he found that the noble Lord's speech, to which reference was made, was a diatribe against the introduction of Poor Laws into Ireland at all, as Poor Laws put hastily into operation might make Ireland one vast poorhouse. He had also cited the commission of which Drs. Murray and Whately were members, which sat nearly thirty years ago, as favourable to his views, but that Commission recommended that Poor Law relief should not be given to the able-bodied. The Irish Poor Law Guardians had at present the power of granting outdoor relief in certain cases; and he had himself proposed in the Limerick Board, which was composed of ninety guardians, one-half of whom were elected by the ratepayers, that they should afford outdoor relief to the families of persons disabled by accident or sickness, and who would be actually under the eyes of the guardians in the workhouse hospitals; but the proposition had been ignominiously scouted, and he had never seen a stronger opposition than that which it had met from the elected, as well as from the *ex officio* guardians. As to the question of economy, did the hon. Member believe for one instant, if the great majority of the persons requiring relief were to be relieved out of the workhouse that the cost would not be trebled or quadrupled? At all events, the ratepayers in Ireland believed that such would be the case.

SIR HERVEY BRUCE said, that it was a very strong argument against the Bill that it would give to a board in Dublin and not to the local authorities, who knew the necessities of their districts, the power to make the proposed extension in outdoor relief. The assertion that people going into the workhouse for relief received thereby a moral stain which never could be effaced was totally unfounded, for he knew that in his part of the country the most respectable farmers continually applied to the workhouse to obtain young girls for the purpose of employing them in work at their farmhouses. He would certainly give his vote against the Bill.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, that he was in favour of the principle of the Bill, but from the tone of the observations which had already been made in the course of the discussion he did not believe that it would be carried, and he, therefore, suggested that the hon. Member for the King's County should not press the measure to a division.

MR. MAGUIRE said, he wished to direct attention to two petitions—one from Limerick and the other presented by the hon. Member for Roscommon, praying that in certain cases outdoor relief might be given in Ireland as in England. Those petitions proved that there was a wish on the part of a large number of persons for a more liberal administration of the Poor Law in Ireland. He intended to vote for the second reading of the Bill, on the one ground that he was in favour of an extension of the Poor Law by which relief could be afforded to a greater number than received it at present. The details of the Bill might be considered in Committee, and no one would be bound to them by voting for the second reading. The number of persons receiving relief could not be taken as any indication of the real state of the country. By granting outdoor relief more extensively much might be done to preserve the status of the lower classes of the population, for when a family had gone into the workhouse, its self-respect was destroyed. No moral stigma ought to attach to those who became inmates of the workhouse, but it could not be denied that there was a social brand upon them. He wished they could get rid of the fear of outdoor relief, which he believed would prevent instead of causing poverty.

MR. ESMONDE said, he objected to the Bill, because it would take the administration of the poor rates out of the hands of the local authorities, and rest in a Central Board of Commissioners at Dublin.

MR. HENNESSY, in reply, maintained that his Bill was identical with the English law in regard to outdoor relief. As to petitions on the subject he found that in 1862 there were 339, each containing a prayer for the assimilation of the law of Ireland to that of England in respect to outdoor relief. He had been supported by the majority of Irish Members who had taken part in the debate but—["Divide!"] Well, as there seemed to be a desire that he should go to a division he would do so.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 24; Noes 201: Majority 177.

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *put off* for three months.

TESTS ABOLITION (OXFORD) BILL.

[BILL 18.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

MR. SELWYN said, that the absence of

opposition to the Bill at that stage must not be regarded as any sanction to it from those who shared his views. The third reading of the Bill would be opposed, and he hoped due notice of the time when the Bill would be set down for that purpose would be given.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read 3° on *Friday.*

STREET MUSIC (METROPOLIS) BILL.

[BILL 90.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Repeal of recited Provision and Substitution of amended Provision).

MR. THOMSON HANKEY said, he wished to know whether "Punch" would be abolished by this Bill?

MR. BASS said, he regarded "Punch" as an institution of the country, which ought on no account to be disturbed.

MR. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN said, that "Punch" was generally accompanied by drum and fife, which, under the Bill as it stood, might be removed on account of music.

MR. BASS said, that if the hon. Gentleman would introduce a clause to provide a remedy, it should have his hearty concurrence.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, there was a more stringent clause on the subject in the Police Act.

MR. BRISCOE said, he was in favour of the exemption of that national pastime from the Bill.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) had got some Amendments on the paper which would improve the Bill, and to which the hon. Member for Derby had no objection. The hon. Gentleman had better submit those Amendments at once.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK moved that after the words—

> "Any householder within the metropolitan police district personally, or by his servant, or by any police constable, may require any street musician or singer to depart from the neighbourhood of the house of such householder"—

to insert the words—

> "On account of the illness, or on account of the interruption of the ordinary occupations or pursuits of any inmate of such house, or for other reasonable or sufficient cause."

Mr. Selwyn

MR. AYRTON said, that he wished to have a definition of the phrase, "the interruption of the ordinary occupation," and to know who was to be the judge of what constituted an interruption. Was the interpretation to be left to the person who professed to be aggrieved, to the policeman, or to the magistrate? If left to the complainant it might mean anything. "Ordinary occupation" might mean knife cleaning. He was at a loss to discover the principle on which the Bill was based. There was not only the right of the person making complaint to be considered, but the right of the person complained against. The Bill seemed to aim at this—that the owner of a house had a right to regulate what was done within sound of the house. Was that an assertion of the rights of property? Some persons interpreted "rights of property" to mean the most exclusive enjoyment of it; but if the owner of a park so regarded his rights he (Mr. Ayrton) doubted whether such rights would be long respected. If the claim to remove the musicians was based on the rights of property, the Bill ought to be made conformable to the principles on which it was founded, and the owner limited to that which was annoying to him from the front of his own house to the middle of the road. What possible right could a man have to regulate every kind of noise which was within ear-shot? The public street was no more the property of a man than was the house of his neighbour. But if the right of property were not the principle of the Bill what was it? His hon. Friend the Member for Derby had circulated a little volume containing letters which had been addressed to him on the subject. Not only professors and other learned men had communicated with his hon. Friend, but ladies had also written to him, promising him if he would put down street music to play for him any evening, and signing themselves "with kind love, &c., &c." He did not wonder that the hon. Member was not proof against such appeals. Nobody could resist them. The literary *Punch* was also on the side of his hon. Friend against its dramatic rival, which was nothing without the overture; but a concession, he understood, had been made on that point. It appeared that the gentlemen connected with the literary *Punch* could not manufacture their jokes when any music was being played. The editor of another journal, whose mission it seemed to be to put an end to all harmony in the political world, was also in favour of prohibiting harmony in the streets. These letters displayed a misanthropic disregard of the feelings of other people. Because some hundred people in the metropolis were of so nervous and sensitive a character that street music did not agree with them, the pleasure of two or three millions were to be interfered with. Persons who were so easily annoyed should not sit at their front windows—if they retired to the back of their houses they would be left in peace. [Mr. BASS: The musicians come both at the front and back of the house.] People who were so sensitive ought not to select houses inconvenient to themselves. The great majority of the houses were not exposed both behind and before; and if in this great metropolis a man required such seclusion he ought to look out for a house specially suited to him, and not apply for a law to enable him to enjoy perfect quietude. There was one much greater annoyance in London than street music, and that was the rolling of carriages. If people were ill they were obliged to take means for preventing the annoyance arising from the noise of carriages; but no one would venture to say that because he was of a nervous temperament carriages should not be allowed to roll by his door. If street music were prohibited the result would be to drive poor people who wished to hear music to the public-houses. That was the case abroad. The law was directed against their servants. How was it that gentlemen who did not encourage street music found it playing before their houses? Why, it was because they kept their domestic servants buried below the surface of the ground. It was easy to understand how delighted these poor buried people must be when having nothing but a vacant area before them, they caught sight of a musician. He never yet saw a wandering Italian looking up at the drawing room window for money. He always looked down to the kitchen window. That being the case with respect to music in private streets, he asked hon. Gentlemen would it be a wise or decent thing to pass a law against these wandering Italians when it would in reality be a law against their domestic servants, who paid the street musicians to play for their amusement. If gentlemen could not control their household it would be better to leave them to the quiet enjoyment which they now possessed, which was no real annoyance to people upstairs unless they were of that sensitive character which rendered every kind of noise an annoyance. The only ground on which anything like a justification could be offered for the measure was the right of property; and, by way of limiting the exercise of that right in accordance with the law, he moved that instead of "near any such house" should be inserted "in front of any such house."

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 3, to leave out the word "near," and insert the words "in front of."—(*Mr. Ayrton.*)

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, he quite concurred in the opinion that "Punch"—whether the *Punch* of literature or the "Punch" of the streets—ought to continue to be privileged, for both "Punches" were national institutions. [An hon. MEMBER: With the music?] Certainly with the music. Beyond that, he doubted whether the inhabitants of the Tower Hamlets would agree with their representative. The Amendment of his hon. Friend (Mr. Bentinck) was scarcely worth pressing, as there was no material difference between his proposition and that of the hon. Member for Derby. The question before the House was this—either to leave the law as it stood, or else to enact that every householder should have the absolute right to send away any street music which was annoying or unpleasant. He should be very sorry to get rid of the German bands, for some of them were well worth listening to. He thought, however, that it should be in the discretion of a householder to have everything which he considered an annoyance removed from the front of his dwelling.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY said, he would be the very last to say that any annoyance to a person in front of his house should be allowed to continue against his will, but the Bill was simply ridiculous, since a special exemption was to be inserted in favour of "Punch." The right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down was in favour of the German bands; then it was to be assumed that he would desire an exemption in their favour. The right hon. Gentleman had a fine ear for music, and he believed had a very fine voice as a vocalist; and he cultivated his taste at the opera. Those who delighted in street music had no opportunity of going to the opera, but they took as much delight in music as those who could pay to listen to a Patti or a Mario. If the Bill was good for the metropolis it would be equally good for Brighton and other large towns, and he saw no reason why London should be selected for special legislation. It had simply been brought forward at the instance of such persons as Mr. Babbage, who was now commencing a crusade against the popular game of tip-cat and the trundling of hoops. Where were they to stop if such a Bill were to pass? They must legislate against the noise of carriages in the streets. He believed if the Bill passed it would be wholly inoperative.

Sir GEORGE GREY said, the Bill as it originally stood would have enabled any person to remove street music simply because he did not like it, but the Bill as amended would so far alter the existing law only as to enable a householder to object to street music if it interfered with his calling. The existing law was differently interpreted by different magistrates. In the case of Mr. Babbage, it was held by one magistrate that the being engaged in abstruse calculations was reasonable cause for removal, by another it was held that it was not. The Bill, with the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman, would remove that uncertainty. It would be left to the magistrate to decide what was a reasonable interference with a person's calling to the satisfaction of the community. No magistrate would say that music could interfere with knife-cleaning, as suggested by the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets; but if a gentleman were writing his speech or writing an article a magistrate would hold, on complaint, that street music would be an annoyance. People living in a place like London might be seriously annoyed by disagreeable neighbours without any hope of redress, but there was no reason why they should not be protected against avoidable inconveniences.

Mr. BASS said, he quite admitted the principle that property had its duties as well as its rights; but he denied the right of any man to obstruct the public highway, and who could deny that a band of musicians was such an obstruction? An hon. Gentleman told him that he lost a division because his horse refused to pass through a band of German musicians. Again, the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets was in error in supposing that the complaint against street music only emanated from a few individuals of peculiar idiosyncrasies, who had no feeling of sympathy with the rest of the community. He had received representations on the subject from thousands of persons, including some of the first men in the kingdom, all expressing the hope that the Bill might be passed into law. Among his correspondents were gentlemen who took a great interest in the welfare of the poor; and it was incorrect, therefore, to say that the Bill was opposed by the working classes and their friends. Mr. Charles Dickens was in favour of the Bill, and he had letters from the Poet Laureate, Mr. Carlyle, all the leading artists, and between 300 and 400 of the first musicians of the day, who declared that the interruption caused by street bands rendered it quite impossible to carry on their profession. One of the most distinguished musical geniuses in Europe—a young man—had actually been obliged to give up composing during the day, and was now compelled to work at night. Mr. Tennyson wrote that he was driven from London by street bands, and the late Mr. Thackeray used to say that he had often been glad to take refuge in the fields. It was absurd to pretend that the nuisance of which he complained was kept up for the amusement of the poorer classes. What had poor people to do in Belgrave and Eaton Squares? His hairdresser recently told him that the street bands were encouraged mainly by scullery and nursery maids. Now, he had a great affection for scullery maids, but he must say that they too often poked their heads out of window to listen to street music when they ought to be attending to their work inside. He hoped the House would support the Bill.

Sir JOHN TRELAWNY said, he could not help thinking that they were then engaged in peddling legislation. He admitted that some persons suffered from the evils of street music, but there were evils of greater magnitude which no one sought to remove. There were people who suffered from the rolling of carriages at two or three o'clock in the morning, and yet it was not proposed that the practice should be discontinued. He would remind the House that the working classes might have their own opinion upon that subject, but they had no opportunity of expressing that opinion. If music was to be driven out of the streets, some arrangement ought certainly to be made by means of which bands, &c., would be allowed to play in the parks.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, that the object of the Bill was merely to give effect to the existing law. The highways were meant for the passage of the Queen's subjects, and street music in them was *primâ facie* illegal. The rolling of carriages, on the other hand, was one of the special objects for which highways were constructed, and there was no analogy between that case and the case contemplated in the present Bill. The most efficient magistrates had always held that personal annoyance was a "reasonable cause" for ordering away a street band, and in that judgment he cordially acquiesced. In its present shape the Bill went no further. A constable could not act under the existing police regulations, and it was time that Parliament should interpose with fresh legislation.

MR. THOMSON HANKEY said, he considered the subject of the Bill was not a fit matter for legislation. Moreover, the Bill was a tyrannical measure, providing for the comfort of the higher classes at the expense of the labouring poor. He would also remind the last speaker that Regent Street was obstructed by long lines of carriages whenever there happened to be anything going on at St. James's Hall.

MR. CLAY said, that several hon. Members seemed to think that the Bill would drive music out of the streets altogether. But such was not the case. By the Bill street music would be only removed from that part of the town where it was not wanted to that part where, according to many hon. Gentlemen, the people were anxious to enjoy it. The existence of nuisances for which a remedy was either difficult or impossible was no reason why the House should not deal with an evil to which a cure might easily be applied. Such was the case with street music, and he hoped the Bill would be passed.

Question put, "That the word 'near' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 201; Noes 87: Majority 114.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK then moved to insert in line five, after the word "shillings," "or, in the discretion of the magistrate before whom he shall be convicted, may be imprisoned for any time not more than three days."

Amendment proposed,

In line 5, after the word "shillings," to insert the words "or, in the discretion of the magistrate before whom he shall be convicted, may be imprisoned for any time not more than three days."—(*Mr. Cavendish Bentinck.*)

MR. BUTT said, he objected to the Amendment, as carrying the penalty for a trifling offence much too far.

VISCOUNT ENFIELD said, he would ask the hon. Member for Taunton, whether the imprisonment proposed was not rather too severe for what, after all, might be a mistake?

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he thought the Amendment most reasonable and intended to persevere in it. The term of imprisonment would practically be only one day, because the day on which a man went in and the day he came out were counted.

MR. AYRTON said, he hoped the Committee would not sanction the proposal. It would be the first time they had passed a law inflicting imprisonment in lieu of a pecuniary penalty where it was impossible for the person to know at the time that he would be liable to it or not. There was no accurate definition in the Bill by which a man would be able to tell whether he was committing an offence or not. To justify such a punishment the offence ought to be distinct and patent, and not one depending on a nice question about reasonable cause.

MR. CRAWFORD said, that an organ grinder usually had a monkey with him, and he wished to ask whether the hon. Member for Taunton did not intend to make some provision for the monkey when his master went to gaol. Would it be sent to the workhouse?

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he thought the monkey should be provided for at the expense of the metropolitan Members.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, the Amendment gave very little additional power beyond what already existed, because now a magistrate might fine an organ-player 40*s*., and if the man could not pay he might be sent to prison.

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 121; Noes 111: Majority 10.

MR. AYRTON said, they had now come to the last provision of the Bill, which made it lawful for any constable to take into custody, without warrant, any person who should offend as before described. After the alteration which had been made in the former part of the Bill, he thought that provision ought to be struck out. As the Bill originally stood, the householder might ask the musician to go away, and if he did not go away the offence was committed. But since the alteration it was left doubtful until the magistrate had given his decision, whether an offence was committed or not; and did his hon. Friend mean to say that when two persons differed about a doubtful thing one was to take the other into custody? The authors of the Bill ought to rest satisfied with the power of imprisonment for so trivial an offence, and not carry their exceptional legislation any further. He moved the omission of this provision.

Amendment proposed, in line 5, to leave out the words "and it shall be lawful for any constable."—(*Mr. Ayrton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. PEACOCKE said, the chief difficulty of the existing law was, that if a householder ordered a street musician to go away and he refused he had no power to give him into custody, and the only remedy was to summon him. If therefore that part of the Bill was expunged, the law would remain as it was at present. Of what practical use was the remedy of proceeding against an itinerant musician by summons? He hoped, therefore, that the hon. Member for Derby would adhere to the most valuable power of giving the offender into custody.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, if he understood the argument of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets it was very strong. The Bill as it originally stood gave the householder absolute power, without any reason, to require a street musician to depart from the neighbourhood of his house, and that then, if the musician refused to depart, the offence was at once complete, and the police constable might immediately take him into custody. But the Amendments that had been introduced essentially altered the character of that part of the Bill. The demand for the street musician's departure was to be effectual law only if it was sustained by reasonable cause, and the reasonable cause was a matter for trial, not by the householder or the police constable, but by the magistrate before whom the musician was taken. It would be an infringement of the principles of liberty if, while the matter might be entirely dependent on the trial before a magistrate, the street musician was at once to undergo a penalty which stopped his means of livelihood, and that at the will or the judgment formed as to reasonable cause by a police constable at eighteen shillings or a guinea a week. He thought there was no doubt that in that part of the Bill they were treading very near to dangerous ground, and that the Bill would be much improved if they adopted the sugges- of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets.

Mr. MALINS said, he apprehended that the Bill would be deprived of all its efficacy if the recommendation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer were adopted. The object of the measure was to give the householder a summary remedy, and avoid the necessity of his going about to find where an itinerant musician lived in order to summon him. That Bill had been called "tyrannical;" but how was it to be compared with the tyranny of these wandering people, who, as the law now stood, at their will and pleasure might come under a man's window and render his house uninhabitable? It was necessary that the inhabitants of this great town should be armed with a summary power of abating a nuisance which had been allowed to continue too long, and as that was the essence of the Bill, he trusted that the hon. Member for Derby would not surrender it.

Mr. LOCKE said, he thought there was a great defect in the clause. Let them take an analogy from the Game Laws. If a man was found on the land of another committing a trespass, and armed, he could not be taken into custody or removed from that land until certain questions were put to him and certain statements made to him; and it was necessary that all that should be proved in a court of law. As the Bill had been altered, a street musician was to be required to move away for a reasonable cause, such as the illness of an inmate or some other ground; but the words of the clause would not render it necessary that the street musician should be told the reason why he was ordered away before he could be taken into custody.

Mr. BASS said, his hon. and learned Friend was mistaken in the matter. The Bill had certainly been altered to some extent in deference to the suggestions of the Home Secretary, but if the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Tower

Hamlets were to be adopted, why they had better all go home. The language of the clause was perfectly consistent, and he hoped the Committee would agree to it.

MR. BUTT moved that the Chairman then report Progress.

Whereupon Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Butt.*)

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 54; Noes 175: Majority 121.

Amendment again proposed.

MR. BUTT said, there was another provision in the clause besides that of a person being ill or being disturbed in his occupation, and that was that a musician might be taken into custody for other sufficient and reasonable cause. Now, surely that was much too indefinite, for under such a provision a person might be kept in custody from Monday to Saturday, and it might then be discovered that no sufficient or reasonable cause had been assigned.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY said, it was something quite new to propose that such extraordinary confidence should be placed in a policeman by giving him this arbitrary power.

MR. AYRTON said, that to give a constable the power of taking a person into custody was practically to withhold from him any remedy.

SIR GEORGE GREY observed, that if the words proposed to be left out were omitted the law would remain as at present. Offenders could only be proceeded against by summons, and when summoned to appear before a magistrate they could not be found. But he was aware of no case in which a constable had power to apprehend a person under the Metropolitan Police Act unless the offence were committed within his view. He should move afterwards the insertion of the words "within view of such constable."

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, in cases of annoyance under the Bill, the difficulty would be to find a policeman, and when he was brought to the spot the street musician would not be playing on his instrument, but probably sitting on the doorway of the householder, so that the constable could not act.

MR. ALDERMAN SALOMONS said, that in an assault case, it was not necessary for the officer to see the assault; it was sufficient if he perceived marks upon the person complaining.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 151; Noes 68: Majority 83.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, he would then propose the insertion of the words "within the view of such constable."

Amendment proposed, at the end of the Clause, to add the words "within view of such constable."—(*Sir George Grey.*)

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he should oppose the Amendment. He was greatly surprised at the quarter from which this Amendment proceeded.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, unless the words "within the view of such constable" were inserted, the constable would be called upon to act upon the mere allegation of the householder, which would be totally unprecedented and exceptional.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 83; Noes 118: Majority 35.

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

BLEACHING AND DYEING WORKS ACTS EXTENSION BILL.

Bill to place the employment of Women, Young Persons, and Children in the occupations of Finishers, Hookers, Lappers, and Makers-up and Packers in Warehouses under the Regulations of the Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension; *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 181.]

ELECTIONS PETITIONS ACT (1848) AMENDMENT BILL.

Bill to amend "The Election Petitions Act, 1848," in certain particulars; *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 182.]

And it being Six of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House till To-morrow, without putting the Question.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, June 30, 1864.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Weights and Measures (Metric System)* (No. 164); Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment* (No. 167).

Second Reading— Government Annuities, &c.* (No. 145); Clerks of the Peace Removal* (No. 126) [H.L.]; Oyster Fishery (England and Wales) (No. 108) *negatived.*

Committee—Valuation of Rateable Property (Ireland)* (No. 147); Cathedral Minor Corporations* (No. 157) [H.L.]

Report— Summary Procedure (Scotland)* (No. 148); Valuation of Rateable Property (Ireland)* (No. 147).

Third Reading — Coventry Free Grammar School* (No. 153).

Withdrawn — Oyster Fishery (England and Wales) (No. 108) [H.L.]; Servants Hiring (Scotland)* (No. 146).

Royal Assent—Countess of Elgin and Kincardine's Annuity [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 31];
Fish Teinds (Scotland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 33];
Vacating of Seats (House of Commons) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 34];
Banking Co-partnerships [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 32];
Beerhouses (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 35];
Chimney Sweepers Regulation [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 37];
Chief Rents (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 38];
Army Prize (Shares of Deceased) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 36].

ABOLITION OF METROPOLITAN TURNPIKES.—OBSERVATIONS.

LORD RAVENSWORTH wished to call their Lordships' attention to the fact that a great social reform would take place that evening in the metropolis — that the long-standing grievance, not to say nuisance, of the metropolis, the metropolitan suburban tolls, ceased at once and for ever in the northern districts. This was no small boon to the public. He was old enough to recollect when a turnpike-gate interposed at Hyde Park, and also at the Marble Arch. Her Majesty's subjects might now travel from the heart of the City to the furthest extremity of the metropolis, without obstruction, and without being robbed, he might say, by the licensed tax gatherer. It had been his lot to present several memorials to the Government and many petitions to that House upon the subject; and he thought that great thanks were due to a noble Earl, not then in his place, for originating the movement for their abolition, and he begged to express his satisfaction that Her Majesty's Government carried out the recommendations of the Royal Commission that had inquired into the subject. He, therefore, asked the noble Earl the President of the Council, What arrangements Her Majesty's Government had made in substitution of the tolls to effect this improvement; and, secondly, whether every suburb of the metropolis was to enjoy the same liberty?

EARL GRANVILLE said, that he shared the satisfaction of the noble Lord at the great improvement that had been effected, but required time to obtain the necessary information required by the noble Lord. He would give the noble Lord a satisfactory answer on a future occasion.

LONDON CITY TITHES BILL.

SECOND READING POSTPONED.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2ª.

LORD TAUNTON noticed that it occupied a similar position to the Brokers Bonds Bill, which had been postponed in consequence of its being introduced as a Private Bill instead of a Public one.

LORD REDESDALE admitted the force of the objection, and would not oppose the postponement of the Order.

Further Debate, and Second Reading, *put off* to *Monday* next.

OYSTER FISHERY (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL—[No. 108.]

SECOND READING. BILL WITHDRAWN.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said, that the subject was one which had been much discussed of late in newspapers and periodicals. He was in no way connected with the description of property to which it related, but the investigations which he had some years ago made on the subject had led him to the conclusion that it was one which was well deserving the attention of Parliament. He had, therefore, endeavoured to frame a Bill dealing with the subject on a principle which he thought ought to be adopted; but he was happy to think that the Government were prepared to take the matter into their own hands. With the view of showing their Lordships the importance of the interests concerned, he would refer their Lordships to a book which had been published by the Irish Fishery Commissioners, from which he found that in the Whitstable fishery and adjoining grounds, which consisted of 12 square miles of public grounds and 15 of private, in all 27 square miles, 3,270 persons earned a daily livelihood, and from 800 to 850 dredging boats were employed. The average wages received by the 3,270 men engaged in the fishery were 20*s.* a week throughout the year. The amount paid in wages, he might add, by the owners of private beds at Whitstable in one year amounted to £125,500, the amount paid by the Essex local beds being £35,000, making a total of £160,500 expended in wages yearly. If to that were added the money spent in keeping the boats in repair—the sums paid to smiths, shipwrights, sail and ropemakers, amounting to £17,000; the expenditure for old boats and those lost in storms amounting to £4,500—the total outlay would be found to be £182,000 on the 27 square miles to which he referred. To show how matters stood in a smaller locality, he might state that at the Arklow oyster fishery the number of barrels of oysters caught and sold from the 14th of January to the 26th of May, 1863, was 34,038, the value being £10,830. Of these 2,860 went to the Welsh coast, 2,600 to France, 20,500 to the Kentish coast, and the remainder to the Irish coast. It was stated on the same authority that between £20,000 and £30,000 was paid annually to Jersey for oysters to breed, while Queensborough on the Thames paid sometimes to Granville, on the French coast, from £1,500 to £2,000 for oyster spat. The prices for oysters for laying down in beds had, he might add, risen in the case of the Channel ridge from 3*s.* and 3*s.* 6*d.* per bushel in 1859 to 7*s.* and 9*s.* in the present year; while in the case of Falmouth and the Southampton waters the prices had risen from 1*s.* to 1*s.* 6*d.*, which was the rate up to 1858, to from 15*s.* to 20*s.* in 1864. The subject was one, he might further observe, in which the French Government had taken a great interest with the view of encouraging the fishermen and increasing the productive powers of the country. He held in his hand a statement which had been made before the Committee on the Herne Bay Fishery Bill, which showed that at the Isle de Rhé in 1858 there was not a single oyster on the shore, whereas there were now 3,063 oyster beds in full work or being completed, containing 100,000,000 oysters valued at more than £50,000, and giving employment to 1,700 men. He had also a statement of the development of an oyster bed of the extent of one acre, situated in the Thames Estuary, capable of producing a good quality of natives, and stocked with 1,000 bushels of oysters of 1,600 each, which showed an increase in value in four years of from £256 to £12,500. He proposed to follow the plan adopted in Ireland of granting a licence to persons to establish oyster beds, and that that licence should be obtained under the authority of the Board of Trade, which would of course previously make the requisite inquiry. As the Government had issued a Royal Commission to inquire into this subject he did not wish to proceed further than the second reading, which would affirm the principle of the Bill.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*The Marquess of Clanricarde.*)

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND said, he was glad that the noble Marquess did not intend to press the Bill this Session, as some of its details appeared to him objectionable. Indeed he thought that the second reading should not take place. It was better, he thought, to wait until the Report of the Royal Commission was laid before them, which would furnish them with information on which to act.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY also thought it was premature to attempt to legislate before the Report of the Royal Commission was laid before them.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE expressed a similar opinion.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE said, he would withdraw the Motion for the second reading.

Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn;* and Bill (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

AGRARIAN OUTRAGES (IRELAND).

RESOLUTION.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE, in rising to move the Resolution of which he had given notice, said, he felt considerable diffidence in bringing this subject forward, because he felt the difficulty of treating so important a matter in the manner it deserved. He brought the subject under their Lordships' attention in no spirit of hostility to the noble Earl who held the office of Lord Lieutenant, for whom in his social position he had the greatest possible regard and affection. But he should be wanting in frankness if he did not say—and he was not alone in thinking so—that Lord Carlisle had shown in the government of Ireland a want of prudence and of firmness in resisting improper pressure. Nothing would induce him to bring this subject forward if he had not a strong conviction that the Lord Lieutenant's decision in releasing certain convicted prisoners had aggravated the unfortunate position in which many parts of the country stood. During the viceroyalty of the noble Marquess, now no more, (the Marquess of Normanby) he made a sort of Royal progress through the country and released prisoners by hundreds. The result of that policy was fully disclosed before the Committee of 1839, and it was shown to be most injurious to the peace of the country. To come to a later period—in Westmeath the Riband Society was flourishing, and some extracts from charges of the Judges who had held Her Majesty's assize for that county would best illustrate the position of affairs there. At the summer assizes of 1859 Chief Justice Monahan said—

"He regretted that, although the calendar was very light in point of numbers, he could not congratulate them upon the state of the county. It was lamentable that since he had the honour of addressing them last, a most barbarous murder had been committed in their county, under circumstances of great atrocity. The crime was perpetrated in the presence of several persons, and the assassin, who must have been known, had not yet been made amenable to justice. It was a shocking thing that one of the bills that would be laid before them had reference to a threatening notice that had been sent to the wife of the man who had been murdered. He need not say that when such a state of things existed in their county it was most important that every magistrate and gentleman of property should do all in his power to aid in the administration of justice, for until such men as he saw before him co-operated in putting an end to such crimes and disturbances as at present disgraced them, they could not hope to restore tranquillity to their fine county."

The Chief Justice here threw blame upon the magistrates and grand jurors, as though they had not performed their duty. Now, the fault did not lie with them, but with the Irish Government, who had released culprits justly convicted and sentenced. At the Spring Assizes for 1860 Mr. Justice Keogh charged the grand jury in these words—

"Although the number of prisoners upon the calendar which has been laid before me is not large, I am sorry I am not able to say, from the information I have obtained, that the condition of the county is satisfactory; the very reverse is the fact. The number of cases upon the calendar is only seven, but when we look to the character of those cases, four being murder and two for assaults so as to endanger life, it is impossible to abstain from the expression of the opinion that the condition of the people of this county is anything but desirable."

He wished to show that the condition of the county was not the result of a sudden outbreak of agrarian outrage, but had long existed, and that for years this war of ribandism against life and property had continued in the county. At the Summer Assizes in 1862 Chief Justice Monahan said—

"I sincerely wish that the calendar before me could be taken as an index of the state of your county. If such were the case, it would be a matter of sincere congratulation, but I regret to find that it is not. Since my arrival in town I have been furnished by the county inspector and other officials with a return of the offences committed in the county since last assizes, and this return shows that, in a very large number of cases, the perpetrators have escaped detection. There are twelve or fourteen instances where parties have been served with threatening notices, and in not one of these have the authors been discovered. There are several cases of malicious injury also, for which not a single person has been made amenable. There is a repugnance evinced by the persons aggrieved to aid the authorities in the detection of the guilty parties. This repugnance—whether caused by fear, intimidation, or otherwise—I consider, in a great measure accounts for the non-discovery of the perpetrators of crime."

There was a remarkable case in connection with a small property belonging to a gentleman named Smith. This gentleman was obliged to evict a tenant or tenants. The first tenant put in, a man named Kelly, was murdered. His murderers had never been detected, and no one had been punished. The next tenant named Jessop, was also murdered, and while he was lying dead a threatening letter was sent to his widow. No one was convicted of either of these crimes, though the murder was committed in broad daylight. Suspicion, however, fell upon a man who was very fortunately convicted shortly afterwards of a malicious assault, and sentenced to two years' imprisonment. But, in spite of his known character, he was not allowed to spend the full period of his sentence in prison, but was released six months before his term had expired. A magistrate of the neighbourhood, having ascertained this fact, wrote to the Chief Secretary of Ireland, desiring to learn the cause of his release. He received the following answer from Sir Robert Peel:—

"Dublin Castle, Oct. 17, 1861.

"Dear Sir,—I have made inquiries respecting the case of Darby Grehon, committed March, 1860, by Judge Keogh, for malicious assault, and sentenced to two years' hard labour. I find that this prisoner was discharged August 16 of this present year, consequently with six months of his sentence unexpired. You expressed a no doubt well grounded alarm at the premature release of this convict, particularly as you were under the impression that Judge Keogh had announced in court that he regretted to be unable to pass a more severe sentence than the one recorded. I find, however, that it was upon Judge Keogh's own special recommendation that this prisoner was discharged last August, on the plea that the prisoner was a very poor man when convicted, and that the state of the county of Westmeath is much improved. I would venture to recommend that you should direct the police to have a vigilant eye upon this man, so as to afford him no opportunity of further disturbance of the peace.

"I am, yours faithfully,
"G. A. Boyd, Esq." "ROBERT PEEL.

That was the excuse urged by the Chief Secretary for the release of a man who had been discharged, certainly without any communication with the local magistrates. He had another case to bring forward, which would show the manner in which the Irish Government were in the habit of dealing with offenders. Their Lordships knew how difficult was the detection of persons in possession of passwords of illegal societies. A conviction in such cases was almost impossible. A man named Martin Fallon, however, was convicted of this offence at the Spring Assizes of 1859, and in passing sentence upon him Chief Justice Monahan said—

"Martin Fallon, you have been found guilty of having in your possession the passwords of an illegal society, knowing them to be such, without being able to account satisfactorily for the same. It has been proved that this unlawful conspiracy exists, and is widely spread throughout Ireland. If one thing is calculated more than another to do injury to the peace of the country, it is the existence of this abominable society. I entertain no shadow of a doubt whatever that you had the copy of those passwords in your possession solely and expressly for the purpose of disseminating them through the country. Of that I am quite as certain as I can be of anything of which I have not actual knowledge. Therefore it becomes my duty to pass upon you the most severe sentence which the law allows me to do. I am quite convinced that if there be any one thing more injurious to men in your class of life than another it is the existence of such illegal combinations and confederacies. It happens, unfortunately for those who wish to carry out their illegal designs, that their power to do mischief will be of temporary duration. The law at present in force has not reached the combination which at present exists in the country to its fullest extent; but the day is fast approaching when there will be evidence sufficient to reach such persons. As you were implicated in several crimes before you went to America, and on your return you have again commenced the same course of conduct, under these circumstances the sentence of the Court is, that you suffer seven years' penal servitude."

A friend of his, a magistrate of the county of Westmeath, to his astonishment saw this man walking about a short time since, and so strong was his impression that the Government would not release a man of such a stamp, that he thought he must have been mistaken, and determined to write to the governor of the gaol to ascertain whether the man was still in prison. The governor, in his reply, stated that the man had been released upon a ticket-of-leave. The man might now possibly have resumed his old employment, and be persuading people to join these illegal societies. He had no doubt that it might be said that the prisoner had behaved very well while in prison, and had given such satisfaction to the authorities that he had been released before his time. He maintained, however, that such a man ought to have been sent to Western Australia, for the only way to suppress those conspiracies was to show no mercy whatever. He now came to the case of which he had given notice. It referred to the case of a man named Kelly, who had been living at Moate, and the injuries which he had suffered had been thus detailed in a letter which he had received from an inhabitant of the place—

"In March last an office of Kelly's, with eleven head of good cattle, was maliciously burned, and he believes the reason to be his having let a garden to the Doulans, which had for many years previously been in the possession of a family named Costello. For this offence against the Riband code Doulan's house was attacked by an armed party in 1862, among whom were the Duigans and Egan. Early in 1863 another house on Kelly's land was maliciously burned. They have never ceased persecuting him since he let the garden to the Doulans."

He understood that the defence of the Lord Lieutenant's conduct would rest upon the fact that there was some doubt as to the identity of the prisoners, Michael Duigan, Patrick Egan, and Patrick Duigan; but the evidence of Ann Doulan was conclusive upon this point. The defence for the prisoners was one often employed by the guilty, an *alibi*—and he must say that he had always found an *alibi* in case of failure to be the very worst defence that could possibly be set up. He could not conceive any case more clear as to guilt. The learned Judge in passing sentence promised them that he would inflict the heaviest punishment in his power, and he kept his word, having no fault to find with the verdict of the jury. Under these circumstances it was important to know why these three men were let out of prison. It appeared that the Lord Lieutenant received two memorials. He received one memorial in March, 1863, from one of the prisoners, Michael Duigan, the only one who had ever so asked for a remission of the punishment. That person in his memorial stated some things which were not true. Of course he denied his guilt—as every Irishman who was ever accused had done—but he went on to state that he had an aged father and a mother dependent on him for support. The Lord Lieutenant was not aware that

that statement was untrue, but he took no steps to ascertain whether it was true or false. If he had made inquiries, he would have found that Duigan's father possessed eight or ten cottages and was in a very comfortable position. That memorial was backed by the recommendations of forty-seven persons living at Moate; but the names of only two of these were printed by the Government, as the Castle authorities were ashamed of the other forty-five. He had some information as to the characters of those persons, and he was informed by an inhabitant of that town that "the memorial was signed by a class of persons that the Government were ashamed of." Thus, among the signers there was a draper and spirit dealer, a baker and spirit dealer, a grocer and whisky seller, a baker and whisky dealer, &c. It was noticeable that no Return had been made, according to the order of the House, of the communications which accompanied the memorial. Upon that memorial no steps were taken, but they were not informed whether the Chief Justice was communicated with. The answer to that memorial it appeared was not favourable, for a second was presented in February last. That memorial was signed by Mr. Berry, a Baptist minister. Respecting that gentleman he had received some information which it was well the House should possess. It appeared that Mr. Berry, although an excellent man, entertained some very curious notions about punishments and rewards, thinking that temporal punishments were altogether wrong, and that offences committed in this world should be left to the awful punishment of a dreadful hereafter. These notions might be very amiable in a Baptist minister, but they were not such as should animate persons who had to deal with offences committed in this world, or else it would be better at once to abolish our criminal code of laws. That memorial was supported by Mr. William Greene, who was described as agent to a large landed proprietor. Mr. Greene's own description of himself was that he was not agent to any one, but that he farmed forty-two acres of land; and an inhabitant of Moate, who had furnished him (the Earl of Donoughmore) with information, described Greene as

> "One of the Rev. Mr. Berry's congregation, and being the only Protestant in the neighbourhood, he lost no opportunity of interfering in such matters by way of gaining popularity."

This memorial being received on the 10th of February, the men were released on the 16th. Having shown how these memorials had been got up, and the manner in which they had been received, he had to complain that upon neither of those memorials had the Lord Lieutenant consulted any person connected with the locality. The Lord Lieutenant knew that there were magistrates and grand jurors acquainted with the district, from whom he could have ascertained the character of the persons who signed the memorials. In fact, the noble Earl seemed to have been guided by a statement in Mr. Berry's letter—

> "That he had always used his influence for the deterring of crime, and that influence he had felt it a privilege to give to the present Liberal Government."

Perhaps that was the reason why Mr. Berry succeeded in his application to the Lord Lieutenant—that kind of soft sawder might have blinded the noble Earl—but still he ought to have taken some precautions before interfering with the verdict of a jury and the award of a Judge. Within a few days afterwards Kelly's offices were burnt down. Only one of the three prisoners remained in the country, and when he found that the police were making inquiries he ran off, affording very fair ground for the presumption that he had taken part in the outrage. The murder took place a few days afterwards. An old man, assisted by his son, had taken a small piece—two acres—of land. This was against the decree of the secret society. A party of men came in open day, beat the unfortunate son, and left him dying. There must have been plenty of witnesses; but there was the greatest difficulty in getting any one to speak to the facts. These were the outrages which were going on in the county where the Lord Lieutenant was amusing himself with his gaol deliveries. The Lord Lieutenant was not satisfied in letting one of the prisoners out. Two of them by their silence admitted the justice of their sentence; but the Lord Lieutenant was so generous a man that he released the whole three prisoners. Such proceedings might be very amusing to the Lord Lieutenant, but they were ruin to property, to the security of life, and all the best interests of the country. They required a man of courage and determination—a man with a firm hand—in the position of the Lord Lieutenant, and that they certainly had not in

Ireland at the present moment. The noble Marquess concluded by moving to resolve—

"That, considering the Extent to which Agrarian Outrages prevail in certain Counties in Ireland, and the Difficulty which exists in obtaining Convictions for Offences of this Description, this House is of Opinion that the Power of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to remit the whole or a Portion of the Sentences of Persons convicted of such Crimes should be exercised with greater Care and Circumspection; and this House observes with Regret that the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland ordered the Release of Michael Duigan, Patrick Duigan, and Patrick Egan, Prisoners under Sentence for an Agrarian Offence, confined in the County Gaol of Westmeath, upon Grounds which appear to be insufficient."

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, I have listened with attention to the long and, I admit, perfectly clear and very carefully-prepared speech of the noble Earl. His Motion is one certainly of importance, and, I may add, of an unusual character. The object of the Motion is to invite this House indirectly to interfere with the discretion with which the Royal prerogative of mercy is exercised, and that this House will agree to a strong personal and severe censure upon the person to whom is delegated the exercise of the Royal prerogative in Ireland. I am quite sure that nothing would induce your Lordships to agree to such a Motion unless it could be shown, and could not be contradicted, that there had been a very gross want of discretion in the administration of that prerogative, or that the person exercising it had been influenced by some corrupt motives. Now, with regard to that, the noble Earl began with a very just eulogium on the Lord Lieutenant; but the fault he imputed to him was this—he was too subject to pressure in the exercise of his duties. Now, I certainly am relieved to find that part of the charge brought forward by the noble Earl has been so entirely abandoned; for, so far from political pressure being imputed, the noble Earl said the memorial to the Lord Lieutenant was only signed by persons in a small town in Ireland, whom the noble Earl spoke of with the greatest contempt, because they were only Baptist ministers, grocers, and persons of no influence whatever. The noble Earl enlarged at considerable length on a topic well calculated to affect the feelings of your Lordships, with regard to agrarian outrage in the county of Westmeath—a subject of the greatest importance and sincere concern to Her Majesty's Government. But the question, as I consider, turns on a very different issue. The noble Earl gave no particular instance of the misguided clemency on the part of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and then claimed for himself credit for the fairness with which he gave both public and private notice of his intention in regard to this debate. I did not know what the cases were to which he would refer; but see now what they amount to. In one case, on the recommendation of the Judge, the Lord Lieutenant released the prisoner; and in another the prisoner was not released by the Lord Lieutenant at all, but was released on a ticket-of-leave. Then, with regard to the particular case with which he had to deal, the prisoners had been in gaol for upwards of nineteen months out of the twenty-four for which they were sentenced. The Lord Lieutenant referred to the Report of the case by Chief Justice Monahan. That learned Judge gave an account of the trial. I regret extremely that I cannot read it to your Lordships to show the sort of evidence which was brought forward, but I will show it to any one who desires to see it. There were three rooms in the house—an inner room, where there was a girl; the second, in which was the father; and the other, in which were the two brothers. The girl stated that she saw the three prisoners and identified them. The two brothers did not identify them. An *alibi* was proved. The noble Earl spoke with great comtempt of an *alibi*, and of course it must depend entirely on the facts proved. But what does Chief Justice Monahan say on that point? He said this, "I certainly considered it a case of considerable difficulty, and I really do not know what I should have found if I had been on the jury." I think that casts a great deal of doubt upon the case, and I think the case of these unfortunate men, who had been so long in prison, was in these circumstances a very fair one for the exercise of the Royal prerogative of mercy. The noble Earl complained very much that the local magistracy had not been consulted. I am surprised that complaint should have been made after what was said in this House the other evening in the course of a debate that neither in Ireland nor in England were the magistrates consulted in such cases, except where the chairman of Quarter Sessions was the Judge. Why it should be made a matter of reproach that the Lord Lieutenant did not depart from a practice universal both in Ireland and in

England I really cannot conceive. The noble Earl went on to show that two of these men had not been guilty of some very atrocious crime, but left the country, and the third, fearing he might get into difficulties again, took himself off as soon as he could. That is a very short statement of the facts. I do not think your Lordships will feel that this is a case for this House to interfere in so unusual a manner as the noble Earl proposes. I cannot believe the noble Earl will be disposed to press his Motion to a division, but if he does I am perfectly confident your Lordships will not support it.

THE DUKE OF LEINSTER inquired whether the noble Earl intended to divide the House.

THE EARL OF LEITRIM expressed his hope that his noble Friend would divide the House, for the matter which had been brought before them was one which was of a very serious character, and the lives of the people ought not to be trifled with as they had been lately. [The noble Earl addressed further remarks to the House which were very imperfectly heard.] As the House, however, was impatient for a division, he would not do more than express his opinion that there was not a proper desire upon the part of the Government in Ireland to promote the welfare of that country. Sub-inspectors of police were put upon the bench, commoners were put over the heads of Peers, and everything was done to degrade the gentry in their counties.

LORD CHELMSFORD said, that his noble Friend had said that the House was impatient for a division; but he (Lord Chelmsford) must say that he never saw a House more impatient not to come to a division. When he came down to the House he had no knowledge of the facts upon which the Motion was to be founded. He had listened very attentively to the speech of his noble Friend (the Earl of Donoughmore), and he was satisfied that it had not been made out that there had been an improper exercise of leniency or any improper interference with the course of justice on the part of the Lord Lieutenant, in carrying out the very delicate duty of dispensing the mercy of the Crown. Under these circumstances, he hoped that the Motion would not be pressed to a division.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said, he would withdraw his Motion; but that he did not regret having brought the matter forward, because he felt very strongly in reference to it, and he thought that but a weak defence had been made. He hoped that more care would be exercised in future.

Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

THERESA KEENAN — ALLEGED MISCONDUCT OF THE POLICE IN LEITRIM.

ADDRESS FOR A PAPER.

THE EARL OF LEITRIM moved That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for

> "1. Copy of the Informations of Theresa Keenan, taken before J. Tyrell Byrne, Esquire, J.P., at Drumsna, in the county of Leitrim, on the 2nd day of April, 1864, relative to some Windows being broken at Eskeragh alias Esker South, in the Parish of Mohill, Barony of Mohill, and County of Leitrim, between the 24th and 30th days of March, 1864 : Also,
>
> "2. Copy of the Police Reports and Correspondence relative to the breaking of the above-mentioned Windows, and the taking of the said Theresa Keenan by the Police before a Magistrate : And also,
>
> "3. Copy of the Warrant, if any, authorizing the police to take the said Theresa Keenan before a magistrate."

The noble Earl stated the substance of his charge against the police to be that they had gone into the bed-room of Theresa Keenan, who was a schoolmistress, had cross-questioned her there, and had afterwards forcibly taken her before a police magistrate; though all she could say when there was that she did not know who it was that broke the windows. He also asserted that repeated outrages were committed by the police in Ireland, and instanced the annoyances to which he had himself been subjected. It might be said that he should communicate with the Government in Ireland; but that was impossible after what had happened. It was the fashion to say that the Lord Lieutenant was a good-natured and kind-hearted man; but he (the Earl of Leitrim) looked upon him as a traitor to his Queen, his religion, and his country.

EARL GRANVILLE declined to defend the conduct of his noble Friend the Lord Lieutenant against the assertions which had been made. He had no objection to produce the informations; correspondence there was none; it was not the custom to produce police reports; and warrant there was none, for the young woman had gone before the magistrate voluntarily.

The Earl of LEITRIM asserted that it was utterly untrue that she had gone voluntarily; for he had positive information that she was taken after repeated remonstrances on her part.

Motion for an Address for

"Copy of the Informations of Theresa Keenan, taken before J. Tyrell Byrne, Esquire, J. P., at Drumsna, in the County of Leitrim, on the 2nd day of April, 1864, relative to some Windows being broken at Eskeragh alias Esker South, in the Parish of Mohill, Barony of Mohill, and County of Leitrim, between the 24th and 30th days of March, 1864."

Agreed to.

PRISON RETURNS (IRELAND).

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

The Earl of LEITRIM moved for

"Return of the Names of Prisoners under Sentence and discharged from the several Gaols or Convict Prisons in Ireland before the Expiration of their Sentences, or whose Sentences have been commuted by the Order of the Government in Ireland, during the Years 1859, 1860, 1861, 1862, 1863, and 1864; showing the Nature of the Crime for which each was convicted, the Sentence of the Court, and the Grounds upon which the Release or Commutation has taken place."

Earl GRANVILLE said, he could not agree to the Motion; the Returns would be very troublesome and expensive to prepare, and would be quite useless.

On Question, *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, June 30, 1864.

MINUTES.]—New Member Sworn—Sir Hedworth Williamson, Bart., *for* Durham County (Northern Division).

Supply—*considered in Committee*—Civil Service Estimates.

Public Bills—*Resolutions in Committee*—Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)*; Isle of Man Harbours Act*.

Ordered—Isle of Man Harbours Act*; Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)*; India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment*.

First Reading—India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment* [Bill 183]; Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)* [Bill 184]; Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* [Bill 185].

Second Reading—Local Government Act (1858) Amendment* [Bill 155]; India Office* [Bill 166]; Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland)* [Bill 174] (*Lords*); Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* [Bill 176].

Select Committee—Contagious Diseases* (*List of Committee*).

Committee—Inclosure (No. 2)* [Bill 170]; Cranbourne Street* [Bill 154]—r.p.; Mortgage Debentures (Stamps)* [Bill 169]—r.p.

Report—Inclosure (No. 2)* [Bill 170].

Considered as amended—Factory Acts Extension* [Bill 55]; Railways (Ireland) Acts Amendment* [Bill 173].

Third Reading — Greek Loan [Bill 144]; Thames Conservancy* [Bill 135]; Lunacy (Scotland)* [Bill 146]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 2)* [Bill 147].

CANADA—DEFENCES OF QUEBEC.

QUESTION.

Mr. ADDERLEY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether orders having been sent for concentrating a large British force at Quebec, steps are also being taken to put that place in a defensible state?

Mr. CARDWELL said, in reply, that what he had stated was that orders had been sent to Montreal and Quebec to concentrate the forces. With regard to the fortifications of the Colony, the Secretary of State for War had recently received from Canada a Report as to the state of the defences. That Report was now under the consideration of the military authorities; but his noble Friend (Earl de Grey) was not prepared to announce any determination upon it at present.

ARMY—BARRACK MASTERS.

QUESTION.

Mr. C. P. BERKELEY said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether a Barrack Master has recently been promoted from the Fourth Class to the Second Class without having served in the Third Class the period laid down by the Royal Warrant of 7th February, 1860?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON replied that no Barrack Master had been promoted in the manner indicated by the question; but Captain Forbes, a Barrack Master of the Second Class, having retired before the issue of the Warrant of 1860, had, at his own request, been recently reinstated in his position as Barrack Master in that rank.

TRAFFIC ON WESTMINSTER BRIDGE.

QUESTION.

Sir JOHN SHELLEY said, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Whether he has inquired as to the traffic on Westminster Bridge, and will state the reason why the Police do not interfere in the regulation of the traffic, so as to divide the heavy from the fast traffic, there being Tramways laid down on the Bridge, which must tend to facilitate regulations which have had the best results on London Bridge?

SIR JOSEPH PAXTON said, he wished to know whether there would be any objection to take up the Tramways, seeing that they only obstructed the traffic over the Bridge?

MR. COWPER said, in reply, that the tramways were intended to separate the slow and heavy traffic from the fast and light traffic. He differed from his hon. Friend (Sir Joseph Paxton) in regard to the alleged inconvenience of the tramways. It was the interest of the drivers of the slow and heavy traffic to go on the tramway, because the draught was easier for the horses. It was obviously for the interest of the drivers of slow and quick vehicles to accommodate themselves to the arrangement, and he believed they generally did so. Two policemen were usually stationed on the bridge, and they reported that no obstruction of a serious character had taken place, so as to justify their interference. The police had no legal authority to compel reluctant persons to go along the tramway except on account of obstruction. They could point out that it was for the general convenience that the light and heavy traffic should be kept separate, and he had no reason to believe they had failed in their duty in that respect.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY: Will the right hon. Gentleman make inquiries as to the traffic regulations of London Bridge, and see whether the same regulations cannot be adopted at Westminster Bridge?

MR. COWPER said, that there was no tramway on London Bridge. The rule there was that the light and heavy traffic going in the same direction should take a particular side of the bridge. If that direction were not strictly observed an obstruction would arise. The police had authority to interfere the moment an obstruction occurred or when they had reason to apprehend that an obstruction would arise. There had been no such obstruction hitherto on Westminster Bridge as would justify any exercise of authority on the part of the police.

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, he would suggest that if the police had no legal power at present to regulate the traffic the right hon. Gentleman would do well to confer with the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and see if some means could not be devised to give them that most necessary authority.

THE LADIES' GALLERY.—QUESTION.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER said, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Whether, for the purpose of providing for the due ventilation and comfort of the Ladies' Gallery, he will give directions for the removal of the grating in front of that Gallery?

SIR JOSEPH PAXTON: Before the right hon. Gentleman answers the Question, I should like to know whether, instead of the removal of the grating in the front of the Gallery, he could not remove one of the panels from behind to allow of ventilation?

MR. COWPER: I have, Sir, already done what is in my power to promote the comfort of the ladies by improving the ventilation by an outlet in the ceiling in that part of the House in which they are allowed to sit. But the question of the hon. Baronet opens up another matter which is not within my province. He wishes to remove a grating which I suppose he thinks is of a too conventual character for this House. I remember that some years ago this subject was very generally discussed in this House, and many hon. Members maintained that if there was an open and visible gallery for the reception of the ladies, the influence exercised by that gallery over the proceedings of the House would be such as not to be altogether desirable. It was determined that it would be better that the House should not be exposed to such an influence. Until the House has pronounced a different opinion, I must decline to remove that conventual grating, which has its uses, for it enables persons behind it to see, without being seen.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in the House of Lords ladies sit in an open gallery without any grating at all? And is this House likely to be influenced by the ladies when they do no harm in the House of Lords?

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

GRANTS TO ENDOWED SCHOOLS.

QUESTION.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON, who had given notice to move—

> "That in the opinion of this House the mode in which it is proposed by the Minute of the 11th day of March, 1864, to make Grants to Endowed Schools, and the distinction made by the same Minute between Endowed Schools in the country and in towns, are unsatisfactory and unjust."

said, it had been intimated to him that a Motion, similar in substance and effect, having been moved by his right hon. Friend the Member for North Staffordshire (Mr. Adderley), and decided by the House, it was a serious question whether it was competent to him, consistently with the rules of the House, which forbade making the same Motion twice in the same Session, to move the Resolution which stood on the paper in his name. He, therefore, begged to ask for an authoritative decision from the Chair, whether it would be in his power to make the Motion or not?

Mr. SPEAKER: According to the rules of the House, no Question or Amendment may be proposed which is the same in substance as any question which during the same Session has been resolved in the affirmative or negative. The original Minute of Council deducted the amount of the endowment from the grant in all cases. The amended Minute of the 11th of March made no deduction from small rural schools, but withdrew the grant from the schools in towns. The right hon. Member for Staffordshire objected to this amended Minute and to this distinction between town and country schools, and on the 2nd of June moved a Resolution in these words—

> "That this House, having considered the Minute of Council of the 11th day of March, 1864, on Endowed Schools, is of opinion that it does not meet the objections made to the Minute of the 19th day of May, 1863."

This Motion was negatived. To-day the right hon. Member for Droitwich proposes a Resolution—

> "That in the opinion of this House the mode in which it is proposed by the Minute of the 11th of March to make grants to Endowed Schools, and the distinction made by the same Minute between Endowed Schools in the country and in towns, is unsatisfactory and unjust."

I have not been able to arrive at any other conclusion than that this Resolution is the same in substance, as it is very nearly the same in terms, as the Resolution of the right hon. Member for North Staffordshire, which was resolved in the negative, and that it could not be put without a contravention of the rules of the House.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON bowed to the decision of the Chair. He had not the least disposition to oppose the judgment of the right hon. Gentleman, and he thought the House would agree with him that he would be unnecessarily intruding on their time if he entered into any argument on the Question. But before he retired from the Question, there was one remark that he desired to offer, and that was that distinctly for himself, and he believed he might say for many Members of the House, he entirely refused to admit that the decision of the House was a final decision of the Question. The division was a very narrow one, the majority being only eight or nine; it was taken unexpectedly; and it could not, in any sense, be considered as testing the opinion of the House upon the subject. In his opinion, the policy of the Government with regard to Endowed Schools was unrighteous and unwise, and he thought that if any hon. Member would refer to that part of the Report of the Royal Commission which related to the establishment of these Endowed Schools he could only arrive at the conclusion, that if we had an Educational Department, with a responsible Minister at its head, it would be impossible for that Minister not to feel that it would be his duty to avail himself of the endowments, in order to improve and extend education throughout many districts of the country, and not to lend himself to the unworthy policy of saving a few thousands of the annual charge at the expense of impeding the education of the people. While, then, he bowed to the decision pronounced by the Speaker, he thought it impossible that this subject could be left where it was; and in the next Session of Parliament he intended himself, unless it was done by some other hon. Member, to revive the discussion, and induce the House of Commons to reverse its decision.

SCHOOL OF NAVAL ARCHITECTURE.

RESOLUTION.

Mr. AUGUSTUS SMITH said, it would be in the recollection of the House, that on the discussion of the Navy Estimates a Vote was taken with reference to the proposed school, and that he, with other Members, objected, not to the establishment of such a school, for which he believed there were cogent reasons, but to the place in which it was intended to locate it. Since then he had made exertions at different times to get certain papers, especially a document by Sir W. Snow Harris, which had been submitted to the Admiralty, and laid upon the table of the House; but the noble and gallant Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty objected on the ground that it was the production of a private person, and ought not to be printed at the public expense. Certain documents, however, had been laid upon the table, which, though exceedingly incomplete, fully confirmed the objections to the establishment of the school at South Kensington. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Droitwitch (Sir John Pakington) had taken credit to himself for having been the first to propose the scheme to the Admiralty; but on looking back to the papers he found that the first document on the subject was from the noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty, and was dated January 13, while the paper transmitted by the right hon. Baronet was dated the 12th of March following. But the right hon. Baronet probably intended to refer to what had taken place in the Institution of Naval Architects, of which he was president, and before which a paper was read last year by Mr. Scott Russell with reference to the establishment of such a school. He must do Mr. Scott Russell the justice to say that it was to him the scheme was justly to be ascribed. Last March twelve months Mr. Scott Russell read a paper to the Institution of Naval Architects, in which he pointed out what had been done in France in the matter, and expressed an opinion that such a school, if established at all, ought to be in this metropolis. But if hon. Members considered what the Ecole Polytechnique was, and the difference between it and the Museum at South Kensington, they would see that there were no grounds whatever for establishing such a school at the latter place. A report was subsequently made to the same institution by Dr. Woolley, in which he alleged that there were thirteen grounds upon which the school ought to be established. Dr. Woolley said, that half the time, or three days in the week, would be devoted to the study of the theory, and three other days to the practical application of the science. Dr. Woolley went on to say that that principle would be preserved in the new school at Kensington, but with this important difference, that the time devoted to the practical study of shipbuilding at the dockyards would be six months in the year, and that for the remaining six months scientific instruction would be given at the school in London. He certainly did not think that arrangement at all advantageous, and he feared that the students would, in the six months during which they were practically working in the shipyards, forget a great deal of what they had previously learnt from lectures in the school. In like manner, he felt that students could not properly follow up a practical study of shipbuilding if they were taken away from it every six months. As the scheme, drawn up by a Committee of the Institute of Naval Architects, was presented to the Admiralty by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Droitwich, he should like to be informed who the gentlemen forming that Committee were, because a great deal must depend on the degree of authority which would attach to their names. He certainly considered it most extraordinary that Dr. Woolley, an Inspector of Schools, should be selected to draw up a scheme for a School of Naval Architecture. His inquiries had convinced him of the truth of what he had stated on a former occasion, that almost everything that was required could at present be taught in the dockyards, where there was an efficient educational staff, who were able to give lectures on almost every subject included in the programme, and who, in case of necessity, might be supplemented at a very slight additional expense. At Portsmouth there was a naval college and a laboratory equal, if not superior, to any out of the metropolis. There was a similar establishment at Devonport. There was also the School of Naval Engineers. Surely much better instruction could be afforded at these establishments than at Kensington, where the pupils had no means of working out the lessons which they received during the time they were obliged to attend the lectures. The original School of Naval Architecture at Portsmouth had been conducted most successfully, and to that institution the country was indebted for some of the most able men connected with the Admiralty. The second school, established in 1845, and which was in existence for some four or five years, had been equally successful. There was an admirable building which had cost £35,000, which was comparatively lying idle; and yet the House was to be called upon to expend a large sum at Kensington on a building unfitted for the purpose to which it was to be devoted. The whole of the salaries would amount to £7,000 a year, and he should like to know whether they would be paid during the whole or only during the half-year. There were to be, he understood, only eight shipwrights and eight engineer students, with probably half-a-dozen private pupils; and he submitted that there was no justification for the establishment of such a large and costly new staff for twenty-two students, more especially as they had a sufficient staff already in the dockyards. The whole expenses of the former School of Naval Architecture did not exceed £2,000 a year, and it was given up because there were not enough openings for the pupils who were educated there. At South Kensington there was no educational staff suited to give lectures, as the noble Lord had led them to believe. He was not aware of any branch of instruction which could not be given at Portsmouth, with perhaps a little additional assistance, as well as, if not better than, at South Kensington. He hoped the noble and gallant Lord would tell them whether the scheme had undergone examination at the Treasury as well as at the Admiralty. The school ought to be established where there could be daily instruction in all the different practical operations of shipbuilding. It was very important that students should have the opportunity of watching the construction of a vessel, not for detached periods, but continuously from beginning to end. That could not be done under the system now proposed. He maintained that, whether or not South Kensington would, as was alleged, inspire students with "a sense of the beautiful," it would not give adequate facilities for the inspection of machinery such as would be afforded at a dockyard. The hon. Member concluded by moving his Resolution.

SIR JOHN TRELAWNY seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the New School of Naval Architecture ought to be established in immediate connection with one of the chief Naval Arsenals, where the students may have, together with scientific lectures of a high order, the benefit of regular, progressive, and continuous instruction in every branch of practical shipbuilding, as well as constant opportunities of inspecting and studying steam and other machinery, the varied armaments, and numerous operations carried out in the docking, fitting out, and working of every species of vessel embraced by the Royal Navy; and further, that the South Kensington Establishments and Museums are altogether wanting in the educational staff and means of practical application indispensable for such School," — (*Mr. Augustus Smith,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, he agreed with the hon. Gentleman as to the great importance to our naval interests, that there should be established a good scientific school for the education of naval architects. The hon. Gentleman seemed to doubt whether the Government had acted wisely in deciding that the proposed school should be established in the metropolis instead of at one of our naval arsenals. Now he (Sir John Pakington) found himself in rather a peculiar position in having to speak for the Admiralty from that side of the House; he was bound to say that he did not share the doubt of the hon. Member on that point. In justice to himself and others he was also bound to say, that in the course of his speech the hon. Gentleman had fallen into several misapprehensions with respect to the part which he had taken in framing and promoting the scheme. Neither in that House nor elsewhere had he ever taken credit to himself for the establishment of the school. He did not presume to be competent to express a satisfactory opinion upon the various scientific questions involved, and if he had taken a rather active part in the transactions connected with the establishment of the school, he had done so solely in his capacity of president of the Institute of Naval Architects. What really led to the establishment of the school was a most able paper drawn up by Mr. Scott Russell, and read by him to the annual meeting of the Institute of Naval Architects as far back as March, 1863. The shipbuilders present on that occasion were much struck by the statements which the paper contained; but their attention was particularly attracted by the allegation of Mr. Russell, that he and other eminent builders had been obliged to send their sons to France in order to be properly instructed in Naval Architecture, as there was no institution in England where they could be trained. In consequence of that remarkable statement the Council of the Institute took the whole subject into their consideration, and the result of their deliberations was that they requested him, as their president, to enter into communication with the Admiralty, expressing their belief, in which he shared, that the best plan for the interests of the country would be to establish a new School of Naval Architecture on such a footing that it might be beneficial both to the Royal Navy and to the mercantile marine. Acting on the request of the Council, he had several interviews with the Duke of Somerset, and with the noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty, and he would not be doing justice to them if he did not acknowledge the frank and cordial manner in which they entered into the scheme, and evinced their readiness to meet the views of the merchant service as represented by the Institute of Naval Architects. The hon. Member had cited the authority of Sir William Snow Harris, in favour of the establishment of the school, not in the metropolis, but in one of our great arsenals. He had a great respect for Sir William Snow Harris, but he could not concur in his view. It might be all very well, if a School of Naval Architecture solely for the benefit of the Royal Navy were in question, to establish it, as before, at one of the arsenals; but the proposed school was to serve the interests of the mercantile marine as well as those of the Royal Navy, and for such an institution one of the arsenals would not be a convenient site. The hon. Member called for the revival of the old school at Portsmouth. He admitted that the late Sir James Graham never made a greater mistake than when he abolished instead of altering and improving the Portsmouth school; but the great objection to that institution was that, though capable of being made an efficient aid to the Royal Navy, it was not fitted from its site to confer the smallest benefit on the mercantile marine, as there was no means of giving any other instruction than what the dockyards afforded. The hon. Member wished to know who drew up the scheme for the proposed school. In reply he had to state that the whole subject was first of all considered by the Council of the Institute of Naval Architects; that the Council then appointed a Committee to go into the details, and that, as the hon. Gentleman would see by glancing at the names, the scheme was framed by the most eminent men in the shipbuilding profession. He would not say there was not an eminent man connected with the mercantile marine who did not approve the whole plan, but he had not heard of any gentleman of eminence as a shipbuilder who had expressed any dissent from the arrangement which had been made, and he submitted that when the Admiralty authorities and the great body of the merchant service were found concurring in a scheme, the fair inference was that no great objection could be taken to it. For his own part, he believed that, whether as regarded the interests of the Royal Navy or those of the mercantile marine, the best arrangement had been adopted, and that the Government had come to a wise decision in resolving to establish the school in the metropolis, which was the most convenient of access from all parts of the country, and where there were greater facilities for scientific instruction than could be found in any other part of the country.

Lord CLARENCE PAGET said, he had only a very few words to add to the remarks of the right hon. Baronet. In the opinion of Dr. Woolley, whose valuable services were about to be transferred to the Admiralty from the Department of Science and Art, there existed at none of the naval ports either instructors or any of the appliances necessary for a good School of Naval Architecture. He supposed the hon. Gentleman would not demur to the opinion of so eminent an authority as Dr. Woolley. The hon. Gentleman thought it was desirable to combine the theoretical with the practical instruction. On that point Dr. Woolley said that at South Kensington the services of the most eminent lecturers in the subsidiary sciences of chymistry, metallurgy, physics, and practical mechanics were already secured, while competent instructors in the sciences more immediately professional were more readily obtainable there than elsewhere. He also said that the principle of devoting one-half of the time of the pupils to instruction in the theory, and the other half to instruction in the practice of their profession, would be kept intact in the new school. Mr. Scott Russell, whose valuable suggestion had been referred to by the right hon. Baronet opposite, after adverting to the immense advantages which the French possessed in their Naval School at Paris, which was a long way from any dockyard, and to which English shipbuilders sent their sons, said they should ask the Government to allow the young men to come to London without forfeiting their dockyard pay in order to attend the college; and that in the dockyards there was now a preliminary training given for the higher instruction which should be obtained at the institution in London.

The hon. Member said that a correct account of the cost of the school had not been given to the House; but in a paper which had been laid on the table at the hon. Gentleman's desire, there was a detailed estimate of the whole cost of the college, and also of the allowance to the young men, which estimate was a correct one as far as their knowledge went. Many persons supposed that the school would become self-supporting. All the scientific men, with the exception of Sir William Snow Harris (for whom he had the highest respect, but who was not an authority on that matter), and all the shipbuilders, whether connected with the Admiralty or with private yards, with whom he had been in communication, were extremely satisfied with the proposed school, and entertained the greatest hopes of its success. He trusted, therefore, that the hon. Member would not persist in opposing the school. They had taken the lecture rooms at Kensington on economical grounds. Those rooms might be capable of improvement, but they were already used for the Department of Science and Art, and there was no doubt that they were adapted for the purpose in view.

MR. AUGUSTUS SMITH: Will the professors be migratory as well as the students?

LORD CLARENCE PAGET: No; the lectures will take place in London.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment *negatived.*

TRADE OF COVENTRY.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. TREHERNE said, he rose to call the attention of the House to the injury which the staple trades of Coventry have suffered, and are still suffering, from the operation of the Commercial Treaty with France, and to ask the Government, Whether they will use their influence with the French Government to obtain the same free admission into France of English Riband and Watches as is accorded by that Treaty, on the principle of Free Trade, to French manufactures of a similar description in England? His constituents were still suffering so much from the consequences of the French Treaty that, although labouring under infirm health, he felt it to be his duty no longer to delay bringing their case under the notice of the House. They had heard a great deal about free trade, and it was on that principle that he requested the favourable consideration of the Government. The value of an abstract principle depended entirely on the manner of its application. Free trade implied an intercourse carried on without hindrance or obstruction on either side; but in the treaty to which he referred, protective duties were retained for the benefit of one country and wholly abolished in the case of the other. That was the bargain which our Plenipotentiary had made for the disadvantage of the silk trade and certain other branches of our industry — a bargain contrary to the principles which Mr. Cobden himself had approved in the month of June 1859, when he endorsed the principles of the Liverpool Financial Reform Association, and which every fair-dealing man would also approve. About the year 1860 the city of Coventry began to experience such severe distress as, he believed, had not been exceeded in Lancashire or any other part of the country. He would not seek to harrow up the feelings of the House by a narrative of persons dying from want, nor would he dwell on the fact that weavers, who had been brought up rather better than the common labourer, had been obliged to accept sixpence a day for grubbing up commons, and working with the spade and shovel, to gain a miserable subsistence. What he wished to urge upon the Government was, that they ought to do something for his constituents, and endeavour to put an end to a state of things under which Coventry ribands could not be sent into France without paying a duty of 7½ per cent, whereas the French were permitted to send their ribands into England without paying one farthing of customs duty. The old saying, "Fair play is a jewel," was one by which Englishmen liked to be guided in their conduct. His constituents sought to bring their case under the consideration of Parliament, not pressing it unduly, not framing any condemnatory Resolution, but simply bringing the facts to the knowledge of the House, and asking whether they were such as to meet with the approval of the Legislature. And it was the duty of those who passed that treaty, and who urged the Emperor of the French to make the arrangements which had led to the hardships complained of, to see whether by further negotiation they could not obtain some welcome concessions. The city of Coventry, whose connection with the riband trade dated from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, had for many years been a flourishing city. In 1801 the population was 16,049, in 1861 it contained no less than 41,647 inhabitants. Up to that time the weavers always had plenty to eat, and economized their funds for the purchase of looms, at which the father of a family worked, surrounded and assisted by his children, whom he was thus enabled to bring up decently and to educate well. These looms cost as much as £50 to £80 each to buy; but when pressure came upon them in consequence of the treaty, and the choice lay between starvation and selling their looms, they were obliged to part with these for £5 each. Although the town contained the very large proportion of 5,000 electors, as a class they were so high-spirited that until the last election, when distress was general, any one known to accept parish relief was sure to be taunted with it upon the hustings. Many years ago, when first he canvassed the electors, he had seen men eating potatoes and salt rather than apply for parochial aid. Now, on the contrary, men with their utmost exertions could not earn enough to support life. The ill effects entailed upon Coventry were by some attributed to a change of fashion, leading to consequent change in dress. But the consumption of riband, far from diminishing, had increased of late years, having become a prominent feature in the trimming of bonnets and dresses. The Coventry weavers were confident that they could still beat the foreign manufacturers if they only competed on equal terms; but from undue competition great numbers had been obliged to leave their native place for the colonies, and though the population had thus diminished, the inmates of the workhouse had increased from 169 in the week ending April 23, 1859, to 231 in the corresponding week of 1864, being at the rate of 40 per cent additional. Before 1860 there were seventy or eighty master riband weavers in Coventry; now there were not half that number, and from the want of private looms additional numbers of hands were driven to the factory, where nothing like remunerative employment could be afforded. Out of about 9,000 houses, 1,500 were without occupants, and yet some people with more money than wisdom were building twenty-five new houses; in fact, the place wore a deserted appearance. It was said that Coventry had been greatly affected by the American war; but it was curious to note that in the watch trade, which that conflict must have affected, there had been a revival; while in the riband trade, upon which the war had no perceptible effect, there had been a marked falling off. At present a weaver, taking advantage of all the opportunities that were open to him, could not earn half as much in Coventry as a bricklayer's labourer. Even if peace were restored in America the watch trade would not be expected to be much improved, as an *ad valorem* import duty of 60 per cent was levied on English watches. The French import duty on English watches was 7½ per cent. Coventry was interested in ribands, but was not so much concerned in broad silks as Macclesfield, Manchester, and other places. The imports of broad silks in 1858 were 309,926lb.; in 1863, 1,504,848lb., being an increase of 500 per cent. The imports of foreign watches were, in 1858, 99,335; in 1863, 160,648. The imports of ribands in 1857 were 375,890lb.; in 1863, 849,835lb., being an increase of more than 100 per cent. On the other hand, the exports had fallen off. The exports of English ribands in 1859, the year before the treaty, were 25,580lb.; in 1863 they had dwindled to 13,709lb. He thanked the House for the attention it had given to the case of his constituents, and he trusted that the Government would, both on grounds of humanity and justice, take their claims into favourable consideration.

Sir JOSEPH PAXTON said, he was unfortunately able to bear testimony to the severe distress which had existed, and still existed, in Coventry. He was unable to take quite the same view with his hon. Colleague as to the causes of that distress; but he was perfectly satisfied that the French Treaty, coming into operation at the particular moment it did, had greatly contributed to that unfortunate result. Indeed, it had had a most injurious influence, not only upon the trade of Coventry, but upon the silk trade of the country generally. He was told that at the present time at Macclesfield there were 2,000 houses unoccupied. No doubt there had been various times when the silk manufacturers of Spitalfields, Coventry, and Macclesfield had been in great distress; but the French Treaty coming into operation at the very moment when the riband trade was already in a state of great depression had greatly aggravated that distress. He argued at the time, that if the duties on the importation of riband had been gradually lowered instead of being taken off at once, the whole tax of 15 per cent, the abolition would not have pressed so severely on the riband manufacturers. His hon. Colleague had expressed an opinion that English ribands should be admitted into France upon the same terms as French ribands were admitted into this country, and he (Sir Joseph Paxton) thought that if proper representations were made to the Government of the Emperor of the French, that might be done. The manufacturers of Coventry could not compete with the French in the production of the finer kinds of ribands, but they made an inferior kind of riband cheaper than it could be made in France; and they believed that they could carry on a considerable trade in this article if it were admitted into France on equal terms. With regard to the present distress in Coventry, he was bound to bear his testimony to the marvellous patience and forbearance with which the weavers had borne their sufferings. The whole inhabitants seemed to be actuated by a pride and determination to abstain, even under circumstances of the deepest privation, from seeking relief from the parish; and there was no place in England of equal population where the poor rates had been on an average so low as in Coventry. The freemen would rather starve than accept relief from the parish; and they were no doubt to some extent influenced in that resolve by their extreme reluctance to forfeit their right to vote. He should be glad if the request of his hon. Colleague could be complied with. One of the French Chambers of Commerce most interested in the question had declared that they had no wish to maintain the protection; and it seemed a strange omission in the treaty that the French duty should have been maintained when so great a reduction was made in the duty levied upon French ribands in this country. He felt sure that if vigorous representations were made to the French Government they would consent to forego the duty now placed upon this article imported from this country.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON said, it was quite true that it had been repeatedly urged upon the Government that they should exert their influence with the Government of France to procure a better market on the Continent for the cheap ribands manufactured at Coventry. His hon. Friend, however, had made a remark in which there was much force—namely, that the Coventry manufacturers, in their turn, must submit to the application of the principles of free trade; and seeing that the manufacturers of nearly all other articles had been required by the Legislature to submit to free competition, it was clear that the same principles would ultimately have to be applied to the silk and riband manufacturers of Coventry. The Coventry manufacturers were about the last to whom the principles of free trade had been applied. It was put off in their case for a long period; but no doubt, whether there had been a French treaty or not, it would have ultimately been the policy of Parliament to apply to the silk manufacturers the principles which had been applied to the other manufacturers of the country. The hon. Gentleman who had brought forward the Motion put in a word for the paper manufacturers, and said that riband manufacturers and the paper manufacturers had been unfairly treated. But the hon. Gentleman had forgotten that his own constituents were much interested in free trade in paper, because they said it was so extensively used in packing their manufactures that its price ought not to be enhanced by a protective duty.

Mr. TREHERNE said, the right hon. Gentleman had misunderstood him. He had alluded to an agitation which he had heard was going to be got up in the spirit of free trade.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON: All he could say was that it was an advantage to the riband makers of Coventry to have free trade in paper. He deplored the distress which prevailed in Coventry, and if any representation which could be made would have a tendency to mitigate that distress, such representation should have his support. But although there was a duty upon ribands imported into France, that duty was not very low. The French Government had adopted the policy of entire freedom of trade in the import of goods into France; but while they retained a duty on manufactured goods imported into France, it could not be said that the duty was very large. For instance, on velvet ribands it was 5 per cent, *ad valorem;* on other descriptions 8 per cent, *ad valorem;* and on mixed kinds 10 per cent, *ad valorem.* These duties did probably stand in the way of the trade of the cheap ribands manufactured at Coventry being carried on in France; but he was glad to find that there was a tendency to increase the export of British silk ribands. Take, for instance, the returns for the first five months of 1864, as compared with some months of

1863. In 1863, during the first five months of the year, the value of goods exported was £24,000, while in the same months of 1864 the amount had risen to £50,000, or more than double. He did not say this increase would go on throughout the entire year, yet the return at present bore a very favourable aspect. He believed that there were symptoms of a revival of trade in Coventry. With regard to the imports into England, although he admitted there was an increase, yet one fact must be taken into consideration. He was informed that the weight given of ribands imported included the packing paper, and therefore the whole quantity of ribands was not so large as appeared on the return. And then the sale of ribands was affected by the fashions: it must be remembered that ribands were not now so extensively worn as formerly; and he was informed there had been considerable distress in the trade in France. The hon. Gentleman said he did not think the American war had any effect upon the riband trade. He very much doubted whether that statement was correct. He should rather say that the American war had had a considerable effect upon the demand for silk goods in France, and consequently the English market being open would be flooded by French goods and prices unduly depressed. There had been many causes which had been operating together to produce the present depressed state of the riband manufacture, and it was not fair to say that the only cause of the alleged distress was the operation of the French Treaty. He felt that this was one of those cases in which the House could really do little. He entirely sympathized with the hon. Gentleman and his Colleague, but he was afraid it was beyond the power of legislation to meet that distress in the way that, perhaps, some hon. Members thought it might be met. The policy of the country would not admit of that course of proceeding. Any representations that could be made at a fitting opportunity, he, for one, would be most happy to back. Speaking for the Government at large, he would say that they would only be too glad to see the same freedom in the importation of British manufactures into France and other countries that we permitted those countries to enjoy into England.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, he was not about to enter into the history of the protracted distress which had existed, and was still felt, in Coventry and a large district of Warwickshire. It was impossible to dispute the facts, because, as his hon. Friend had said, 4,000 people had left Coventry. He had had some experience, having acted upon the relief committee for three successive years. A computation had been made, that from eleven to twelve thousand people had left Coventry and that district. He was happy to say that neither the people of the city of Coventry, nor the upper classes of North Warwickshire, had sat down idle under the distress. They had made every exertion. They had promoted other manufactures. The very clothes he (Mr. Newdegate) wore had been made by riband weavers, who had turned their hands to cloth manufacture and to other sources of obtaining a livelihood. But, notwithstanding all these exertions, the depression had been very severe, and he was sorry to say the trade was sinking. He did not wish to go back to all the circumstances that occurred in 1860; but he remembered urging the hon. Member for Coventry opposite (Sir Joseph Paxton) to do all he could to delay the change. He was sorry to say that in 1860 the hon. Member did not agree with him; but he was willing to bear testimony to his exertions to obtain such a change in the stipulations of the Treaty as should place the riband trade of England exactly on a par with the trade in France. He voted with the hon. Gentleman when he asked that the change should be simultaneous, and that the same terms should be adopted by either country; but they met with no success. This matter had not rested with the House of Commons. He was sorry to say that the House had been precluded by the fact that the Treaty had been negotiated, as they were then precluded; and they could not do more than express a hope that her Majesty's Government would approach the Government of France, and represent that as France had gained great advantages from the Treaty, they would use the discretion which they possessed in order to place the export of English silk goods, particularly ribands, upon the same terms as the imports from France were received in this country. That was the request they made, and he was afraid, from the tone of the Government, that there was little prospect of its acceptance. When his constituents were now told that years ago they should have foreseen the change which has befallen them, and the distress which they had suffered in consequence of that change, he would ask, whether any class of manufacturers was justified in trusting to the faith of the Legislature? The faith of the Legislature had been as much pledged to the continuance of the protection of the silk manufacture as they were now told it is pledged to the abolition of every import duty which could afford protection to any branch of native industry. If it were not for the French Treaty it was his firm conviction that there would have been a modification in that rigid rule. He admitted that if it were possible to abolish import duties throughout the whole world that would constitute free trade; but that supposition rested upon a fallacy. It rested upon the belief that all the world would be governed by one system, or that there would spring up some gigantic power which should govern all the world. When they looked at the import duties levied by the United States, and when they looked at the stipulations of that very Treaty—under which import duties of 7 per cent at present, with power to raise them to 30 per cent for a time, and then to fix them at 15 per cent—he could not believe that we had yet reached that period when the nations of the world would consent to be governed by one absolute system of free imports; he was afraid it was chimerical to look forward to that period. In the United States import duties were the main source of the Federal revenue, for by the constitution they could not impose export duties; and the levying of direct taxes upon real property within the states was the privilege of the states themselves, from which the Federal Government was debarred except in cases of war and great emergency. Therefore he thought it was idle to look forward to a period when the system of free imports would universally prevail. Believing that, he had only to hope that the Government would take into consideration the long period of patient suffering which his constituents had undergone. He spoke it to his honour that the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his private capacity had extended to them his aid, and they were grateful to their fellow-countrymen for the sum of £50,000, which had preserved thousands from absolute destitution. The depression had not ceased, although it was abated. The people were willing to turn to other trades; but the period of transition was one of great suffering, for it was impossible to divert a population who had been brought up to an occupation requiring skill in one generation from the prosecution of that trade. He thought it most unreasonable that the House should declare that we should have no silk or riband trade in this country. It had been a profitable business, under which had grown up an intelligent, thrifty, and worthy population, who shrunk from parochial relief. Could it be sound policy to crush such a population? He thought not. He hoped that the Government would accept as a fact, proved by four years' experience, that there was great depression, and that they would ask the French Government to reciprocate more closely the extreme liberality which induced us to abandon the whole duty upon the importation of silk goods and ribadns.

INCOME TAX DEDUCTIONS.

QUESTION.

Mr. HUBBARD said, that he was desirous of putting a Question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer with the view of clearing the honour and character of a public servant. On a former occasion he had referred to a document emanating from the Inland Revenue Department as a proof of the demoralizing effect produced by the operation of the Income Tax. That document, dated the 1st of March, 1849, directed the collectors who received the drainage rent charges in Scotland not to suggest to the payers that they were entitled to allowances for Income Tax, but to make the allowances only in case they should be asked for. He had chacterized the document as discreditable, and he understood that Mr. Fletcher, at the head of the Inland Revenue Office in Edinburgh, feared that he might be supposed to be involved in the censure then expressed. He, therefore, wished to state that he had been informed that Mr. Fletcher, so far from being implicated in drawing up that document, had taken the earliest opportunity of remonstrating against its tenour, and had suggested that the instructions should be reconsidered. He believed that they were reconsidered and withdrawn, and he, consequently, thought it right to state what had come to his knowledge with respect to Mr. Fletcher; but he regretted that in a matter of this kind, when character was at stake, there should not be the possibility of acquitting every one of the public officers concerned with the document, and he would be glad to see all of them eagerly rush, one after the other, to disclaim any responsibility with regard to the document in question. He was unwilling to fasten on any one the responsibility of a paper so discreditable. Holding very high the character of the public servants, he would be the last to cast any imputation on them. He believed that the country was singularly happy in having public servants distinguished for their high character and integrity, and, therefore, the blame was to be thrown, not on any one of the public servants, but upon the miserable law which the officers of the Inland Revenue Board were the unhappy instruments to carry into execution. In order that Mr. Fletcher's character might be entirely cleared, he would now beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it be true that Mr. Angus Fletcher, the head of the Inland Revenue Department in Edinburgh, is in no way responsible for originating the Circular to Collectors of Drainage Rent Charges, dated the 1st of March, 1849; that, on the contrary, Mr. Fletcher remonstrated against the tenour of the Circular, and obtained authority for the Collectors to allow the Income Tax legally due to the parties paying the Drainage Annuities, whether they claimed it or not; and if he will lay upon the table of the House the instructions of the Board of Inland Revenue for the issue of the Circular, Mr. Fletcher's Remonstrance, and the Reply of the Board?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER had great pleasure in answering the Question, as far as regarded the character of Mr. Fletcher; but he confessed he was sorry that his hon. Friend had thought it necessary to give utterance to the highly fanciful doctrine that the vice of the document he had referred to had actually affected the moral tone of the officers of the Inland Revenue Board. When he first heard that doctrine he thought it might have been broached in the heat of debate, and he regretted to find that it was the hon. Member's permanent and serious conviction. The fact was, that the Board of Inland Revenue made a mistake, to the effect of requiring that the burden of applying for the deductions should be thrown on the parties, instead of the deductions being allowed at once without application; but to imply that that proceeding had a connection with any moral deterioration was a wholly unnecessary and gratuitous assumption. It was simply an error, and nothing but an error; and it was in the nature of Revenue Boards, as it was in the nature of all persons engaged incessantly in business, occasionally to make errors. His hon. Friend could not have been so fortunate as never to have made a mistake. For his own part, he committed many mistakes himself, and found that others did the same. It did not, therefore, produce such marvellous astonishment in his mind when he learnt, that those performing such difficult duties as the Board of Inland Revenue once perhaps, in a thousand years, fell into an error. There was no necessity for making such a charge as the hon. Gentleman had done. A circular was issued to the effect that deductions would be allowed only to those persons who made application. Mr. Fletcher, so far from being responsible for it, no sooner learnt what had been done, than he wrote to the Board of Inland Revenue pointing out the error, and the Board immediately corrected it. That was the whole affair, and he could not help thinking his hon. Friend's charges were out of place. His hon. Friend had acquitted Mr. Fletcher; and he might have extended the acquittal to all parties concerned. As to the papers, he would have no objection to produce them if his hon. Friend moved for them; but he trusted that, after that explanation, he would not deem it necessary to do so.

MR. HUBBARD said, he wished it to be understood that he made no attack on the officials. It was the system which they had to administer that was to blame.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £525,404, to complete the sum for Public Education, Great Britain.

MR. H. A. BRUCE, in rising to move the Vote for the furtherance of Public Education, said, that the exceptional circumstances under which the Vote had been administered last year—two different systems, the Code of 1860 and the Revised Code having both been in operation—rendered it impossible to form a perfectly accurate estimate as to the expenditure for the coming year. The estimate, however, was fixed at £705,404. His right hon. Friend the Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe) who moved the estimate of last year, was under circumstances of similar difficulty to those in which he was now placed, and calculated the amount required at £804,002. In this estimate he had taken an ample margin, for the expenditure of last year was £721,391 against £774,743 in 1862, and there was, therefore, a diminution of £53,351. The reduction in the expenditure arose chiefly on two items—building grants, £24,831, and annual grants for the maintenance of schools, £37,143. Against those reductions, however, had to be placed increased payments of £9,516 for normal schools, which occurred mainly in Scotland, where far more persons were educated as teachers than were required for the purpose, and of £2,160 for the cost of inspection and administration. The cause which interfered with the accuracy of the estimate was, first of all, the fact that the Revised Code did not come into such general operation as was expected, 457,000 children being the number estimated as likely to be in average attendance and entitled to payment, while the actual attendance was only 180,005. Another reason was that all new schools which received grants during the past year were examined for the first time, and the scholars in these schools being necessarily less advanced than those under inspection the amount of grant paid in these cases was not so high. The result was that the payment per head, instead of being, as his right hon. Friend anticipated, 10*s*., was only 8*s*. 1*d*. There seemed to be good reason to believe that the payment would be greater in the coming year, and they had therefore, taken it at 9*s*. 3*d*. The number of children present at inspection in 1863 was 1,092,741, as against 1,057,426 in 1862, the increase being 35,315. During the year the building grants to elementary schools paid out of the Vote amounted to £36,681; but besides that there was contributed for building purposes by voluntary contributions £128,129; so that, altogether, £164,811 was expended on that account; 125 new schools were built, 50 schools were enlarged, and 82 teachers' residences were erected. The number of scholars for whom additional accommodation was provided was 27,098; thus bringing the total accommodation up to 1,512,000 children, which probably corresponded pretty closely with the number on the books. The number of schools visited by the Inspectors was 7,739, or taking departments of schools—dividing them into boys, girls, and infants—11,230. These schools were taught by 10,136 certificated teachers, and 14,180 pupil-teachers, making a total of 24,316. The Inspectors also visited 40 training colleges, in which were 3,109 students, 179 schools for pauper children, with 12,454 scholars, which had been transferred to the Poor Law Board, and 26 industrial schools, with 2,159 children now transferred to the Home Department. These were the figures relative to the transactions of the past year. But it might interest the Committee to know the statistics with regard to two other years—1854, of which they had accurate Returns, and 1861, when the Vote was at the highest. The number of inspected schools was 3,825 in 1854, 7,705 in 1861, and 7,739 in 1863. The accommodation in the schools was in 1854 for 558,000 scholars, in 1861 for 1,396,000, in 1863 for 1,512,000. The number of scholars actually under inspection was 473,000 in 1854, 1,028,000 in 1861, and 1,092,000 in 1863. The cost in 1854 was £326,000; in 1861, £813,000; and in 1863, £721,000. It would be observed that of late years the ratio of increase was not so great as in the earlier years during which the Education Grant was made. No doubt, one reason why a lull had taken place was due to the system on which the Vote rested—namely, that voluntary efforts were required to precede State grants, and certain securities were taken for the efficiency of the schools. Another reason was that in the first instance schools were established in the great centres of population, where they were most needed, and where the means existed in the greatest abundance for founding them. There were in England 14,877 parishes. More than half of the population of England and Wales—that was 10,000,000—were contained in 618 of these parishes. All but 53, or 8 per cent of the 618, were provided with schools more or less abundantly—all with one, and some with more. These 618 parishes had each 5,000 or upwards of population. There were, however, 8,761 parishes, having each a less population than 500; and only 765 of these, or 8·8 per cent, had schools receiving aid from the State. Of these 8,761 parishes, 4,149 had a population of less than 200. Consequently, it was in these cases almost impossible to provide schools according to the requirements of the Privy Council, unless means were taken to unite some of the parishes. The difficulty of doing so had been insisted on by the Royal Commission, and, although various attempts had been made, they had proved unsuccessful. It seemed extremely difficult to devise any plan, under the existing system, by which aid could be extended to small parishes. Another reason why educational progress had been less rapid of late years than formerly, arose from the religious circumstances of the country. One of the Articles of the Revised Code was, that the religious denomination of a school should be suitable for the families relied upon for supplying the scholars. Now, in most of the smaller parishes the clergyman was the person who took the most active part in the promotion of education, and he was generally supported by the landed proprietors. After connecting himself with the National Society, which represented the Church, he usually applied for aid to the Committee of Privy Council. But the difficulty which arose was this—that there were few small parishes in which there were not some Dissenters, for whose children a school under the regulations of the National Society was not suited. In the larger parishes where there was room for more than one school, schools might be founded upon the Church principles, and placed in connection with the National Society without doing injustice to the Dissenting population; and in those parishes where no Dissenters existed the difficulty would not arise at all; but wherever a certain proportion of the inhabitants—say, for example, one-fourth—were Dissenters, the question presented itself whether a school in connection with the National Society could, under the Revised Code, be properly assisted. The practice of the Education Committee in such cases was not what it had been asserted to be—to insist upon the insertion of conscience clauses which should protect the religious opinions of Dissenting children. In such cases they simply refused to make a grant; and when asked their reasons they stated that they were founded upon the obvious injustice of giving public aid to a school where the children of Dissenting parents were compelled, under pain of exclusion, to learn the Church catechism and to attend the Church. Wherever the promoters or managers of a school consented to give security for the protection of Dissenting children a grant was made; wherever that security was not given a grant was refused. It had been represented that this was an interference with religious teaching on the part of the Committee. No charge could be more unjust. All the Committee asked was, that a Dissenting parent should have the right of withdrawing his child, if he so pleased, from the religious teaching of a school in connection with the National Society; and the Royal Commissioners had pointed out the manifest injustice of compelling Dissenting children to attend the Church and learn the catechism. The French law, introduced into a Roman Catholic country by a Protestant Minister, was wise and liberal. It provided that the wishes of fathers of families should always be consulted and followed in that which related to the participation of their children in religious instruction. Surely in an eminently Protestant country it would be admitted that every man should be the director, not only of his own conscience, but of that of his children. Those who objected to the practice of the Privy Council said that no hardship really arose, because such was the liberality of feeling on the part of the clergy that rarely, if ever, did any clergyman or manager of a school insist upon the children of Dissenting parents learning the catechism or attending the Church. He admitted the zeal of the clergy in the cause of education, and the great liberality with which they had generally acted, even when in connection with the National Society, and seemingly under an obligation to insist upon attendance at church. Cases of violation of liberty of conscience were not frequent, but some had occurred, and within the last week he had heard of one where children of Dissenters were taken from school because the clergyman, acting under a conscientious sense of duty, insisted on their going to church. That intolerant feeling was not general; but religious sentiment on such points changed from time to time, and although at present the prevailing feeling among clergymen might be liberal, yet ten, twenty, or thirty years might produce a great alteration in their convictions and policy. It was, therefore, the duty of the Council, in every parish where only one school could be established, to see that perfect security was taken against the violation of the religious feelings of a Dissenting minority. In memorials and periodical publications, the course pursued by the Council had been untruly stigmatized as unjust and impolitic. Unjust he was sure it was not, while the impolicy rested with those who were guilty of intolerance. The past year was the first in which the examinations under the Revised Code had been brought into large operation. No fewer than 1,828 schools, at which the average attendance was 280,474, were examined. Out of these 280,474 children, 180,005, or about 64 per cent, were presented for examination; and it would be recollected that the children qualified for examination must have attended 200 times. There were examined under the first standard 70,407; under the second, 45,180; under the third, 35,991; under the fourth, 22,137; under the fifth, 4,671; under the sixth, 1,619. The total number of failures, excluding distinction of standards, was in day schools 17 per cent. There were failures in reading to the extent of 13 per cent; in writing, to the extent of 15 per cent; and in arithmetic, to the extent of 23 per cent. The number of children under six years of age to whom grants were made without examination was 43,798, or about 15 per cent of the average number attending the same schools. The examinations were conducted in accordance with the supplementary rules issued as an authoritative answer to a vast number of questions addressed to the Council, both by managers and by the Inspectors themselves. Those rules were in strict conformity with the spirit of the Revised Code, and they were necessary in order to prevent confusion. The Royal Commission of 1861 reported that the children remained at school under more favourable circumstances till they were about twelve years of age, and under less favourable circumstances till they were ten years old; and the highest standard under the Revised Code did not go beyond what, in the opinion of the Commissioners, a child of ten years and upwards ought to be able to do on leaving school. The sixth or highest standard for the most advanced class, required that the scholars should be able to read a short paragraph in a newspaper, to write to dictation, and work a sum in bills of parcels; and if the children arrived at that point which, in the opinion of the Commissioners they were capable of reaching under a good system of examination, the number who presented themselves would not have been 1,589, or only about 2¼ per cent of the whole, but 70,000. The opinion of the Commissioners was supported by several of the Inspectors, and by one of those gentlemen whose opinions were much quoted in that House during the discussion of the Revised Code—he meant Mr. Fraser. Mr. Fraser's view of what a child of ten years old might fairly be called upon to do, and what it ought to be able to do, if the education he received was to be of permanent profit to him, was expressed in these terms—

> "I venture to maintain that it is quite possible to teach a child soundly and thoroughly, in a way that he shall not forget it, all that is necessary for him to possess in the shape of intellectual attainment by the time he is ten years old. If he has been properly looked after in the lower classes he shall be able to spell correctly the words that he will ordinarily have to use; he shall read a common narrative—the paragraph in the newspaper he cares to read—with sufficient ease to be a pleasure to himself and to convey information to listeners; if gone to live a distance from home, he shall write his mother a letter that shall be both legible and intelligible; he knows enough of ciphering to make out or test the correctness of a common shop bill; if he hears talk of foreign countries he has some notion as to the part of the habitable globe in which they lie; and underlying all, and not without its influence, I trust, upon his life and conversation, he has acquaintance enough with the Holy Scriptures to follow the allusions and arguments of a plain Saxon sermon, and a sufficient recollection of the truths taught him in his catechism to know what are the duties required of him towards his Maker and his fellow man."

That that standard was not reached under the present system was obvious, from the figures which he had adduced; and he knew not what stronger argument could be presented for the introduction of the Revised Code and a system of individual examination, than the fact that out of 70,000 children over ten years of age less than 1,600 of them on leaving school were able to pass the standard which, in the opinion of the Royal Commissioners, all such children ought to have reached. The question had been raised whether these supplementary rules under which the examination was conducted ought or ought not to be laid on the table. It was provided by the Revised Code that any new rule involving a material alteration of or departure from the Code should be laid on the table; and it was for the Department in the exercise of good faith and good sense to determine whether a rule was such a material alteration as that it should be submitted to the immediate consideration of the House. Sooner or later it was laid on the table, for the supplementary rules found their way into the annual Reports, and were submitted to the criticism of the House and the country. But he maintained that in that case there was no material departure from either the language or the spirit of the Code; that these rules were merely declaratory, that they were laid down for the public convenience, and that without them or some similar rules the system of examination that would have been enforced, had the narrowest interpretation been put upon the Revised Code, would have been a mere mockery. The examination had been determined, not by the choice of the Inspectors, but by the mere fact that the inspection fell due at a later time of the year; and, therefore, they might accept the results as a fair specimen of the state of education throughout the country. The Privy Council had not overlooked one danger which might arise from a too strict adherence to the letter of the Revised Code, and they had given instructions to their Inspectors not simply to examine into proficiency in reading, writing, and arithmetic, but to pay the greatest attention to the other requirements of a good school. That, he believed, was a regulation which would not be found fault with from any quarter. The instruction ran as follows:—

> "The grant to be made to each school depends, as it has ever done, upon the school's whole character and work. The grant is offered for attendance in a school with which the Inspector is satisfied. If he is wholly dissatisfied (Article 50), and if the reasons of such dissatisfaction are confirmed (Article 51 E), no grant is made. You will judge every school by the same standard that you have hitherto used, as regards its religious, moral, and intellectual merits. The examination under Article 48 does not supersede this judgment, but presupposes it. That article does not prescribe that if thus much is done a grant shall be paid, but unless thus much is done, no grant shall be paid. It does not exclude the inspection of each school by a highly educated public officer, but it fortifies this general test by individual examination. If you keep these distinctions steadily in view you will see how little the scope of your duties is changed."

The House would agree that if these principles were acted upon, not only would the schools throughout the country be firmly grounded in that which was admitted to be the basis of all learning, but the higher essentials of religious and moral training, order, and attention to those studies which opened and enlarged the mind, as, for example, geography, and such history as could be taught in a few years, or in the form of reading lessons, would be as well secured under the Revised Code as under the former system.

Lord ROBERT CECIL said, that the right hon. Gentleman had alluded to the causes which, in his opinion, had contributed to the lull which had taken place in the ardour of the promoters of education. Without disputing the existence of some of those causes, he could suggest one cause which was more powerful than them all—he meant the unwillingness evinced in many places to go on with the great educational work of 1839, from the distrust created in the minds of managers by the treatment they had received at the hands of the Department. From all he could learn of the state of opinion throughout the country, he thought there was growing up in the minds of those who took an interest in education a feeling that there was no sympathy for them in the Department at Whitehall; that they were there looked upon as plunderers of the public purse, as greedy harpies who desired to get as much as they could out of the Exchequer; and that the Department which they formerly regarded as their auxiliary and protector only viewed them as its enemy, and was contriving by every means in its power to diminish the grants by which their efforts were to be assisted. That was a most unfortunate impression to get abroad, yet it was one not without justification from the acts of the Department. To some of those acts the right hon. Gentleman had himself alluded at considerable length. First, as to the supplementary rules. There were two reasons why the supplementary rules needed a more ample defence than the right hon. Gentleman had offered for them. One of those reasons was the time at which the rules were issued. It was a characteristic of all the great changes in the educational system of late years, that they had always been reserved till the moment when Parliament disappeared. Those great changes were not brought forward in the spring, when the feeling of managers could be ascertained and expressed in Parliament. The Revised Code had been brought forward in July or August, and now those supplementary rules which had so modified that Code had also been left for July or August. Now, what was the effect of this? The House would remember the severe contests which had taken place in respect to the Revised Code, and which terminated in a compromise. One of the most material points in that contest was that the test of age was no longer to be applied, but that the children were to be taken as presented by the managers of the schools. Trusting to the good faith of the Department, which the right hon. Gentleman told them—almost he thought with some irony—was its characteristic, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Walpole) withdrew his proposition; and though the right hon. Gentleman had, he believed, a large majority at his back, he consented to let the experiment, so modified, come into practice, and the Code became practically a law. Was he wrong in saying that the arrangement of which the children were to be taken as they came was one by the material points of the compromise? He held in his hands the words of Earl Granville, and he supposed it was not possible to bind the Department by a stronger pledge than the words of its head. Earl Granville said—

> "With regard to the mode of examination, the grouping by age was given up; and what was now proposed was, that instead of four standard examinations two should be added, making six standard examinations altogether, and the children were to be examined according to those standards in the manner in which the managers or masters should present them."

That was the distinct statement of Earl Granville, and that pledge had been directly broken by the supplementary rules. Instead of being taken as the managers presented them, the managers were obliged to present them in certain standards fixed by the office, and a heavy pecuniary fine was levied on them if they did not so present the children. As he understood the figures, in nearly 97 per cent of the schools the managers had been unable to comply with those supplementary rules. Were those supplementary rules necessary? The House would see that according to the rules of the Revised Code—no child in a successive year being allowed to be examined in the standard which he had been placed in the year before—if the Committee of Council had waited for six years, as the children came up from standard to standard they would have had what they wished, and there was no occasion for that arbitrary and harsh rule. The course which the Department had adopted was one of inducing the managers of schools to invest their money in additional undertakings, then suddenly coming down upon them without notice with a rule for which they were unprepared, and thus depriving them of that in the hope of which they had pledged themselves for payments which often they were very badly able to meet. There were other cases also which had weakened the faith of managers in the Department. He did not know whether managers of schools would continue to entertain the hopes with which they flattered themselves when coming under the sceptre of the right hon. Gentleman; but he would venture to express a hope that if the right hon. Gentleman meant to issue any new rules or minutes by which he intended to mulct those managers of what they received, he would at once make a clean breast of it, and inform the House what he proposed to do in August. Let not hon. Gentlemen be sent back to the country under the impression that a certain code of regulations was to be adhered to, and then when it was too late for remonstrance find out that there was an entire change of regulations. There were many other points with respect to which the right hon. Gentleman must be well aware there was great discontent. There was the question of evening schools. Would the House believe that in many cases the Department required as a condition of aid to evening schools that the scholars should appear in the daytime to be examined? Why the very object of an evening school was to enable those who were not able to attend in the day to receive an education in the evening. He had heard of places in which the Committee of Council had directed the examination of evening schools to take place in the month of May. Evening schools were essentially a winter institution. In summer there was but little chance of getting those who attended them together, so that the Department fixed a time of day and a season of the year when it was impossible that the children should come together. There was one part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech which he had heard with regret. He wished the right hon. Gentleman had let the National Society alone. It was very well known that unhappy differences had existed between the National Society and the Privy Council Office; but he thought the right hon. Gentleman had narrowed the issue very much and very unfairly in the way he stated them. It was not merely a question of a few children being allowed to go to church or not being allowed to go to church. What the difference was he believed to be this. There had for many years been a persistent effort on the part of the officials of the Education Office to get rid of the necessity of teaching a direct, clear, sharply defined form of religion. He believed those who worked the system at Whitehall would be glad if some system of amalgamated religion could be devised, by which the denominational principle would be done away with and the difficulties of the Department shelved for ever. Against this the National Society had protested. They believed there could be no earnest religious zeal unless it was based upon a particular religion, and that in an earnest and religious zeal were the whole bone and marrow of the educational movement of this country. If the Government once discouraged men of earnest religious principles from taking part in education, the whole spring of education would go. He therefore thought it would be wiser of the officials of the Education Office to refrain from trying to make religious men abandon the dogmas and the tenets which they held, and to oblige them to teach a mere diluted and general religion. By some of the regulations, there was a direct premium to managers of schools to teach religion in some form to which parents who were Dissenters would not object. There was a direct premium to amalgamate Dissent with the Church of England. He ventured to think that if the right hon. Gentleman held by the principles acted upon by his predecessor in this matter, he would foster an opposition to the Department which even his ability and kindliness of heart would not enable him to overcome.

Mr. WALTER said, it was not his intention to move any Resolution on that occasion in the direction of those which he had moved in the last year and the year before; nor should he trouble the Committee with many remarks. But he wished to take that opportunity of saying that, even on the showing of the Privy Council, the great inequality which still existed in the distribution of the Parliamentary grant was most unsatisfactory, and deserved the serious consideration of the House. He also wished to give notice, that should his right hon. Friend the Vice President of the Department and himself be in their respective places in the following Session, he would move for a Select Committee to inquire into the circumstances of the unassisted schools and the best mode of bringing them within reach of the Government grant. He thought it could not be considered satisfactory that there should still be 10,961 parishes without annual grant schools. The Privy Council in their Report had tabulated the parishes throughout the country, and had divided them into four classes—namely, the parishes with upwards of 5,000 inhabitants; the parishes with less than 5,000 and more than 1,000 inhabitants; the parishes with less than 1,000 and more than 500 inhabitants; and the parishes with less than 500 inhabitants. Of the parishes with more than 5,000 inhabitants 91½ per cent, according to the Report, contained one or more annual grant schools. Then, by tacking on the next class of parishes—those with less than 5,000 but more than 1,000 inhabitants—the Council made out that nearly four-fifths of the parishes of 1,000 inhabitants and upwards contained one or more annual grant schools. But if the House would allow him to make a different division, and separate parishes with more than 5,000 inhabitants from those with less than 5,000, they would find that out of 14,249 parishes containing less than 5,000 inhabitants each, with an aggregate population of 9,291,170, there were no less than 10,961 parishes, or upwards of 66 per cent of the whole, without annual grant schools. No one could contend that that was satisfactory. There was no other instance in which so large a sum of money was voted out of the annual taxation of the country for local purposes in such a way that only about one-half or two-thirds of the population received any benefit from the expenditure. If the parishes which were thus assisted paid for their schools out of their own rates he should not have a word to say; but they took money out of the pockets of the smaller parishes, which got no grant at all; and yet a great number of these smaller parishes were substantially fulfilling all the requisites of education, though, because they were either unable or unwilling to comply with certain arbitrary rules laid down by the Privy Council, they were deprived of any share in the expenditure. It had been thrown in his teeth by the Inspectors—at the instigation, he presumed, of the Privy Council—that he was anxious to apply some portion of the grant in aid of schools wholly undeserving of assistance, and he must say that the Inspectors had shown great fidelity to their employers in raking together a number of utterly worthless schools, kept by drunkards, by persons with one leg or one arm, and so on, and assuming that that was the class of school which he was anxious to assist. Now, he had never said one word to countenance any such doctrine. The doctrine which he had ventured to lay down had always been that which was understood to be the very foundation of the Revised Code—namely, payment by results; and he contended that the inspection, if it were good for anything at all, ought to be able to prove these results. Any Inspector who knew his business could tell in the course of an afternoon what the discipline and moral condition of a school were. He had had an opportunity of seeing a school examined —an Inspector having been sent down to visit his own school, which had no certificated master—and he could, therefore, speak with more authority than he formerly possessed as to the nature of the examination. He said distinctly that any Inspector accustomed to his business could tell in an afternoon what the condition of a school was, and whether it was entitled to a grant; and he maintained that the proof of a schoolmaster's claim to assistance was the condition of his school, and not any examination which he might undergo at Christmas or any other time under the direction of the Privy Council. One point of very great importance was brought out forcibly in the Report, and to this he wished to call attention—he meant the condition of the pupil-teacher system. He had always complained of the rule of the Revised Code, which either rendered the employment of pupil-teachers compulsory, or subjected the managers to loss of the grant if they did not employ pupil-teachers. Now, it was right that the Committee should know what was the state of the case as regarded the pupil-teachers. In the first place, as to their intellectual status, Mr. Brodie, one of the Inspectors, had on several occasions dwelt very much upon the knowledge of grammar possessed by the pupil-teachers, and last year he stated his opinion in the following words:—

> "I noticed in several of the Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors for last year complaints as to pupil-teachers' grammar, and in a former Report I also called attention to this point. I regret to add that I do not think them improved in this respect. As a body they have no notion, I will not say of composing (the term is too exalted), but of making any simple statement, describing any intellectual process, as of the operations in arithmetic, answering any question, either orally or on paper, in a short, clear, grammatical way. Their papers generally, indeed, disclose far worse grammatical faults, from which they do not get free even in their fifth year—at least, very often—while they retain also strange idioms of their own."

Such was the knowledge of grammar possessed by the boys and girls who were considered indispensable to any good system of education in this country, and of whom he believed there were still 24,000 on the staff. It seemed, however, from the account given by Mr. Brodie, that the system was breaking down. That Inspector gave a frightful list of the number of pupil-teachers disabled by sickness during a very short period. Out of 542 to whom he referred, 214 had been disabled by sickness, and many of them had died. Mr. Brodie said, indeed, that, though it was not his own opinion that pupil-teachers as a rule, and if properly selected and watched over, were overworked, many other persons most competent to judge, such as physicians, surgeons, and the most thoughtful among the managers and teachers in his district, held a different view. That statement was not to be wondered at, and in the appendix to the Report of Mr. Brodie, who was, on the whole, an advocate of the system, some striking letters were to be found on the subject. One of his correspondents, a Mr. Steele, said:—

> "I think my girls have all been most tried in the institution. I have had nine there, and all have come away with their constitutions greatly shattered with the exception of two. I do think the study there is quite too much for any young person to bear. Some of them left me quite strong, and came back completely worn out in mind and body."

Mr. Rowntree wrote—

> "My observation at Hope Street has convinced me that the work which our pupil-teachers have to perform is excessive, and that the majority of young men cannot stand such work without injury to health, while not a few are deterred from becoming pupil-teachers by a knowledge of what they would have to perform. If by the present system you secure a higher standard of literary acquirement, it is, I believe, often at the cost of that freshness and elasticity of spirit without which there can be little sympathy with children, and no great success in the imparting of knowledge."

Such being the case, he was not surprised at the statement made by Mr. Moncrieff, who, in his Report for 1863, said—

> "On the whole, it seems that pupil-teachers are likely to disappear, or be reduced to a very small number, confined, probably, to a few town schools. There is no evidence as yet that they will be replaced to anything like the full extent by second or assistant masters. The causes are chiefly two—the increased scarcity of candidates and the still greater scarcity of funds. It is in vain to tell managers that the pupil-teachers will pay for their stipend by the increase of the grant; the answer is conclusive; on the one hand it is more than doubtful whether the services even of a good pupil-teacher will increase the grant by £10, which is equivalent to twenty-five children passing in all subjects; on the other hand, this is at least uncertain, and school committees are seldom in a position to incur certain liabilities on the strength of contingent, not to say improbable, income."

That being the case, as reported even by the Inspectors themselves, he thought it would be wise if his right hon. Friend could dispense with that regulation at least which rendered the employment of pupil-teachers all but compulsory on school managers. He wished, in the next place, to say a word or two respecting the mode of examination—a subject which was referred to by Mr. Matthew Arnold in his Report. This gentleman observed that the new method of examination did not afford Inspectors the same means of drawing out the children and of ascertaining really what they could do that was afforded under the old system; and when he (Mr. Walter) lately had an opportunity of seeing a school inspection, it struck him forcibly that that was the case. If it were not a breach of confidence, he might add that the Inspector was very much of the same opinion, and observed to him that under the new system of examination it was impossible to get at the intelligence of the children, to ask them questions which would draw out their minds and prove what they really understood, so well as under the old system of inspection. The children were required to read a certain number of lines, to do a sum, and write a copy, but as to putting any question which would test their general knowledge and understanding, nothing of the kind was attempted, and when he (Mr. Walter) suggested that such a course of examination might as well be attempted, the answer was that there was no time for it, and that it would be impossible to get through the work if that system were pursued. He should postpone what he might have to say on that and other points connected with the subject, but on a future occasion he hoped to enter more fully into the question, and should certainly move for a Committee to inquire into the best mode of bringing all the unassisted schools within the reach of the Government grant.

Mr. ADDERLEY said, that following the example set by others, he would confine his remarks to a few objections which he entertained to various parts of the educational system, and especially to the proceedings of the past year as reported in the papers just laid before the House. On two occasions he had brought under notice the course pursued with regard to the endowed schools. On one occasion he was so strongly supported by the opinion of the House, that the Government were obliged to modify their proceedings. On the second occasion, when he protested even against the modification, he believed with the right hon. Member for Droitwich, that he was only defeated by an accident. Believing that if the House attended for a moment to the subject they would alter the minutes passed by the Committee of Council respecting endowed schools, he wished to announce his firm intention not to rest until he had convinced the House that the minutes must be withdrawn. He could not believe that the House would for an instant countenance the rule that schools being supported by private contributions and by Government aid, where private persons had secured their own private contribution, the Treasury should step in and reckon any such secured private contribution in relief of the public charge. That was a proposition which he believed could not be maintained. He hoped on the earliest occasion at the meeting of Parliament in the following year, that the question would be brought again before the attention of hon. Members, the forms of the House precluding the possibility of their raising it a second time during the present Session. If it should not, however, be brought again before the House, and if the principle were really to be established, that the moment a man's subscription was secured that subscription was to be regarded as belonging to the public treasury, they ought, in common justice, to pass a law enabling those liberal individuals by whom contributions had been secured to schools, to cancel the deeds which they had drawn, and place their subscriptions upon the same footing which they occupied before they had met with such rough treatment. He had several exceptions to take to the practice of the Department, and the first matter to which he would advert was the issuing of supplementary rules. He would give one or two illustrations, though it was chiefly to the principle that he objected. The principle had been laid down that "supplementary rules stand to the code in much the same relation as cases decided under a statute to the statute itself." The Report from which he quoted those words was signed by the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President; but he presumed the Report was rather that of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne. [Mr. Lowe: No!] Decisions of the Judges, however, were simply interpretrations of the law, and not, as in the case of the supplementary rules, additions and alterations. Unless the House abrogated the functions which it possessed, the decisions of the Judges could be nothing more than the determination of doubtful intention, and when once decided the decision was recorded and considered so fixed amongst Judges, that no other Judge ventured to alter it except upon very strong grounds. In no case in England did a Judge pretend to vary a law, or make a new law. That power existed in America to a certain extent, but that was only the result of the imperfections of democratic legislation. Supplemental rules were not justifiable then if they ever departed from or added to the minutes they intended to supplement. It was hard enough to understand the minutes, confused, complicated, and obscure as they were, and their concoction was quite sufficiently removed from the control and cognizance of the House; but it was still worse to have supplementary rules besides, which in every respect were open to greater complaint. Take, for instance, the supplementary rule about an imperative standard under which children were to be examined. All that the Revised Code said upon the subject was that every scholar was to be examined according to one of the standards, and that no pupil was to be examined a second time on the same standard. The Report which came out the same year, and which was meant to be explanatory of the law, went further, and said that children were to be presented for examination according to standards selected by those interested in their success. The supplementary rules stated still further that no grant would be paid to a school, not being one for evening scholars or infants only, unless one class was presented as high as standard 3, and that a deduction of at least one-tenth would be made from the grant to a school unless one class was presented above standard 3. He maintained that the supplementary rules were not capable of defence if they went further than the terms of the minute, which they pretended to supplement. He would mention one or two other cases, though in the state of the Committee (about sixteen Members were present) he should not go into the subject as fully as he might otherwise have done. He might, however, say, that complaints were made by the managers of schools in all parts of England of what they considered to be a departure from the understanding conveyed by the Revised Code. But besides these supplementary rules, there was another way of altering the code, and that was by means of instructions. One of these papers, issued in 1862, contained forty-one instructions. One of them, No. 7, directed that an infant school, forming part of a larger school under a certificated teacher, must have a certificated teacher itself. At the close of the letter the intention appeared; it was to bring the infant school as well as the larger school under certificated teaching. But if this object were good it ought to have been carried out, not by instructions, but by a new minute. There was a condition introduced without the knowledge of any one, which condition in many cases had a penal operation. He recollected reading one letter from a clergyman, the tone of *naive* remonstrance in which greatly amused him. The writer complained that the nature of the grant had totally changed from what it was under the Revised Code, and he was told in reply that he did not appear to be acquainted with a certain letter of 1863. The clergyman frankly confessed that he had not seen the letter, and had never even heard of it. Laws issued in the course of twelve months did not even come under the notice of the House until the following year, much less could a country clergyman be expected to be thoroughly acquainted with them. There was a stipulation in the Revised Code as to the number of pupils for whom one pupil-teacher was required, and it was expressly stated that the number was to be reckoned according to the average attendance at the school. But the 37th instruction stated that the attendance was to be decided by "the largest number of scholars present at one time together." That alteration would press most severely upon the rural schools, which, in reality, ought to be dealt with the most leniently. The attendance at one season of the year would naturally be much larger than at another. He had now only one other objectionable mode of proceeding to mention, and that was the circulars, which he regarded as being quite as objectionable as either the supplementary rules or instructions. In the Revised Code of 1862, Articles 123 and 124 provided that the allowances to normal schools in respect to each student examined should be so much for the first year and so much for the second, without any reference to the fact of their being Queen's scholars or not. In the edition of 1864 those two articles were omitted, and this omission was explained in a circular which was issued several months before in 1863 from the secretary's office, in which it was said that it was thought necessary to explain those two articles, and that they really meant that no candidate who failed to pass the examination for admission should gain the grant to the college on his account as a certificated teacher. That made a most material difference, whether it were right or wrong. There was this fact also to be observed in connection with the circular which explained the article in question, that it anticipated the decision of 1864 by six months, the secretary who issued it taking upon himself to pass a Minute in anticipation six months before it came out. He also observed that in the Report it was stated that the grants for evening schools were still under consideration. He had received many letters of complaint that in other respects there had been a material departure from the conditions laid down in the Revised Code; for instance, that the number of days during which evening schools must be open had been considerably increased, and the conditions rendered much more severe. Now his proposition had always been that supplementary rules and alterations, whether issued in circular letters or by instructions, if they amounted to an alteration in the minutes which had been sanctioned by the House, should be put forward in the shape of new minutes, and submitted to the House. He went still further, and contended that it was most essential that some steps should be taken to make the House more acquainted with the introduction of new minutes. He would wish that the Minister, having laid upon the table a new minute, should give notice that he had done so; but he had been told upon the highest authority that it was not usual to pass a rule to compel a Minister to make a speech. It might be difficult to prescribe the exact form, but he thought there should be some way of making the House aware that a minute had been laid upon the table, which, if not objected to for a month, should become law. Then, as to a passage in the Report referring to the National Society, he, being a Vice President of that Society, wished to say a few words. The Report seemed to say that the terms of the National Society in some places excluded public grants, and that the grants would have been larger this year had it not been for those terms of the National Society. He presumed that it was meant that the Education Department felt that it could not properly vote public money to exclusive schools—to schools that were so exclusive in their terms as to shut out the children of Dissenters in places where the population was not sufficient for two schools. Supposing that to be the principle intended, he would observe that that principle had never been distinctly laid down, and it would be much better, in his opinion, to lay down definite and intelligible principles than to enter upon long and inconclusive correspondence with the National Society. That, however, would be assuming that the terms of the society were exclusive, which he denied. In cases such as were referred to he knew that in practice the children of Dissenters did make use of those schools. It might be said that if such were the case why did not the society take credit for their liberality and say so; but there was an obvious reason. The society was willing to admit Dissenters' children, but if they were to advertise that every Dissenter might make an objection to his child following the ordinary religious teaching in the school, it would be inviting objections which would impair the efficiency of these schools. The society was willing to meet objections when they were made, but they did not want to bind themselves and invite interference. At the same time he was willing to agree that the Department should lay down a rule that places, where there was not population sufficient for two schools, and where there were Dissenters who wished to send their children to school, should not receive a grant of public money without the conscience clause being introduced in the deed. He wished to call attention to another point—one to which he had referred upon former occasions—the removal of some public schools from the Educational Department to another. That evil was, he was sorry to find, still on the increase. In the Report he found it stated that pauper schools and industrial schools were now placed under the Home Office and the Poor Law Board, on the pretext that the reasons which dictated the association of the Education Department with those schools no longer existed. He should think rather all schools supported by public money should be placed under the control of the National Educational Department, which would produce a complete Report and lead to a simpler system of inspection. It was difficult to understand why there should be separate Inspectors for the Home Office, the Poor Law Board, and the Education Department, to visit different schools in the same town. Such a separation of account also placed it almost beyond the power of the House to know how much money was expended altogether on schools. In conclusion he wished to congratulate the Vice President, or rather the right hon. Gentleman's predecessor—the right hon. Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe)—upon the satisfactory remarks of the Inspectors upon the working of the Revised Code. He had himself supported the changes made in the Education Code, and had never foreseen the disadvantage which some had anticipated would flow from its adoption; but he had not expected that so early as 1863 all the Inspectors—as far as he had seen—in their Reports should express such strong approval of that measure of which many of them had felt great misgivings. With the cordial cooperation of the Inspectors additional vigour would be imparted to local management, and the result would be a useful check on the expenditure of public money. He hoped the Department would take into consideration the recommendations made that evening for a more uniform system of working, and for making more prominent all intended changes of rules, and he had no doubt their efforts would be rewarded by a great advance in the cause of education.

MR. HADFIELD said, he was almost at a loss to conceive what was the cause of the apathy observable on a question of such great importance. During the last hour the Benches opposite had been occupied by only three hon. Members, although the Vote under consideration involved an expenditure of £1,300,000, while the Ministerial side of the House could only show a number which he would not specify lest it might be a provocation to the arrest of public business. He believed the apathy was caused partly by the deadening effect which money granted by the State invariably produced, and he was of opinion that it would be much more satisfactory if the State would leave education alone.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE observed, that the theory of the hon. Gentleman that diminished interest was owing to the largeness of the sums voted did not hold good in all points, for they were discussing Estimates which were considerably less than those of former years. The sum they were then called on to vote was £705,000 as against £804,000 last year, and £840,000 two years ago. The decrease was no less than 16 per cent on the whole sum granted for the promotion of education. But while there was that reduction on the Vote for education as it stood two years ago, the expense of the administration of the system had increased 17 per cent during the same period. The year before last they had voted £66,299 for the expense of the office; last year the expense was £72,000; and that year it amounted to £77,800. That increase was a little remarkable, and might give some clue to the solution of the difficulty proposed by the hon. Gentleman. The hon. Gentleman said the interest had diminished, and that was explained by the fact that the House found itself unable to deal with the matter, and more and more at the mercy of the Department which administered the grants. The House had, as well as it could, expressed its views and enforced them on the Government, but only to see them quietly set aside, having no power to resist what was going on. Hon. Members, therefore, gave it up very much as a bad job. There were one or two points in the dealings of the Committee of Privy Council during the last two years which were unsatisfactory. Against some of those dealings he considered it necessary to enter a protest. He did not wish to find fault with the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President, or with the right hon. Gentleman the late Vice President (Mr. Lowe), who, he thought, had very hard measure dealt to him by the House. He was not disposed to use severe language either with respect to him or to the administration of the office; but they were dealing with a system which was excessively complicated and difficult to understand. The House had not been able to apply its mind to all the details of the system. It was absolutely necessary, therefore, that a great deal of trust should be reposed in the administrative body; and so long as there was a want of harmony between the House and that body there would be continual complaints. There were two points to which he would direct the attention of the right hon. Gentleman, which very much affected managers of schools. It should be remembered that managers of schools were not mere bloodsuckers endeavouring to get all the public money they could for purposes of their own. They were men labouring, giving their time, money, and abilities to carry on a system which they deemed for the public good. The particular system they were administering was not invented by them. It was created and forced on them by the Government. It was the agitation in that House, aided by the Committee of Council, which led to the establishment of schools on principles which two years ago were universal as regarded all the schools connected with the Government. The Report of the Committee of Council admitted the propositions which he had laid down. The Department thought it desirable to inoculate the whole country with its system of training masters and pupil-teachers and other modes of promoting education, and these were engrafted on the old system of education in the country. What was the consequence? The managers incurred responsibilities both moral and pecuniary. Then in 1862 the Department of the Government which had fostered that feeling swept away the old system, and adopted an entirely new one. In these circumstances the Government should have been as tender as possible in their dealings with those who had been placed in this position in order to carry out the views of the Department. An effort should have been made to make their position as little painful as possible. He was sorry to say very much the reverse of this had been the case. The managers had contracted obligations with the masters, and also with the pupil-teachers. When the Department came to alter the system, how did they deal with each of these cases? The managers found themselves bound at the time to secure certain payments to the master, which payments had been fixed with reference to the mode which the Department had adopted with regard to the augmentation of salaries. They had agreed to give a salary of £40, because they knew there was an augmentation of £20 from the State. There were also pupil-teachers who received payment from the State. The right hon. Member for Calne said he would endeavour to meet the case of the masters by making it a condition of the grant, that the managers of schools should give to the masters a certain amount of payment, which amount should be adjusted to the amount of their former payment from the Department—that was to say, that the managers should pay to the masters three times the sum that the augmentation grant represented, so that if the augmentation grant was £20 they were bound to pay him £60. Then came the question with regard to pupil-teachers, and after some consideration and discussion the Government proposed to continue them to the end of their apprenticeship, and pay them the same as they otherwise would have been paid, and that their salaries should be paid as a second charge out of the earnings of the school. And further, that if the earnings of the school, according to payment by results, were not sufficient to meet the charges for the pupil-teachers, the Government promised to make good the deficiency. The interpretation, and the natural interpretation, that was put upon the two offers of the Government by nineteen-twentieths of the Members of that House and the managers of schools was, that if the school had earned a certain amount from results, the portion which the Government had proposed to secure to the masters should be first paid to them, and afterwards the amount due to the pupil-teachers, the Government making up any deficiency that might arise. To the astonishment of the managers, however, the Government said otherwise. They said the first charge was —and he could not really use any other word—mere moonshine, and that the only charge they considered themselves bound to pay was to make up any deficiencies that might arise with regard to pupil-teachers, which thus became practically the first and only charge. An illustration of the consequences following from the course the Government had taken was afforded by the case of the school of St. Ive, at Liskeard. The Rev. Mr. Hobhouse, writing to the Committee of Council on Education, said—

> "Our school and its master satisfy every condition of Article 51 B, and he has, therefore, under that article, a claim upon the grant now received, amounting to £21 10s., the value of his certificate under the Code of 1860. When he shall have received this, there will remain in our hands out of the grant now announced by you the sum of £9 18s. But the pupil-teacher has a claim (as second charge under Article 54) for his stipend of £17 10s., and the master for his gratuity of £5 for instructing the pupil-teacher. There thus appears a deficiency of £12 12s."

Mr. Hobhouse wrote to ask that these twelve guineas might be paid over, but the Privy Council refused to do so. That, he feared, was one case out of a large number of a similar character, and on a former occasion he gave notice for a Return of all the refusals that had been made under the Revised Code of the same kind; but he was told by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne, as no doubt would have been the case, that it would entail a search through a large amount of correspondence, and it would put the Department to a deal of trouble—which he had no wish to do—that there was no distinction in the principle in all the cases, and that there were several of them; and he (Sir Stafford Northcote) fancied there were a great many of them. [Mr. LOWE: No.] At all events there were several, and they all turned upon the same point—namely, that the master was ignored, and the pupil-teacher alone recognized. He had given the subject his serious attention, and he had examined carefully all that passed in Parliament on the subject. Some discussion took place upon it last Session, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne gave him an answer on the subject; and he (Sir Stafford Northcote) was bound to say that, after carefully looking into all that had passed, he could not say that the Department had been guilty of anything in the nature of a breach of faith in the case, but at the same time he thought there had been harsh and severe treatment adopted towards the managers. In point of fact, by the requirements of the Privy Council the managers were placed in a difficult position, for they were bound to continue payment to pupil-teachers whom they had not themselves engaged; and there was a case illustrative of the difficulties sometimes arising within his own knowledge. It had not been brought under the notice of the Privy Council, and never would, because the person primarily interested was well able to bear any claims that might be made. The school was supported by a country gentleman in a small parish; it had worked extremely well, and attracted a number of children from other parishes. After a time the manager asked and obtained leave to take first one pupil-teacher, and then a second; and, after some time, the school grew to a considerable size, and the master received payment for both those pupil-teachers. When the Revised Code was issued the master became alarmed, but the manager promised that he should be no loser, and that they would tide over the difficulty. But when they came to settle accounts, having only seven months to deal with as the inspection on account of the change had taken place unusually early, the manager found that he had lost his capitation grant of £14 or £15 a year, and though 95 per cent of the children attended and passed their examination he had to pay nearly £20 to the master to put him in the same position as before. That was the case of a school wealthily supported, and no complaint had been made, but suppose the case had been one of a parish school in a remote district, where the loss must fall either on the master or the clergyman who could not hope to raise additional subscriptions. In the case he had mentioned the two pupil-teachers were just under their time, and by restricting the operations of the school a little, the manager would eventually get back pretty much to his old position. But cases constantly arose where for three or four years the pupil-teacher's apprenticeship had still to run, and it was during those periods that consideration was most needed. He did not ask any favour for managers, or that they should be bloated with money; but when by a course of legislation they had been brought into a certain position and saddled with obligations from which it was impossible to withdraw with honour, it was but charitable and just that Government should make such arrangements as would enable them to tide over the difficulty. Had the propositions of the Government been carried out in the way they were understood by the House and the country, he believed the dissatisfaction and complaints which had arisen would have been entirely obviated. He rejoiced that the attendance in the Committee was limited that evening, for last year, when he brought forward the question in a full House, it was impossible to gain the attention of hon. Members. How was it possible to expect that 500 or 600 Gentlemen would enter into all the minutiæ of that widely ramified system? Many considerations led him to believe that they were erroneously endeavouring to achieve a complicated work by a centralized administration, and that the difficulties could not be met unless they were prepared to enter upon a different system. [Mr. ADDERLEY: Hear, hear!] He knew what was meant by the cheer of his right hon. Friend; but that field of discussion was too wide to be entered upon just then. He would pass to another point—that of the standards; and he must say th t there he did charge upon the Department something as near to a breach of faith as was consistent with the habits of the Board. How they could reconcile to their consciences having put out these supplementary Estimates he was at a loss to understand. An opinion expressed by Earl Granville in the House of Lords had been quoted. In the debates in the House last year, the subject of grouping by age was a good deal discussed. Much might be said both for and against grouping by age. The House was, however, opposed to grouping by age, and the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Lowe) gave way, and stated that a system of payment according to standard would be adopted. [Mr. Lowe: Examination according to standards, not payment.] On that occasion Mr. Puller, whose death was a great loss to the House, put certain questions to the right hon. Gentleman on the subject. Mr. Puller was alive to all the difficulties and intricacies of the subject, and he asked the Vice President of the Council whether it was right that John Thomas, a boy of the first-class, but very young, should be presented for a standard below that of the first-class. It was obviously for the credit of the school that as many boys as possible should present themselves for the first-class, but it was for the pecuniary interest of the school that he should be at first in as low a standard as possible, and present himself for a higher standard afterwards. The right hon. Gentleman, in answer to the question whether it would be in the power of the master to place him in any standard, said that it would be so, but that when he had been once placed the minute would take hold of the child and fix his position. From that question and answer and the debate altogether the Committee had a right to assume, that it would be in the power of the managers of schools to present a child upon any standard they pleased on the first occasion, and that they would not be bound by rules contrary to the statements made in that House. And yet the supplementary rules, that professed to be an exposition and explanation of the Revised Code, went into minute details that rendered it utterly impossible for any child to be presented for a different standard from the class in which he was examined. He would not go into the policy of such a regulation; he only contended that it was a violation of the understanding arrived at by the House. When hon. Members found, after so many nights' attendance and discussion, that it was impossible to bind the Government to an understanding so distinctly come to, it was sufficient to account for Houses as thin as that of that evening. He wished to press upon the Vice President of the Committee of Council that he must consider the feelings and infirmities of those with whom he had to deal. The present was an artificial system. He should have preferred a somewhat different system, but that which existed was a centralized system administered by a body sitting at Whitehall, and knowing very little of the feelings of the managers of country schools. He trusted that the present Vice President would lay aside that primness and stiffness that almost of necessity belonged to an official system. He did not sympathize with all the indignation felt against the Education Department by the country managers. But the Privy Council had no doubt sinned on the side of unnecessary harshness, sharpness, and severity towards the managers, who were giving a great deal of their time and money to the work of education. He would entreat the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. H. A. Bruce) in his official administration to endeavour to smooth over the suspicions and feelings that had been excited, and to give peace again to a body of men who were labouring in a good work and assisting in the education of the poor.

Mr. BLACK said, he might as soon find his way through *Bradshaw's Guide* as attempt to master a Revised Code which hardly a dozen men in the House understood. The hon. Baronet who had just sat down truly called it an artificial system, and said they all knew from the complaints that were made how difficult it was to work out the rules and regulations of the Board. Perhaps some explanation of these complaints would be found in the distribution of the grants. The sum devoted for education in England and Scotland was £721,391. Of that large sum the Church of England schools received £416,392, while all the other schools in England only got £137,670. Now, would any one tell him that the members of the Church of England were as 416,000 to 137,000 of the population? The difficulty arose from the whole system being denominational. In Scotland the sums distributed were—to the Established Church, £52,477; the Free Church, £39,897; Episcopalians, £4,476; and the Roman Catholics, £2,230. The total exceeded £99,000, of which the Established Church got more than half. To say that the Established Church had one-third of the number of children was giving it a large allowance. The Free Church and the United Presbyterians were each of them near it in numbers, and nothing could be more unfair than that it should have more than half the grants. The Episcopal Church got £4,476, and the Roman Catholic only £2,230. Now, the wealthiest persons in Scotland were Episcopalians, while their number was very much smaller than that of the Roman Catholics. It appeared from the Census that there were eight marriages among the Roman Catholics to one among the Episcopalians; which shows that the Roman Catholics were greatly more numerous than the Episcopalians, and they needed aid most; but, for all that, the wealthy body with the smaller number of children got twice as much money from the State as the poorest and the more numerous class. Now, as the whole system seemed to him one of inequality, and therefore of injustice, it was high time to look into it. If a plan could be devised by which they could have one school in every parish or educational district, it was not necessary that it should be called Church of England, Presbyterian, or denominational of any kind: were this disregarded, it would be so much the better. If he were a manager he would take the best master he could find, no matter to what denomination he belonged, whether Quaker or High Church. There would be some difficulty with the Roman Catholics, but there would be none in getting Protestants of all denominations to read the New Testament in the school, and then, if a man of sound religious principles, no matter what sect he belonged to, were put at the head of it, religion would be better taught than when the master was obliged to teach the children some sectarian creed. The denominational system was not successful in teaching religion, and therefore he would have no creed at all taught in the school; that might be done by the clergyman or parents at other times. But according to the present system they gave grants to those who did not want them, and withheld them from those who did. He had taken great interest in a ragged school where Roman Catholics and Protestants were taught together; but they could not get a small sum from the Board to enable the school to be maintained. The Board said, "If the children are paupers, let them go to the poorhouse; if they are criminals let them be put into gaol." At the last examination of the school he made some inquiry into their funds, and found that more money was got for the school through the Industrial School Act than they had actually asked for before; but he found that it was got in this way — some of the children were brought up before the magistrates for petty offences, and then, when they were branded as criminals, a grant was given for them. But would it not have been better to save the children from the brand which, through the fault of some, to a certain extent, was attached to the whole school?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON: Sir, I have listened with much attention to the interesting discussion which has taken place upon this subject, and I confess that I am glad to see so thin a House upon the occasion; because I do not think it possible to have a good practical discussion in a crowded House upon a question in the abstract so dry. I have no desire to enter at any length into the subject after the able speeches that have been made by my hon. Friend the Member for Stamford and the hon. Member for Edinburgh. But there are nevertheless one or two points upon which I am desirous of saying a few words. Now it appears to me that, from some cause or another, the present system of National Education is regarded throughout the country with dissatisfaction and distrust. I am not disposed to attribute this dissatisfaction and distrust to individual feeling, but rather to the system itself. But while I am conscious of the defects of the system I am willing to admit that it is very difficult, after a certain system has so long existed and grown up to such an extent as the present one, to tear it up by the roots, and substitute for it another system of a wholly different character. If the evils complained of could be corrected without resorting to so strong a remedy, no doubt such a correction would be most desirable, and I cannot help thinking that the right hon. Gentleman opposite has a great opportunity before him. The whole of this interesting subject has been dealt with in a most able and argumentative manner in the Report of the Royal Commission. There is scarcely one of the defects of the system that is not boldly handled, and if the right hon. Gentleman would but direct his attention to that Report, with a determination to act as the really responsible head of the Department of Education, I believe that he would find that the recommendations of the Commissioners afforded elements for the engrafting upon the present system material improvements which would go far to correct the evils so generally complained of. I heard with much satisfaction the notice which was given this evening by the hon. Member for Berkshire (Mr. Walter), anticipating as I do the most beneficial results from the Committee of Inquiry which he proposed next Session to move for. The fact that the unassisted schools derive no benefit from the grant is one of the most serious character. It is a mystery to me how hon. Members representing in this House the whole of the population, can consider it consistent with their duty to vote away nearly one million of money taken from taxes contributed by the whole population, and devote it to the interest of not more than one-half of them. I think it is inconsistent with our duty to give our consent to a distribution of the public money so partial and unequal. If there be one cause more than another which leads to the total neglect of a great portion of the population, it is, I believe, the excessive centralization of the system. I have again and again entreated the right hon. Gentleman opposite to reflect upon this fact, and have said that I do not believe that you will ever get the education system satisfactorily worked until you have largely called local assistance to your aid. We employ local assistance in almost every other branch of our administration; why, then, should we exclude it in regard to National Education? I believe that the elements of local assistance exist at present in a manner deserving of our consideration. I allude to the diocesan boards now established in almost every county, and which I think might be made available for the carrying out of the system. I have thought if a plan could be framed by which those diocesan boards could be brought into harmonious action with a central department, that you might rapidly organize a system which would go far to correct a grave defect — namely, the want of the assistance to those small schools which cannot at present come into your terms. If you will look to the Report of the Royal Commission you will find some such suggestion made. I think that this suggestion is well worthy the consideration of the Government before the arrival of the next Session, when a Committee of Inquiry will be moved for by the hon. Member for Berkshire. Such a question could not be placed in abler hands than that of the hon. Gentleman, who has so long distinguished himself by the manner in which he has promoted the cause of education. I am quite sure that if that Committee be moved for, neither the Government nor this House will refuse it. Before, however, the time arrives for that Motion, I hope the right hon. Gentleman will consider whether he cannot obviate the necessity for such an inquiry by proposing some scheme which will correct the evils which have been so often adverted to, and which it is impossible for the right hon. Gentleman to deny. My hon. Friend the Member for North Staffordshire (Mr. Adderley) has alluded to another subject, which is well worthy the consideration of the Government. I mean the present system under which new minutes are from time to time laid upon the table. I think that we ought not to submit to the continuance of this system, believing it to be open to grave objections and serious inconvenience. Now the 150th and 151st sections of the Revised Code were passed in order to give security against the possibility of surprise; notwithstanding which, I think we have reason to complain of the many and sudden changes that are made from time to time in the system. It appears to me that whatever new minutes may be thought necessary during the year, they should not be made until the month of January, when they might be embodied in the new Code, and then laid before Parliament, so that Parliament should have a full opportunity of considering the changes. Unless such a construction is put upon those articles I confess I see much evil arising from them. It is impossible to expect that the attention of this House can be constantly directed to those frequent changes from day to day and from month to month, indicated by the new minutes laid before the House, while it would be a great advantage if it were understood that there was one particular period of the Session when the Minister of Education would draw the attention of the House to any proposed change. There is one other subject to which I wish to allude. I mean the question of the conscience clauses. An important correspondence has taken place, and been laid on the table, between the Government Department of Education and the National Society. Now, I feel I should be shrinking from my public duty if I did not say that I think the Committee of Council are essentially right in requiring the insertion of those clauses. I deeply regret the part which the National Society has taken in this matter. It is very painful for me to be compelled to declare my disapprobation of any part of the conduct of a society to which the country is so much indebted for the admirable spirit and zeal in which for many years it has promoted education. Nevertheless I feel compelled to say I think that the position which the National Society has taken up in respect to these clauses is wholly indefensible, because they require all schools to conform to their terms of union. Now those terms preclude a minority of Dissenters from benefiting by those schools. The answer of the National Society is, no doubt, "We have given you a discretion." But I consider that it is impossible to accept this answer, because I look upon it as really no answer at all. How unfair it is to those who act under the terms of the union to say you have a discretion! One clergyman finds it perhaps consistent with his conscience to avail himself of that discretion. But another says "I feel myself bound by the terms of union, and must act upon them." I will go so far as to say that this defence resorted to by the National Society really, I think, aggravates the case, because it makes the case of the Dissenter of one parish different from that of another. I trust that the day may come when the National Society will see fit to put an end to this state of things by altering their charter and the terms of union. At all events, it appears to me that the Committee of Council are only doing their duty in pursuing the course which they have taken.

Lord HARRY VANE said, he fully concurred in the expression of regret uttered by the right hon. Baronet, that the National Society were not inclined to relax its rules, which were inconsistent with the existing circumstances of the country; but he could not agree with the right hon. Gentleman in thinking that a general system, which he believed the people would not assent to, should be attempted to be introduced throughout the country. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman who had charge of the Department would attend to some of the remarks which were made by the hon. Member for Edinburgh, and, if possible, introduce some improvements into the system. He had no objection to the appointment of a Select Committee early next Session, nor did he think that the Motion for such a Committee could be in better hands than those of the hon. Member for Berkshire, and, therefore, he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would have no difficulty in assenting to its appointment. He must, however, object to the notion that it was possible to abolish the present system, and substitute for it one of general rating, to the entire exclusion of the voluntary principle. He did not deny that the present system was capable of any improvements, but he believed that his right hon. Friend near him had introduced many valuable changes which, if they were followed up, would bear good fruit.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER said, that the idea of the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. Black), that there might be a religious education without creeds or anything denominational in its character was impossible of realization. The hon. Gentleman suggested that the children should read the New Testament; but there were many texts of the New Testament as to the meaning of which the children might inquire, and of which it would be impossible for a teacher to give any explanation without touching upon controversial ground. Religion entirely freed from denominationalism would sink into mere indifferentism, and indifferentism was mere Deism or no religion at all. It could not be Christianity, because that must be definite. The secular system was open to equal or still graver objections. It would be impossible to give more than the mere rudiments of instruction without raising some questions of religion. Take, for instance, the study of modern history and the great question of the Reformation. The only way to carry out such a system would be to sink religion altogether, and teach history and other things to which religious considerations were essential without those essentials, the result of which would be to lead the children to regard religion as a matter of no importance whatever. He believed that the system which existed in England, the denominational system, was the best that could be adopted; and one proof that it was so was to be found in the fact, that the National system of Ireland, which was based upon a diametrically opposite principle, had by the force of circumstances been compelled to adopt to a great extent the denominational form. Any attempt to restore to it its original character would make it to a great extent inoperative. They ought to be thankful for the denominational system in England, and the more the Irish system was assimilated to it in that respect the more satisfactory it would be.

Mr. BLACK said, that in Scotland there were very excellent schools where religion was taught without reference to creed at all.

Mr. LOWE said, that situated as he still was in regard to this matter, he would very much rather have taken no part in the debate: he felt, however, that it might be deemed unfair if he left his right hon. Friend the Vice President of the Committee of Council to answer for his misdeeds, and he therefore rose to offer a few explanations on points in which the administration of the Committee during the last year had been impugned. As to the controversy which had broken out between the hon. Members for Edinburgh (Mr. Black) and Dundalk (Sir George Bowyer) he might observe that the justification of the present system, if it had any, lay not in any abstract principle but in the necessity of the case. It was the will of the country to have a denominational system. It was not worth arguing the question, for it was, as it seemed to him, a political necessity. That being the case it followed that as the denominational element was not strong enough to support itself, and as the House would recoil from the expense of maintaining out of the public purse three or four schools in the same place to suit different denominations, some compromise must be effected, and the result was the present system by which the schools were supported partly from one source and partly from another. The necessary consequence of that state of things was a central administration, with, on the one hand, all the complexity and difficulties which had been pointed out; and on the other a very partial expenditure of the public money. Until wealth, generosity, and public spirit could be made equal all over the country, and as long as the grants were dependent on voluntary contributions, there must necessarily be inequality. There might be Committees without end; but if they started from the position of the denominational plan they would never get rid of that fundamental and insuperable difficulty. To complain of inequality was to cast blame, not on the administration, but on the system itself. As to the question of the supplemental rules raised by the hon. Baronet the Member for Stamford (Sir Stafford Northcote) in his very temperate and candid speech, he contended that the Committee of Council did not exceed their authority in issuing these rules. The original proposal of the Committee of Council was grouping by age—that the examination of children should be conducted not according to classification in school, but according to age. That proposition was violently opposed in the House, and the Government saw fit to give way on it. In the end it was arranged that the children should be examined in six standards, and that the managers should put them in these standards. The terms of the proposal were exceedingly vague, and could hardly of themselves embrace the whole working of the system. Experience proved that such was the case. The first thing pointed out to the Committee of Council was that a boy might be in age below the highest class, and yet by his diligence and ability might have reached the highest class. By the rule, however, he could not be examined in a standard twice, and the school would lose his grant for the next year. The Committee of Council therefore relaxed the rule to meet that case, and announced that they would allow the boy in question to be put below the place he would otherwise occupy, to be put down a class or two, so that the school should not lose anything by his precocity. Another point was that an Inspector who found a school deficient in instruction had the power of reducing the grant by not more than a half or less than a tenth. As the rule stood, it was possible that it might be eluded altogether, for a schoolmaster might place all the children in the lowest standard, where they would only have to read words of one syllable, to enumerate figures, and to write single letters, and then claim the grant for his school. It was certainly not the intention either of the Government or of Parliament that such an abuse should be permitted. The Committee of Council issued no new rule on the subject, but merely exercised their power under the Revised Code to make a deduction from the grant if a schoolmaster placed all his children so low that there was none above the second standard, taking that as evidence that the instruction was not what it ought to be. It was quite clear that the practice of placing children so low was an infraction of the rules agreed to by Parliament, and it was right that the Committee of Council should have power to check the unfair acquisition of public money which might be attempted by construing the regulation loosely or in bad faith. Many admonitions had been addressed to his right hon. Friend the Vice President. He would not, however, presume to admonish him from his side, because he was sure it was not necessary to tell him that though it was his duty to conciliate the managers in all fitting ways, he had also a duty to discharge towards the taxpayers; and unless a man in his position kept a strong firm hand on the expenditure, and unless he was prepared to brave some degree of public obloquy and expose himself to much trouble and vexation, he could not fill the office with honour to himself or benefit to his country. His hon. Friend (Sir Stafford Northcote) had also raised a question as to the rules concerning the payment of masters. He could not expect that the House would allow him to go into the details of the matter, but he would try briefly to explain it. The rule referred to was made for the protection of the masters, and for that object alone. Before it was adopted, a master was entitled to be paid an augmented grant by the State, and ran no risk of having any of it misappropriated. That advantage was lost when the master was left to make his own terms with the managers. There was supposed to be a danger —an imaginary danger, no doubt — that the money might not reach the teacher through the managers ; and it was agreed that he should have a charge on the money to the amount of the augmentation, and that if he were not duly paid by the managers the Government should stop the grant or pay so much of it over to him. That provision was given exclusively for the benefit of the masters. Subsequently, however, the arrangement was made that the pupil-teachers should be paid by the Government if the grant was not sufficient. That rule, which was not contemplated when the other was made, gave quite a new complexion to the system. The managers became anxious not to pay the masters in order that by an appearance of exhausted means they might get payment for pupil-teachers. The rule, therefore, had been construed, not as it was intended, for the benefit of the masters, but for the benefit of the managers, who were thus enabled to obtain from the Privy Council an allowance to which they were not entitled. With regard to evening schools, in order to obtain a grant, it was required that a pupil should attend so many times, but nothing was said as to average attendance. The Code being silent on the subject, the Committee of Council determined that forty sittings of the school should be deemed an average attendance. That was, it appeared to him, a fair and reasonable proposal. Other smaller points had been started into which he would not pretend to go. Allowing for the immense difficulty of managing these things, and the absolute necessity of protecting the public revenue against any blot in the regulations, a free, liberal, and not a jealous construction should be placed on the rules of a Department which had to deal with persons so anxious to get the largest possible share of the public money, and so acute in studying the system in order to attain that object. With regard to the complaint as to the minutes, as far as he was concerned, he would be satisfied that no minute should be altered except by Act of Parliament. He was tempted to sympathize with Lycurgus, who made his laws and then told the Spartans to obey them till he came back, which he took care not to do. Without saying that all the measures of his time were good, or all the legislation perfect, he believed it was not likely to be improved by anything that could be forced on the gentlemen at the head of the office by the House without a single exception. Every interference of the House with the Department had been with the object either of reducing its efficiency or increasing the expenditure. It was said the Department was unpopular, and probably the reason was because it administered with so much strictness the funds committed to its control. The Education Vote amounted in 1861 to £840,000. It was going on at the rate of nearly £100,000 a year, and but for the most obnoxious regulations which were introduced by the enemies of the human race who presided over the Department, it might at the present moment have reached £1,200,000 or £1,300,000 instead of £700,000, and have swallowed up that penny in the Income Tax which everybody was so glad to see taken off. When, he might add, the administrators of the Department were charged with being prim, and precise, and harsh, and with having very little feeling for the unfortunate persons whose receipts might be cut down, it ought to be borne in mind that they were exercising a great public trust, and that while, on the one hand, the education given did not suffer in point of efficiency since the changes which were so much complained of had been introduced, on the other hand, a stand had been made on behalf of the taxpayer, and those demands resisted which would infallibly have broken down the whole system, which had, he contended, got a new change of life by the alterations in question.

MR. LYGON admitted that the system, as administered by the Council of Education, was unpopular, but that was because it had lately put itself out of harmony with the spirit of the taxpayers of the country; and the real secret of the distaste with which it was regarded was, that while it professed to accept the denominational system as a political necessity, the whole efforts of the Committee and of its subordinates had been mainly directed towards breaking down the denominational system. He thought it would be far more satisfactory to the taxpayers at large if the regulations respecting these grants were embodied in a definite legal form, and not based on such a nebulous system of minutes. The denominational system would be far preferable to that now sought to be introduced. What was the principle of that system? Why, that the State undertook to aid the efforts of the various schools throughout the country, in union with the two or three great religious societies of the country. Much obloquy had been cast during these discussions on the National Society, but its object had been forgotten. The object of this Society was not merely to teach the multiplication table, but to educate the poor in the principles of the Established Church. That was the great trust confided to the Society, and he thought that great credit was due to those who had laboured to check the unpopular proceedings of the Privy Council on Education. He thought that education, to be worth anything, should be founded on religion, and that principle had been distinctly approved by the House of Commons. The teaching of reading, writing, and arithmetic did not constitute education. Education, to be good for anything, should teach a man his duties to God and to his neighbour; and it was impossible for any body of professing Christians to touch this subject without the inculcation of definite principles as to religious teaching. Religious education was a fundamental principle with the people of England. No doubt some confusion had arisen from mixing up the denominational system with the voluntary system. He regretted very much that the Committee of Privy Council made their various aggressions in the way they had. The National Society was subject to aggressions and humiliations which no other body in the country having charge of education were subject to. It was extremely desirable that the Educational grant should be administered with strict impartiality; and an impression largely prevailed throughout the country that the members of the Established Church were not treated with strict impartiality. In their efforts to establish schools they were subjected to pressure, to terms, and to suggestions; and hindrances were thrown in their way which were not extended to members of any other religious community. So long as that was the case, so long would dissatisfaction exist, and so long would the Committee of Council be unpopular. He did not for a moment believe that the members of the Church of England, whose zeal and liberality in the cause of education were well known, and who made large exertions and sacrifices for that cause, were animated by such sordid notions as the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Lowe) attributed to them.

Mr. PUGH said, he wished to make some remarks with reference to that part of the country with which he was connected. He had observed with great pleasure that it was stated in the report of the Inspector in South Wales, which had lately appeared, that that country had made great progress in education, even since the Revised Code was established. It was right that this should be made known, because great doubts existed at the time whether that would be so, and whether some of the schools would not be injured. In that respect the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne had proved a true prophet; for he very kindly said, when these difficulties were pointed out, that the Welsh children were remarkable for their intelligence, and would overcome all obstacles. If there was one part of the speech which he had just made which he (Mr. Pugh) had listened to with less pleasure than another, or from which he might venture to differ, it was that part of it in which he gave it as his opinion that nothing could be done to remedy those evils of the present system which had been so forcibly depicted, whereby large tracts of country were left untouched by the Education grant. If those evils were felt in a rich country like England, much more must they be so in the remote and rural districts of Wales. They were forcibly exhibited in a Return moved for by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire, showing that large cities and towns absorbed vast sums, while rural districts were comparatively unprovided for. He, therefore, hoped that something would be done to take their case into consideration, and if it was found to be irremediable, the managers would then have the satisfaction of thinking that their grievance had been fairly inquired into. They had no wish to get any of the public money for nothing—

"Pater ipse colendi
Haud facilem esse viam voluit;"

they knew this; they duly appreciated the difficulties by which they were surrounded, and were prepared to struggle with them.

Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £97,582, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for the General Management of the Department of Science and Art, of the Schools throughout the Kingdom in connection with the Department, and of the Geological Surveys of Great Britain and Ireland, &c."

Mr. GREGORY said, he did not intend to go on with his Notice for calling attention to the management of the institution at Kensington. If he were to call attention to the improper manner in which the purchases were conducted, according to the latter paragraph of his Notice, he must ask for a Committee of Inquiry, and at that late period of the Session he should not be willing to serve upon a Committee of Inquiry himself, nor should he find it easy to induce any other hon. Gentleman to do so. He hoped, however, that the Vice President of the Education Committee would look into the matter during the recess, and that it might be unnecessary for him to demand such an investigation next Session. Meanwhile, he could not refrain from calling attention to some portions of the Vote now before the Committee. In one item, the amount of which was no less than £16,000, a whole host of subjects—examples, diagrams, objects of art, catalogues, &c.—were huddled together in a manner which gave facilities for manipulating the public money in a way that should not be tolerated for a single day. The whole item might as well have been put at once under the head of "etceteras." He wanted to have each item set clearly and distinctly before the Committee, so that every one could ascertain at a glance what sum had been spent on each object of art, and what was the exact amount of expenditure under each head. He was asking for nothing out of the way, or what was not required from any other Department. Nothing could be clearer, or more correct, than the manner in which the Votes were taken for the British Museum, and he saw no reason why the same plan should not be followed in the case of the Kensington institution. He was also of opinion that some explanation should be given of certain recent purchases for Kensington — he thought they trenched rather on what belonged to other departments. Some time ago a fresco was bought for £480; but it was perfectly obvious that a purchase of that kind, if made at all, ought to have been made for the National Gallery. The excuse for it was that the fresco represented certain costumes, and that it was consequently suited to the meridian of Kensington. But if that were an excuse, pictures of the old German and Spanish schools might be purchased; in fact, a complete picture gallery might be established at Kensington. Recently, too, large sums had been given for the drawings of Mulready for the School of Design. He did not say it was improper that the drawings of Mulready should be purchased for the nation, nor did he assert that they were not fitted for a School of Design; but if they were to purchase drawings of that high class and at that high price, the Kensington people might just as well buy drawings of Raphael and the other great masters —they were just as appropriate to a School of Design. Kensington had likewise made a purchase of antiquities which ought to have been secured for the department of the British Museum, and in this instance a formal and serious remonstrance had been presented to "My Lords" of the Treasury by the trustees of the latter institution. Surely nothing could be more absurd or irregular than for two public establishments to compete with each other for specimens of the same description. He did not deny that it might be necessary to have some objects of classical art in the School of Design, but then he would suggest that such objects should not be purchased for the Kensington establishment except after communication with the British Museum, and even then, if possible, by an officer of the latter institution. Only two persons, in fact, should be allowed to have anything to do with purchases. Their respective provinces should be distinctly marked out, the one having to certify for all objects intended for modern art, and the other to certify for all objects intended for mediæval art. If that were insisted upon, and if those officers were brought before the Board when there was business to transact, instead of leaving matters to be dealt with by long reports, they would get rid of many of those irregularities which were being freely commented on by the public, which were adding to the weight of odium now daily increasing against the department at Kensington, and which, sooner or later, he believed, would arouse such a feeling of indignation in that House that the whole concern would be swept away—a result which he should most sincerely regret. He should reserve the statement which he had intended to make till the next Session, when if matters did not mend in some respect he would certainly ask for a Committee of Inquiry into the whole of these proceedings.

Mr. H. A. BRUCE admitted that it would be more convenient and more conformable to the usual practice if the item of £16,000 in this Vote were divided under different heads. The charges of his hon. Friend on other points were not sufficiently distinct for him to grapple with them. With respect to the purchase of the fresco, he understood that the National Gallery did not purchase frescoes, and he thought the department would have been wrong in neglecting an opportunity of purchasing a beautiful specimen of this class of art when they had the opportunity of getting them at a cheap rate. So in regard to Mr. Mulready's drawings, they were copies well fitted for study in the schools, and the money paid for them had been extremely well laid out. A thorough understanding existed between the British Museum and the department at Kensington in respect to purchases. Whenever doubts arose, as must occasionally happen, whether articles ought properly to be purchased by the one or the other, in all those cases a conference took place between the two bodies. The department did not profess to purchase classical antiquities as such; but many of those antiquities bore closely on the progress of art, which progress it was their object to illustrate. It would be impossible to conduct those purchases so as never in any individual instance to leave room for hostile criticism; but the collection, as a whole, was of immense value, and if brought to the hammer to-morrow would fetch far more than it had cost.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER said, that at the Kensington Museum there were a number of beautiful specimens of Italian art, and he should like to know how they were come by. That Museum always reminded him of the shop of a receiver of stolen goods. He was afraid that many of the beautiful works there were the fruits of what was called the "moral support," but what he ventured to call the "immoral support" which the noble Lord at the head of the Government gave to the revolutionary party in Italy who plundered churches and religious houses. He was afraid that our Government had somehow got hold of some of the property so acquired. ["Oh!"] The Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs cried "Oh!" but that was no answer. Chief Justice Hale said that the receiver was worse than the thief; and he should be sorry if this country was placed in that category. In the Kensington Museum there was a sedan chair, a beautiful work of art, which belonged to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, with whose name it was ticketed. What business had they with that? They had purchased it with notice; they knew to whom it belonged. Did they buy it of Garibaldi? He should confine himself to that sedan chair, and must ask the right hon. Gentleman to tell them something about it: how they got it, whether they intended to send it back to the rightful owner, and, if not, why not?

Colonel W. STUART wished to know if the hon. and learned Baronet had ever seen the beautiful collection of pictures in the Vatican at Rome? Because a great many of these pictures had been taken from their owners by the French and afterwards given up to the Papal Government. That Government had not restored them to the original owners. In keeping them was it, according to the hon. Baronet, a receiver of stolen goods?

Mr. BAZLEY said, that great dissatisfaction was spreading in the country at the rigid economy practised towards the provincial schools of art, while extravagant sums were given to the school at Kensington. Such an inequitable mode of distributing that Vote would not, he believed, be tolerated much longer.

Mr. AUGUSTUS SMITH called attention to the great increase which took place annually in this Vote. In ten years it had more than doubled. In order to test the opinion of the Committee on the subject, he should move that the Vote be reduced by £15,000, the inrease this year.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £82,582, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for the General Management of the Department of Science and Art, of the Schools throughout the Kingdom in connection with the Department, and of the Geological Surveys of Great Britain and Ireland, &c."—(*Mr. Augustus Smith.*)

MR. MAGUIRE thought the Vote required the grave consideration of the Committee. He denied, in the most emphatic manner, that the collection at the Kensington Museum was an advantage to the country generally, and he appealed to the Members of the Select Committee whether what he had stated was not correct? It was professed that the travelling museum, consisting of a very few objects of very little value, was sent to England and Scotland to promote a taste for art; but it was a very ingenious but not ingenuous proceeding of the authorities, to send the exhibition to Dublin at the time of the Agricultural Show, and, although it did not attract in the face of the superior attractions of the cattle show, to take credit for bringing the people to the Irish capital. The provinces had been starved in order to make a raree show of the Kensington Museum. He hoped his hon. Friend the Member for Galway would next Session probe this evil to the bottom.

MR. DILLWYN said, he did not consider it was the business of the Government to teach science and art, and they certainly had proved that they were not competent to do it. He did not think our collections of pictures and of articles of art should be frittered away between the National Gallery, the British Museum, and the establishment at South Kensington. He would have a National Gallery worthy of the nation, and then would send all the pictures to the National Gallery and all the works of art to the British Museum.

MR. AYRTON said, that up to this time he had been under the impression that the Department of Science and Art confined itself to the collection of the odds and ends which make up the exhibition at South Kensington. But it would seem that the Department was now applying itself to literary pursuits, in order to combine science, art, and literature. It had just taken a literary turn, and had published a book entitled, *Mumbo Jumbo; or, the Mountains of the Moon in the Gaboon.* He had had the misfortune to read that production, and certainly it was the most remarkable compound of nonsense he had ever perused in his life. At first one might suppose that there was some concealed wit in it—some lurking fun or humour in it; but there was none. It was a concatenation of nonsense such as might be expected to come from a combination of children of twelve years of age writing a dramatic sketch under the superintendence of some grown person devoid of sense. The thing would not deserve any consideration but for one circumstance. A well-conducted and respectable person connected with the Museum had been asked, whether it was true that he was to take a part in the representation of the drama of *Mumbo Jumbo; or, the Mountains of the Moon in the Gaboon;* and whether, in order to make himself more interesting in the eyes of the enlightened audience, he was to make his face as black as a coal? He replied that this performance was under the patronage of the Coles, and that it would be necessary for him to blacken his face to that extent, even though he might look foolish. He said he had a wife and children and had no chance—he was compelled to make a fool of himself on the occasion. Under these circumstances, he had to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether public servants at South Kensington, who might be respectable considering the salaries they received, had been obliged to blacken their faces and take a part in the coarse, monstrous, and senseless performance that he was told had taken place in the Botanical Gardens? He did not know whether hon. Gentlemen had been present at the performance, if so, the House might have the advantage of hearing a better account than he had been able to give of the affair. He had only read the production. That was quite enough to make him avoid the Botanical Gardens on the occasion. It was really a serious thing if respectable public servants had to make fools of themselves. Such a proceeding would be in the last degree degrading to our sense of public decency, and to the refinement and feeling which was supposed to exist in this country. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give the House an assurance that the Science and Art Department would not embark in literary pursuits or dramatic performances.

MR. H. A. BRUCE said, that the questions which he had to reply to were almost as various as the objects in the South Kensington Museum. First of all he must assure his hon. and learned Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets, that the performance to which he referred had no connection with the South Kensington Museum; certainly the sums included in the Vote had not been applied to any such purpose. Then the hon. Member for Manchester (Mr. Bazley) had objected to this collection that it was confined to the metropolis. Now that was an objection that would apply to every metropolitan collection. As to the proposal of the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) to remove all the pictures to the National Gallery, a great number of the pictures at South Kensington were by contemporary artists, which class of works were not admitted into the National Gallery, and there were bequests, such as the Sheepshanks Collection, to which was attached a condition that would prevent them from being exhibited in the National Gallery. As to the reduction proposed in the Vote, he would remind the House that the buildings which it was necessary to finish in order to accommodate a valuable collection had already been approved of. It would be premature to discuss a question that was at present being considered by a Select Committee; but having read the evidence already taken by that Committee, he might remark that there was a great deal of testimony strongly favourable to the maintenance of the schools at South Kensington and to the Museum itself. He hoped the Committee would not consent to adopt the Amendment.

Colonel SYKES directed the attention of the Committee to the fact, that there were large items to be voted which it was not fair to charge to the Science and Art Department at South Kensington. There was £47,000 for Schools of Art in the United Kingdom. The item for buildings had increased from £11,000 to £24,000, and the grant for the Royal Dublin Society had increased by a sum of £700.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, the question was, whether the country schools got their fair share of the purchases? But the discussion was premature because the subject was now before a Committee upstairs, and ought to be left open until they had reported.

Mr. HENNESSY, referring to the statement that Ireland was not fairly treated in respect of this expenditure, said, that among the successful candidates for the Queen's medals in the Science Examination of 1863 were, in physics, Joshua Doherty, a student of the North of Ireland, who carried off the gold medal, and Cornelius O'Sullivan, a student from the South of Ireland, who carried off a silver medal. In chemistry the gold medal was won by Richard Geogan, and a silver medal by John Conolly, both students of the South of Ireland. In geology the silver medal was obtained by Robert Smith, and the second medal by George Donaldson, both students of the North of Ireland. In botany a silver medal was obtained by Elizabeth Maffet, a student of Belfast, the second by Lizzie Carson, also of Belfast, the third by Marianne Johns, of Carrickfergus, and the fourth by Samuel Stewart, who was also an Irish student. This showed not only the ability and industry of the Irish students, but also that they got fair play from the Department.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, that anything more discreditable to art than the decoration of the building did not, in his opinion, exist in this country. Great dissatisfaction also existed with the purchases made on account of the Museum; but it seemed impossible to find anybody who was responsible for them. Last year a sum was voted for the residences of officials connected with the Museum. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Lowe) then said, that when the officials were lodged in those houses there would be a deduction from their salaries corresponding with the annual value of their houses. Had this arrangement been carried into effect?

Mr. BUXTON said, that less importance was to be attached to the statement of the hon. Member (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) that the decorations were execrable, because it was pretty well known that the hon. Member was rarely satisfied with anything. Persons who were competent to give an opinion, thought the decorations were exceedingly beautiful, and that great credit was due to Captain Fowke, or to those who were responsible for them.

Mr. MAGUIRE said, that the Department took to itself more credit than belonged to it, because in the majority of cases the people were not attracted by the travelling museum, but attended for the purpose of seeing the fat pigs, fine horses, and beautiful short horns.

Mr. HASSARD differed from the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. Maguire), and contended that the travelling museum in Ireland had been the source of much gratification to the people of that country, and had more than paid its cost.

Mr. GREGORY asked, whether the sum voted for the library had been expended entirely upon it?

Mr. LOWE said, that some injustice had been done to the officials of the South Kensington Museum, because perfect responsibility existed there. For the purchases the President and Vice President for the time being were responsible. They were advised by two gentlemen called referees — one (Mr. Redgrave, R.A.) for modern art from 1750 down to the present time, and the other (Mr. Robinson) for ancient art up to 1750. The referees sent in their recommendations; Mr. Redgrave, who was also Inspector General of Art, advised upon them, and the President and Vice President decided. He was sorry that the sense of duty which induced the hon. Member (Mr. Gregory) to propose to call attention to the improper purchases, did not lead him to carry on his investigation before making a statement on the subject. He regretted that the term "improper" should have been employed, because it appeared to imply that there was some disgrace or discredit attached to some one, and the hon. Member should not have used that word unless he intended to substantiate it. The fresco of Perugino was a fresco painting, which, as a specimen of ornament for the interior of houses, was deemed by many a desirable addition to the Museum. The Museum was not, as a general rule, regarded as a receptacle for pictures at all. They were only placed there when there was no room for them elsewhere, or when, as was the case with the Sheepshanks Collection, the donor requested that such a course might be pursued.

Mr. H. A. BRUCE said, that the library in one particular year had shown a balance in the receipts over the expenditure, and that that balance, by the authority of the Treasury, had been applied to the repair of the roads. Residences were found for four officers, and, as the Museum was open until ten o'clock at night, it was necessary to have officers upon the spot. Previous to the building of those residences, two officers were accommodated elsewhere, and that accommodation was regarded as part of their salary. The question with respect to the other two was now under consideration.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK asked if any part of the £15,000 was to be applied to the decorations?

Mr. H. A. BRUCE said, that the money was strictly applicable to the building.

Question put,

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 73; Noes 131: Majority 58.

Original Question put, and *agreed to*.

House *resumed*.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow*.

Committee to sit again *To-morrow*.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL—[Bill 167.]—LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Lords Amendments *considered*, and, with Amendments to one of them, *agreed to*, as far as the second Amendment, in page 2, line 36.

The second Amendment, in page 2, line 36, to leave out the words, "once in each month," and insert the words, "if required to do so by the conditions of his licence," read 2°.

Mr. HUNT said, he proposed to move that the House do disagree with the Amendment introduced by the Lords in Clause 5, and he asked the House to do so with the more confidence, because it had on a previous occasion passed his own Amendment by a considerable majority. The clause, as it went up to the Lords, was to the effect, that if any holder of a licence from the Secretary of State, who should be at large in this country, unless prevented by illness or other unavoidable cause, failed to report himself to the police within three days after his arrival in England, and subsequently once a month at such places and in such manner as the chief officer of police should appoint, he should be guilty of a misdemeanour. The Lords had struck out the words "once a month," leaving the question whether the ticket-of-leave man should report himself at all after his arrival, to the terms and conditions of his licence. The form of licence in the Bill contained no such condition, and therefore the Lords' Amendment would reduce the clause inserted by the House of Commons to a nullity. It was true the Home Office had power to grant licences in a new form, but those licences would not apply under the terms of the Bill. The alteration in the Bill in the House of Lords was made under peculiar circumstances, for two decisions were come to. On the first occasion the House of Lords affirmed the decision of the House of Commons. On the second occasion they negatived that decision, but the attendance was much smaller than on the former occasion. In support of the opinion which he had expressed, he begged to refer to a Report which had been laid on the table within the last two or three days, in which it was stated, with respect to the prisons in Ireland, that the number of reconvictions had not increased within the year, and that the practice of registration and supervision continued to work advantageously; and the Report further stated that, during the many years in which the convict system had been in operation, no instance had come to the knowledge of the Commissioners in which any complaint had been made against any constable, so far as regarded their supervision having prevented any person from getting employment.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with The Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Hunt.*)

Sir GEORGE GREY said, he hoped the House would agree to the Amendment. He thought it a very beneficial alteration, and had been deliberately adopted after a very full discussion. It would remove the absolute bar that would otherwise exist to the ticket-of-leave man obtaining employment.

Mr. MOOR inquired, whether the Government supported the Resolution of the House of Lords that the holders of tickets-of-leave should report themselves to the police once a month?

Sir HUGH CAIRNS said, it was his intention to support the Motion for disagreeing with the Lords' Amendment, because if that Amendment was carried it would have the effect of altering the Irish system which had worked so well.

Question put,

The House *divided*:—Ayes 129; Noes 84: Majority 45.

Subsequent Amendments *agreed to.*

Committee *appointed,*

"To draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to the Amendment to which this House hath disagreed:"—Mr. Hunt, Sir John Pakington, Sir Hugh Cairns, Mr. Adderley, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Marsh, and Mr. Beach:—To withdraw immediately:—Three to be the quorum.

GREEK LOAN BILL—[Bill 144.]

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Colonel DUNNE said, he wished to inquire whether the loan was really a dotation for life to the King of Greece or merely intended to last during the period he remained upon the throne. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer on a former evening seemed to be under the impression that the treaty was intended to confer the dotation for life; but, if so, that view was directly opposed to the terms of the Bill before the House, and having gone all through the papers on the subject, he felt perfectly certain that they contained nothing to warrant that interpretation. Were the other parties to the treaty equally bound to continue the dotation for life? If so, he had been unable to discover the provisions to that effect. It was expressly described as a personal dotation "to be added to the civil list of Greece." Clearly, therefore, when the civil list came to an end, as it would do if the throne became vacant, the addition must drop as well. According to the treaty made in 1859, a sum of 900,000f., equivalent to £20,000 a year, was to be paid from the Greek Treasury. England's share of that sum would come to about £6,666, of which we had given up £4,000 yearly to the King of Greece, and had voted away more than the balance in salaries to officials. In addition to that, upon the treaty for the annexation of the Ionian Islands, £10,000 a year had been settled upon the King of Greece as a first charge on the revenue of those islands; and what was most extraordinary, the claims of our own countrymen, amounting to £7,000 yearly, had been deferred and made a second charge. A more blundering and dangerous treaty he never remembered. The correspondence relative to the annexation of the Ionian Islands was very amusing. It was stated that the parting of the King of Greece with the then Sovereign of Denmark was an affecting scene. The King of Denmark embraced the young King of Greece and expressed a wish that he would make Greece as happy as Denmark was at that moment. The happiness of Denmark had, however, since been rather disturbed by the proceedings of the noble Lord at the head of the Foreign Office. The Government had made a sacrifice of a large sum, and had obtained no guarantee for the payment of the loan. He observed that a sum of about £250,000 had been remitted to the Ionian Islands for one thing and another. Why did not the Government bring in an Act of Parliament to legalize these remissions as well as the King's annuity? He also wanted to know why the Chancellor of the Exchequer had contended a few nights ago that this was a dotation for the King's life, and had brought in a Bill to confine it to his reign.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that his interpretation of the treaty had been supported by the Foreign Department. No doubt the treaty contemplated the dotation for life. Why, then, it might be asked, did the Bill extend only to the reign, and recognized the contingency that the reign and the life might not be co-extensive? That was a matter of policy and propriety, and the opinion of the Foreign Office was that it would be more becoming and more prudent to draw the Bill only with reference to the reign. The Bill would give effect to the treaty in the present state of things, but he would admit that it would not give effect to the treaty in the event of the termination of the reign, by a revolution for example. It was better that the Bill should be drawn as it was, although it only gave effect to the treaty for a time—namely, while the King remained upon the throne.

Mr. HENNESSY said, he must remind the right hon. Gentleman that he told the House the other night that the Bill ought to be in exact accord with the treaty, and that the House could not consequently consider any alteration in it. The arrangement was a kind of marriage settlement between the young King of Greece and his kingdom, and as marriage settlements were drawn with provisions that contemplated a separation and protected the interests of the lady in that event, so ought the settlement to protect the interests of the King. As the Court of Russia had no Parliament to consult, it would pay £4,000 a year to the King of Greece during his life, and so would the Emperor of the French. Because, however, the English Government had to submit the treaty to the House of Commons, the Bill was drawn in such a way that the £4,000 a year was only payable during the King's reign. Her Majesty's Government had inflicted enough pain already on the family of the young King. He would, therefore, move as an Amendment that the Bill be re-committed with the object of substituting the word "life" for "reign," so as to make it agree with the treaty.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the words "That the" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "said Order be discharged,"—(*Mr. Hennessy,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. LYGON said, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had deprecated on a former night any difference between the treaty and the Bill, while he had now been the first gratuitously to introduce the element of the King's reign not being so extended as his life. The right hon. Gentleman said that the matter had been examined by the Foreign Department. But the House knew nothing of that Department. The matter was proposed upon the responsibility of the Ministers of the Crown, and it was upon them the responsibility must rest. He should support the Motion for re-committing the Bill.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that the speech of the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken exhibited that confusion of mind not unusual with him at that time in the morning. He had not thrown the responsibility upon the permanent officials of the Foreign Department; on the contrary, when he spoke of the Foreign Department he spoke of the Foreign Minister, and he took care not to separate himself from that Minister, because he stated that he concurred in what he had done. Neither had he "gratuitously" introduced the personal matter with respect to the King of the Hellenes. It was not a gratuitous introduction, but was a statement of the case absolutely necessary to remove a misapprehension which might still exist in the mind of the hon. Member, but had been removed from that of the hon. and gallant Gentleman who had introduced the subject. The case was this:—There was a claim of the British Government on behalf of certain British officials against the Government of Greece, and the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel Dunne) said, "We will connect it with an engagement to relinquish the £4,000 on behalf of the King of Greece, so that if the claim be not satisfied the King of Greece shall suffer;" but it was his (the Chancellor of the Exchequer's) duty to show them that the two parties were perfectly distinct; that if the Government of Greece did not fulfil its obligation, that might be a reason for taking measures to compel them, but could be no reason for withholding from the King, in his personal capacity, the sum of money to which he was entitled independently of the question whether he was King of Greece or not. Therefore it was in necessary connection with the subject in debate that he had introduced the matter.

Major HAMILTON supported the Amendment.

Mr. AYRTON said, he was afraid that the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman would not effect the object he had in view, because the Bill was founded on a Resolution of the whole House, and they could not go beyond the terms of that Resolution. That being the case, he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be prepared to admit that the view which he took of the question the other evening was not quite correct. It was a personal dotation to the Prince of Denmark, whether he remained King of Greece or not, and therefore it was a separate and distinct grant out of the money belonging to the people of this country, and the precedents which the right hon. Gentleman cited had no application whatever to the subject. The right hon. Gentleman by his own statement had brought the House to the inevitable conclusion that the transaction was a most irregular one. It was a grant of money which Her Majesty had no right to make unless subject to the sanction of that House. He was glad the right hon. Gentleman had made a statement which was quite in keeping with his (Mr. Ayrton's) views, but he could not but regret that the Foreign Secretary should have advised Her Majesty to exercise her prerogative in a manner which was subversive of the privileges of the House of Commons.

Mr. BUTT observed, that it was the practice of the Crown every day to surrender debts to its own subjects.

Mr. HASSARD said, he was of opinion that it would be useless to re-commit the Bill, which was in perfect harmony with the treaty. If he understood the right hon. Gentleman, it was intended to make a personal dotation of £4,000, no matter whether the King should continue on the throne of Greece or not. But the treaty dealt with him exclusively as King of Greece. How was the matter to be carried out if he should cease to be King of Greece? How was the money to be secured to him? There would be no other way of doing it but by coming to that House.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, it would not have been becoming to anticipate the contingency of the King of Greece quitting the throne, and to legislate for such a contingency; but if it should occur, then the House, no doubt, would be ready to fulfil in good faith the honourable engagements of this country. In the meantime what was proposed was in all respects regular, and if the contingency adverted to should occur, the remission would end. The rights of this country against Greece would then revive, and it would be necessary to make provision in some other way for the personal engagements undertaken towards the King of Greece.

Colonel DUNNE observed, that what he had complained of was, that while magnificent dotations were given to the King of Greece, proper provision was not made for English subjects. He trusted that some Resolution would be brought forward declaring that in future all treaties of the kind should be submitted in due time to the House.

Mr. HENNESSY said, he would, by permission of the House, withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read 3°.

Mr. LYGON said, he was not aware that he had done anything to justify the observations which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had passed on his conduct. The right hon. Gentleman mentioned the Foreign Department, and not the Foreign Minister, in connection with the provisions of the present Bill, and he advised the right hon. Gentleman in future not to hurry a Bill through the House and leave the discussion on it until the later stages.

Bill *passed.*

PILOTAGE ORDER CONFIRMATION (NO. 2) BILL.

Bill *considered* * in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, That leave be given to bring in a Bill for confirming a Provisional Order, made by the Board of Trade, under "The Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act, 1862," relating to the Pilotage of the River Tyne.

Resolution *reported.*

Bill *ordered* * to be brought in by Mr. Milner Gibson and Mr. Hutt.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 184.]

ISLE OF MAN HARBOURS ACT BILL.

Bill *considered* * in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, That leave be given to bring in a Bill for amending the Isle of Man Harbours Act, 1863.

Resolution *reported.*

Bill *ordered* * to be brought in by Mr. Milner Gibson and Mr. Hutt.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 185.]

INDIA STOCKS TRANSFER ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Sir Charles Wood, Bill to amend an Act of the twenty-fifth year of the reign of

Her present Majesty to provide for the registration and transfer of Indian Stocks at the Bank of Ireland, and for the mutual transfer of such Stocks from and to the Banks of England and Ireland respectively, *ordered** to be brought in by Sir CHARLES WOOD and Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER.

Bill *presented*, and read 1°.* [Bill 183.]

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES BILL.

Select Committee *appointed** on the Contagious Diseases Bill, to consist of Nineteen Members:—

Lord CLARENCE PAGET, Sir JOHN PAKINGTON, Mr. WALPOLE, Mr. HENNESSY, Mr. HUNT, Lord HOTHAM, Sir JAMES FERGUSSON, General PEEL, Mr. LIDDELL, Sir HARRY VERNEY, Mr. AYRTON, Sir MORTON PETO, Sir JOHN TRELAWNY, Mr. KINNAIRD, Mr. LOCKE, Marquess of HARTINGTON, Sir GEORGE GREY, Captain JERVIS, and Mr. LONGFIELD:—Five to be the quorum.

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, July 1, 1864.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Lunacy (Scotland)* (No. 172); Thames Conservancy* (No. 173); Local Government Supplemental* (No. 174).

Second Reading—Public and Refreshment Houses (Metropolis, &c.)* (No. 135).

Report—Cathedral Minor Corporations* (No. 166).

JAPAN.—RESOLUTIONS.

EARL GREY, who had given notice of Resolutions to the effect that the relations between this country and Japan appear to this House to be at present in an unsatisfactory state, and to move an Address to Her Majesty thereon, said: My Lords, the subject to which I am about to draw your Lordships' attention is one which has on more than one occasion been under the consideration of the House. Up to the present moment, however, no decided opinion has been pronounced by your Lordships as to the policy which has been pursued in Japan by Her Majesty's Government; and therefore, thinking the time has now arrived when your Lordships should be asked to deal more decisively with the matter, I have placed upon the paper the Resolutions which I shall conclude by moving. But, before I proceed further, I may be allowed to observe that my Resolutions are not intended to imply any censure on the Government. Not that I approve their policy—far otherwise; but what has been done cannot be undone, and while it is very unlikely that I could induce your Lordships to agree to a Vote of Censure, my asking you to do so would greatly diminish the probability of your Lordships being prevailed upon to express a practical opinion as to what ought to be the policy of the country for the future.

The Resolutions I am about to move have, accordingly, been so drawn as not to express any opinion as to the past; they begin by setting forth the various facts of our intercourse with Japan, and they then proceed to state the inferences which I think ought to be drawn from the facts narrated in the papers which have been laid before the House. I trust it will not be necessary for me to take up more than a small portion of your Lordships' time in showing that my statement of facts is correct, and supported by the papers. After a Resolution, which is merely introductory, the second states—

> "That it is shown by the papers laid before Parliament, by command of Her Majesty, that the treaty concluded between Her Majesty and the Tycoon of Japan, on the 26th of August, 1858, gives to British subjects in Japan rights and privileges which the Government of that country was avowedly reluctant to grant, and was only induced to confer upon them through dread of British naval and military power."

And the next—

> "That the Government of Japan has also been induced by this same fear to make with other European nations and with the United States, treaties generally similar to that which it has concluded with Her Majesty."

I might quote many passages from the despatches to show that the treaties concluded by Japan with the Western nations were not entered into willingly, but were obtained from Japan by coercion; but the fact is so notorious, and has been so explicitly avowed by Sir Rutherford Alcock (whose authority is conclusive) in his work called *The Capital of the Tycoon*, that it is needless for me to take up your Lordships' time by quotations in support of a statement which can hardly be questioned. The next Resolution proceeds to state—

> "That under the above-named treaty British subjects are entitled to claim admission into certain portions of the territory of Japan without being subject to the jurisdiction of its Government, Her Majesty having taken upon herself the obligation of enforcing on their part good conduct and obedience to the law."

This Resolution has reference to the fifth Article of the Treaty, commonly called the "exterritoriality clause," which is to the effect that Japanese subjects guilty of any criminal act towards British subjects shall be arrested and punished by the Japanese authorities, according to the laws of Japan; and any British subjects who may commit any criminal act against Japanese, shall be tried and punished by the Consuls, or other public functionaries, according to the laws of Great Britain. Your Lordships will observe that this is a distinct stipulation of reciprocity on the part of both countries. We are bound to enforce the good conduct of our own subjects, as Japan is bound also to enforce the good conduct of hers; but, unfortunately, on neither side had that obligation been fulfilled, as neither party has been able to perform what it had promised. The next Resolution I have to submit accordingly is that

> "The Reports of Her Majesty's diplomatic servants show that Her Majesty has not been able to fulfil this obligation; the provisions of the statutes authorizing Her Majesty's Consuls to try and punish British subjects for offences committed in Japan, and the means available for carrying these laws into effect, having proved altogether insufficient to prevent gross outrages and insults from being inflicted on the people of Japan by British subjects and persons assuming that character."

Now, I think that those who have paid attention to the papers that have been laid upon the table of the House must be aware that that is not an over-statement of the facts; and I will refer you particularly to the despatch of Sir Rutherford Alcock of the 21st of November, 1859, in which he describes the lawless violence which he says in less than five months after the opening of the trade had become habitual on the part of British sailors and others in the ports of Yokohama and Kanagawa. He states in this despatch that drunken sailors have been allowed to land and go about singly or in bands, offering violence to the Japanese whom they have met, or into whose shops they have intruded. He describes these outrages and the insufficiency of English law to put them down still more fully in his book than in the official correspondence; but the statements contained in his despatches were considered so strong that they produced from the Foreign Secretary a letter in severe condemnation of such conduct on the part of British subjects in that country. A letter was written on the 1st of February, 1860, by Mr. Hammond, to the East India and China Association, under the direction of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in which, after describing the state of things, he went on to say that Her Majesty's Government had a right to expect that the extension of the commerce of the country should not be neutralized by such proceedings, and that the whole weight of the commercial interests of this country should be brought to bear upon a state of things which was at once discreditable to the British name, and which was incompatible with the successful progress of our trade with Japan. Sir Rutherford Alcock, in his work on Japan, has expressed in strong language his sense of the misconduct of unscrupulous adventurers in that country. He shows that persons of higher position than common sailors have also shown a contemptuous disregard for the prejudices and long-established customs of the Japanese. I fear that the fault extends still further than Sir Rutherford Alcock alleges, and that even our diplomatic agents there are not exempt from this charge. It has been asserted that in spite of the laws of Japan, which impose the penalty of death on firing a gun within a certain distance of the residence of the Tycoon, the members of our Legation have set the example of shooting within the prohibited distance. Your Lordships will find that Sir Rutherford Alcock records in his own book an act which I will venture to call one of the greatest violence and illegality committed by himself. Sir Rutherford Alcock found a private road, leading to a coal mine, the property of one of the Daimios, stopped by a barrier guarded by two sentinels. When he was going to pass the barrier the sentinels endeavoured to prevent him, but, by his own account, he pushed passed them, so that they were unable to stop him without actual force, which it seems they abstained from using, so that he succeeded in getting by. Why, under such circumstances, the sentries, according to the practice of all Europe, would have been justified if they had shot Sir Rutherford Alcock on the spot; and if he had been so shot he would only have got what he deserved. My Lords, I have already mentioned that the treaties entered into by Japan with this country and with other Western nations were not conceded willingly but from fear. It is important to add that this concession was made against the wish of a very powerful party in Japan, which desired at all hazards to maintain the long cherished policy of the Empire by continuing the rigorous exclusion of foreigners. It is not surprising that this party was greatly increased in strength, and that the disposition to receive foreigners kindly, which had in the first instance been shown by a large part of the population, was unhappily changed into a very different feeling by such misconduct on the part of foreigners as I have described; and this misconduct produced a more intense feeling of animosity in Japan than it might have done elsewhere, owing to the peculiar state of society that exists there. Your Lordships are aware that for many centuries Japan has been ruled by a feudal nobility, and that the law of honour is there carried to the greatest extreme. In Japan an insult to an individual can only be washed out with blood. It is illegal to draw a sword there except in self-defence; but the person who does draw it in self-defence is punished with death if he puts it in the scabbard again without having despatched his adversary. The only alternative given to him is that of suicide in the form prescribed by ancient custom. It is scarcely to be expected that a people so sensitive of their honour will submit to outrages at the hands of Europeans. Accordingly, very dreadful crimes have been committed by Japanese in revenge for what they have suffered in that way. The English Embassy has been attacked, and murderous assaults have been made on several British subjects, some of whom have lost their lives. These crimes are referred to in the next Resolution I have to submit to your Lordships, which is in the following terms:—

> "That the animosity against foreigners excited in the minds of the Japanese by these outrages and insults has increased the repugnance long felt by the most powerful classes among them to renewed intercourse with European nations, and has led to the perpetration of some murders and several daring and desperate attacks upon foreigners; diplomatic servants and other subjects of Her Majesty having been among the sufferers from these acts of violence."

In support of what that Resolution asserts, I may refer to despatches of Sir Rutherford Alcock and to an able Report on the state of Japan by Admiral Hope, dated August 20, 1861, and presented to Parliament in 1862. Both these high authorities state that the acts of violence committed by the Japanese arose out of the provocation that had been given, though often it was not the individual who had been guilty of the original insult who became the victim of the revenge it provoked. The murder of the Secretary of one of the Embassies was traced to the fact that the servant of one of the Daimios had been struck by a person connected with the Embassy, and the person who received the blow had been reproached for having dared to appear before his master without having avenged the insult. The next Resolution which I have to submit to your Lordships states—

> "That the Government of the Tycoon has professed the strongest desire to prevent the commission of these crimes and to punish their perpetrators, but has declared itself unable to do so; nor does there appear to be any reason to doubt the truth of these declarations, since two Tycoons and a Regent of Japan have themselves been murdered, and one of the principal Ministers narrowly escaped the same fate, owing to the hostility they had incurred from being supposed to favour an increased intercourse with foreigners."

The accuracy of this Resolution, so far as regards the professions made by the Government of Japan, is beyond question, since the whole Correspondence is full of the expression of their earnest desire to comply with the demands of the British Minister, by affording better protection to British subjects, and by punishing the perpetrators of the sanguinary outrages complained of. Nor is there the slightest reason for doubting the sincerity of these professions; on the contrary, everything combines to show that the Government was totally unable to control the excited passions of that large part of the population which had become bitterly hostile to foreigners. Strong evidence of the sincerity of the Government of Japan may be drawn from what befel those who held the highest posts in it, from their being supposed to be too favourable to foreigners. One Tycoon had been poisoned; another was otherwise murdered. The Regent, in the midst of his guard, was set upon in open day by a band of conspirators, who sacrificed their own lives for his destruction, and succeeded in butchering him, and carrying away his head. A similar attack was made upon the Foreign Minister, who escaped with difficulty, after an affray in which several of his own followers and of his assailants were killed. These things are quite inconsistent with the supposition that the outrages on foreigners could have been prevented by the Government; but the strongest proof of their sincerity is afforded by the fact reported by Colonel Neale. The Government of Japan, in the hope of guarding against collisions which it felt that it was otherwise unable to prevent, had determined to close against its own subjects, and reserve for the exclusive use of foreigners, forty miles of the imperial highway to the capital. Suppose we had been asked to give up forty miles of the Great Western road to foreigners, and go to the expense of making a new road for our own people in order that they might not be exposed to meet these foreigners? In order to make this case intelligible, your Lordships must observe that the old law of Japan allowed no person to remain on horseback in the presence of a Daimio. Our countrymen, however, refuse to obey this law, and claim the right, not only of not getting off their horses when they meet the Daimios, but of riding along the road when they are coming. I do not pretend that the notions entertained by the Japanese on this matter are consistent with civilized ideas; but if Englishmen for their own purposes choose to go to Japan and find among the people certain opinions and certain prejudices which have existed for centuries, I think they are bound to consider those feelings and prejudices in their treatment of that people. What makes their proceedings more offensive is, that by long tradition persons in trade are looked upon in Japan as of an inferior class. In Japanese society the lowest workman and handicraftsman ranks higher than the richest merchant; and, therefore, when our merchants meet these Daimios in the way I have described, great offence was taken by the Japanese. Nor have our countrymen been content to ride along the roads in a manner to violate only an unreasonable law, and unreasonable customs of the people. The Bishop of Victoria in his account of his visit to Japan, describes as highly reprehensible the reckless manner in which Englishmen were in the habit of riding at full speed through the crowded ways, often causing serious injury and sometimes risk of their lives to the inhabitants, and I hold in my hand an official notice issued by the Consul at Kanagawa condemning this practice. In these circumstances, the Japanese might very fairly have said, that in order to prevent collisions it was our duty to execute our treaty obligations, and compel British subjects to respect the law; and it shows no ordinary desire on their part to preserve peace, that instead of doing this they were willing to deprive themselves of the use of their principal road to the capital, and abandon it altogether to foreigners. It is more important to bear these facts in mind, because it was in riding along a road when one of the greatest Princes of the land was approaching that Mr. Richardson was murdered. Undoubtedly this was a violent outrage for which Her Majesty's Government were entitled to ask redress; but still, in my opinion, what they asked as redress was unreasonable, and the measures taken to enforce their demands were contrary alike to the law of nations, to the plainest principles of amity and justice, and to good policy. Though I cannot conceal from you that this is the view I myself take of what has been done, I do not ask your Lordships to adopt it. I have been content to waive the expression of any opinion, and I have strictly confined myself to a naked recital of facts as to which there can be no dispute, in the following Resolution which I have next to submit to you.

> "That in order to enforce a demand made by Her Majesty's Government of redress for the murder of a British subject, it was found necessary to undertake hostile operations against one of the Daimios, in the course of which considerable loss was experienced by Her Majesty's ships, and a large and flourishing Japanese town was burnt to the ground."

My Lords, I trust that what I have now said will be sufficient to satisfy your Lordships that the brief statement of facts contained in the first eight of the Resolutions I have laid before you is strictly accurate, and is fully borne out by the papers on your table. It remains for me to show that these facts properly lead to the conclusions which I have drawn from them in the remaining Resolutions of which the next is as follows:—

> "That this experience of what has already taken place leaves little hope for the future of its being possible to avert fresh collisions between Her Majesty's subjects and the Japanese if the existing arrangements for regulating the intercourse between them are maintained unaltered; and if such collisions should occur they must sooner or later lead to a war which would necessarily cost many lives and much money both to this country and to Japan, and would probably bring upon the latter the heavy calamities of general anarchy and confusion from the destruction of its existing Government, while there would be no means of creating any other authority to replace it."

In submitting to you this Resolution I would ask you to consider whether there is any ground for hoping, that if the existing arrangements for regulating the intercourse between our countrymen and the Japanese remain unaltered, they will produce any other effects than they hitherto have? Can it be supposed that if British subjects are left in Japan without any effective control either by the Japanese or the English law they will act otherwise than they have done? But, if British subjects continue to ill-treat and insult the people among whom they live, fresh murders will follow, and new demands for redress, which the Government of Japan will be unable or unwilling to comply with, and which we shall think it necessary to enforce. This, indeed, seems to be what is anticipated by Her Majesty's Ministers; for, on the 14th of November, 1863, the noble Lord the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs addressed a communication to the Lords of the Admiralty, intimating that he had instructed Her Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires in Japan to take measures for protecting British subjects, and for resenting any outrages upon them, and he requested that the Admiral on the station might receive such orders from their Lordships as would authorize him to act for that purpose, so far as the means at his disposal enabled him to do so. The British Minister is further authorized to send for 500 troops in addition to those already in Japan. But the effect of these instructions is to give authority to the British Minister and Admiral to begin a war with Japan at their own discretion. Now, my Lords, I would remind my noble Friend that, during his own administration, a very strong opinion, and, I may add, a very just one, was expressed by the late Duke of Wellington as to the danger and inexpediency of intrusting Her Majesty's servants abroad with the power of making war without direct instructions from the Government at home. That power is in reality one of far too dangerous a character to be intrusted to the discretion of any subordinate officer. Local circumstances, the opinions of those by whom they are surrounded, and the feelings with which Englishmen are apt to regard semi-civilized nations with whom they are brought into contact, necessarily exercise so much influence over the minds of those who are employed in the service of the Crown in these countries as to render them unfit to be intrusted with the power of involving the nation in war. Her Majesty's Government have recently had calamitous proof of the effect of leaving such large discretionary powers to subordinate officers in what had recently occurred on the Western Coast of Africa. Her Majesty's Government seem also to have formed a most inadequate notion of the difficulties they would have to encounter in a war with Japan. If, unfortunately, we should be involved in such a war, not the 500 soldiers they propose sending there, nor even 5,000, would prove sufficient for the operations it would require. Our wars with China have been attended with heavy expense in money if not in blood. If I am not mistaken, the Chancellor of the Exchequer estimated the cost of the last short war at £8,000,000, but a war with Japan would cost us far more both in money and in blood. Its people are of a very different character, and its Government of very different efficiency from those of China. They are a high-spirited people, always accustomed to carry arms of a most formidable character, in the use of which they are skilful. Instead of undervaluing the arts and knowledge of the West, they show an anxious desire to acquire them. Already they have learned to construct steam-engines, and have purchased steam-vessels. They are turning their attention to modern improvements in artillery: it is said, and I believe with truth, that they are purchasing rifled guns in the United States, and are endeavouring to obtain instruction in their use. Nor is it likely that the Government of Japan will, like that of China, allow a British force to wage war with them in one place, while British subjects in other parts of the empire are allowed to enjoy all the advantages of peace and continue their trade unmolested. Judging from what we know of the feelings and the character of the people, we may anticipate that if war is begun it will be carried on by them in earnest, and that our merchants and their property at Yokohama and the other open ports will be exposed to attacks from which it will be difficult to protect them. Bear in mind how large is the value of British property in these ports exposed to the torch of the incendiary, and how difficult it will be to defend English residents from the midnight attacks of men who have shown how ready they are to sacrifice their own lives in order to kill the foreigners whom they hate. The nature of the war we shall have to wage, if we allow ourselves to be involved in it, deserves also to be considered. We shall have no means of carrying it on except by measures which will fall most severely upon the part of the population which is best affected to us. Already in trying to punish Satsuma we have burnt a rich and flourishing town, and if we have to attack other batteries we shall in like manner (either unavoidably or by design) destroy the property if not the lives of the unarmed and peaceable population. And when we have destroyed the batteries on the coast and the trading towns what are we to do next, and what shall we have gained? The Daimios and their armed retainers will probably retire inland, and it requires to be explained how it will be possible to follow them into the mountainous and difficult country which composes the greater part of Japan. What measures of coercion can we bring to bear upon them, and of what use will it be to occupy a few spots on the sea coast, if the rest of the territory is in the hands of those who will then be our bitter enemies. It seems to me, therefore, that while a war with Japan would certainly be attended with a fearful sacrifice of lives and of treasure, there is no small hazard that in the end we might be foiled by an enemy totally incapable of meeting us in the field. But assuming that our arms are as successful as you can desire, it remains to be considered whether the war would not be one in which success would be even more calamitous than defeat. The extension of our trade certainly will not be promoted by burning other towns as we have burnt Kagosima, or by the devastation of the country which will be the seat of war, since the destruction of their property will not increase either the power or the willingness of the Japanese to purchase our manufactures, or to supply us with the commodities we wish to buy. But it is not merely the direct consequences of the war which we ought to regard; we ought also to take into consideration results which, though indirect, would be found to be still more important. If we succeed in overcoming the resistance of the Japanese, the result will in all probability be the exaction of a new treaty imposing more onerous conditions upon the people of that country than they have hitherto laboured under. It is well, in considering the question, to glance for a moment at the effect of such treaties. What has been their operation in China? When we first employed our arms to establish closer relations with that country some twenty-five years ago we found the empire peaceful and prosperous, its provinces in a high state of cultivation, and supporting a numerous and a happy population. But by the effects of our wars the authority of the Government in China has been completely broken down, and a state of anarchy has been brought about which has caused the deepest misery throughout that vast empire. Provinces which, on our first entrance into China, were rich and flourishing, are now utterly ruined, hundreds of thousands of human lives have been sacrificed, and in the newspapers of this day I find the latest accounts from China state that some provinces are so completely ruined that the inhabitants have been driven to support life by that last and most dreadful resource—cannibalism. The same process is now in its first stage in Japan. If our present policy be persisted in, it will not be many years before all the authority of the Japanese Government would be entirely destroyed, and we should not be in a position to substitute an authority in its stead to maintain order throughout that extensive empire. A successful war with Japan can hardly lead to any other result. Its institutions are not such as to withstand the effects of defeat, and it is the nature of Asiatic Governments to be easily overthrown, while it is impossible when their strength has once been broken to re-establish their authority, or to create another to take its place. Such are the grounds upon which I submit to the House that it is our duty to avert these evils, and therefore I propose a Resolution—

> "That, apart from all higher considerations, the true interests of this country, and especially its permanent commercial interests, require that such calamitous results should not be risked by maintaining the existing treaty with Japan unaltered, and that it is desirable that the provisions of this treaty should be so modified as to place the future intercourse of the two nations on a better footing for the future."

The truth of this assertion can hardly, I think, be disputed, and, if not, I think there can be no objection to the next Resolution which I propose—

> "That it would therefore be advisable that Her Majesty's servants should without delay enter into friendly communication with the Government of Japan and with the Governments of other nations having treaties with Japan similar to our own, for the purpose of determining what changes it would be expedient to make in the provisions of these treaties."

In this Resolution I have not ventured to prescribe what modifications should be introduced into the treaty, as I do not consider that it falls within the province of Parliament to do so, since it properly belongs to Her Majesty's servants to consider in the first instance what changes might advantageously be made. When they have made up their minds as to what changes it would be desirable to make in the treaties with Japan, it would be well to have an understanding with other civilized Powers, and especially with France. If the concurrence of these Powers could be secured, after the experience of our power which the Japanese have recently had, there would be little difficulty in obtaining their concurrence to any modifications of the treaty which might be suggested. But although I have not thought it right to point out in the Resolution what modifications should be introduced into the treaty, because upon constitutional grounds I think it beyond the province of Parliament to prescribe them, yet I do not think there is any impropriety in my stating what are my own views upon that point. I will therefore express my conviction that if we wish to remain on good terms with Japan, that it is in the first place indispensable greatly to restrict the operation of what is called the "exterritoriality" clause. At present British subjects in certain ports of Japan, and for a considerable distance beyond them, are altogether exempted from the control of the Native authorities. I will venture to say that such a system could not possibly be worked in Europe. If English sailors at Havre or New York, or American and French sailors in Liverpool, were exempt from the interference of the local police, and if they could only be dealt with by their own Consuls, it would be impossible for a single day to maintain order and peace in these towns. It is exactly the same in China and Japan, where we have no machinery to control our own subjects. Indeed, without taking the government of those countries into our own hands, it would be impossible to have an efficient police or proper tribunals for the maintenance of order or the administration of justice. If, therefore, it should be thought necessary to adhere to the principle of "exterritoriality" at all, and I am by no means sure that we ought, for I am far from being convinced that a substitute for that system might not be provided with the assent of the Japanese Government, which would ensure to foreigners all necessary protection without the present abuses—if, I say, that principle is to be maintained at all, it ought to be confined within the narrowest limits possible, and the privilege should be enjoyed within a very restricted space set apart in the different open ports for the residence of foreigners and for carrying on their trade. I do not mean to say that British subjects should be prevented from going beyond the ports. There would be no occasion for prohibiting foreigners from going, or even from residing beyond the defined limits, provided it were distinctly understood that if they thought proper to do so it would be at their own risk, that they would be amenable for any misconduct to the Native authorities, and must look also to these alone for protection from violence or wrong without having a claim to call upon the British Minister or Admiral to relieve them from any danger or difficulty. No doubt a great clamour would be raised against such a restriction of the privileges now enjoyed by foreigners in Japan, but with this restriction all that is really necessary for trade, and surely it is not expedient that we should risk all the calamities of war in order that a few merchants and some drunken sailors should be allowed to seek for amusement, without control, for thirty miles round the trading ports. And under this system men who would really act with prudence and consideration for the feelings and customs of the people would have no difficulty in safely visiting the interior, as we may infer from the kind treatment met with by Mr. Fortune and Mr. Veitch. The evils which must necessarily spring from the absence of police have not yet been developed in Japan. To judge of their extent, we should look to China. I have a trade report from Shanghai, which describes the population as in a state of utter lawlessness; and the evils of such a state of things are greatly increased by the mutual jealousies of the Consuls of the Foreign Powers. The English Consul cannot punish an American subject, nor the American Consul an English subject; and the result is that utter lawlessness prevails among the population. I especially complain that vessels are allowed to hoist the British flag on the coast of China, under cover of which they commit depredations which bring odium on this country. Strict measures should be taken to prevent the growth of a similar system on the coasts of Japan.

My Lords, this is the main alteration which is required in the treaty, but I think it would further be advisable to simplify a good deal the stipulations we have imposed upon Japan with respect to trade; and there are some other points on which I should have wished to touch, were it not that I am ashamed of having so long occupied your Lordships' attention. I will, therefore, only state generally what appears to me to be a wise policy to pursue. In the first place, we ought to restrict as much as possible the engagements we impose on Japan, and we should reduce and simplify as much as we can the stipulations of our treaties, in order that the Government of that country might not be tempted to break them, and thus impose on us the necessity of applying coercion. Then I contend that it is on every account in the highest degree desirable that we should be able to reduce the very large force we have in China and Japan. It appears from the papers produced that it has been found necessary to order 1,000 additional men to China, partly with a view to the demands it may be necessary to make on the force in China for service in Japan. And in addition to the land forces, I find, on reference to the naval papers, that we have at this moment in Japan or China no fewer than thirty-five vessels of war — all steamers, including gunboats. This is a very large force, kept up at great expense to the country, and on the principle of my noble Friend we ought to reduce these demands on our resources as much as possible. This is advisable also for another reason—the maintenance of so large a force kept up the feeling of suspicion in the minds of the Japanese. The Bishop of Victoria has stated that the people are quite aware of the origin and history of our connection with India. They know we went there as traders, and ended by subduing all the Native Princes and Powers of India. They are very much afraid of the same fate themselves, and most anxious to maintain their independence. It appears to me that a really profitable trade between the two nations can never be carried on unless good-will and friendship be established. It is in vain to go on as we are now doing. So long as their object is to thwart or cripple our trade, they will always find out some new means of accomplishing it, apparently within the letter of the treaty. But if we go on the opposite principle—if we make them feel the value of our trade—if we endeavour to remove their just suspicions and just fears as to the consequences of what is now going on—if we do that, the commerce is so mutually advantageous that we may rely on it the people and Government of Japan will learn to see its benefits, and gradually relax their restrictions upon it. I have it upon the authority of my noble Friend himself (Earl Russell) that it was the misconduct of British subjects, their overbearing and lawless behaviour, which has been the source of all these evils. It is the knowledge that they are backed by the force of this country which leads them to adopt such a line of conduct, and nothing would have so good an effect in inducing them to alter their behaviour as the withdrawal or diminution of the force at their command. I may remind my noble Friend how well this policy succeeded in China during his own administration. Almost immediately after my noble Friend formed his Administration (in which I had the honour of holding the office of Secretary of State for the Colonies), in July, 1846, the Government received intelligence of an expedition which had been sent without instructions from the Government at home by the Governor of Hong Kong to destroy the forts in the Canton river in order to punish the Chinese for certain offences which they were said to have committed. With the full assent of my noble Friend and the Cabinet, I addressed to the Governor of Hong Kong a despatch containing a severe reproof for this unauthorized exercise of power; and, in order to prevent the possibility of such an attempt being repeated, followed it up by greatly reducing the strength of the garrison of Hong Kong. That had the very best effect in producing a conciliatory disposition on the part of the British authorities, and for six years there was no quarrel between them and the Chinese. No sooner, however, was the Crimean war at an end than an additional force was sent to Hong Kong ; and in a very short time the Governor picked a quarrel with the Chinese, which led to a war, all the ill consequences of which have not yet been fully experienced.

My Lords, my last Resolution proposes that a humble Address should be presented to Her Majesty setting forth the substance of the preceding ones. I must express my earnest hope that my noble Friend will not regard this as a censure upon the policy of the Government. Although I recommend a change of policy, I do not consider this to imply blame of those who are now in office, because the responsibility for the policy hitherto pursued does not rest entirely with Her Majesty's present Government. It rests in part, at least, with their predecessors, and still more with Parliament, which has tacitly approved that policy. I ask the House to pronounce no censure ; I only ask it to express an opinion that our experience of the working of the treaty concluded six years ago with Japan has shown that it is desirable that that treaty should be revised and its terms amended. If Her Majesty's Government are inclined to take that course, it is most desirable that they should have the declared support of Parliament, because it cannot be done without provoking some clamour out of doors. I trust that your Lordships will agree to the Resolutions which I am about to move. I have asked for your support only upon the ground that our commercial interests render desirable the course which I am recommending; but I am persuaded that your Lordships will agree with me that this question involves far higher considerations than that, and that we are bound to consider not only what is for our interest, but what is consistent with our notions of right and wrong. Even if it can be proved —which it cannot—that it is necessary to adhere in Japan to a system by which we should inevitably become involved in a war with the Japanese, we should be bound to abstain from taking a course so contrary to the plainest rules of justice and right.

The noble Earl then *moved* to resolve,

1. That the Relations between this Country and Japan appear to this House to be at present in a highly unsatisfactory State :

2. That it is shown by the Papers laid before Parliament by Command of Her Majesty, that the Treaty concluded between Her Majesty and the Tycoon of Japan on the 26th of August, 1858, gives to British Subjects in Japan Rights and Privileges which the Government of that Country was avowedly reluctant to grant, and was only induced to confer upon them through Dread of British Naval and Military Power :

3. That the Government of Japan has also been induced by this same Fear to make with other European Nations and with the United States Treaties generally similar to that which it has concluded with Her Majesty :

4. That under the above-named Treaty British Subjects are entitled to claim Admission into certain Portions of the Territory of Japan without being subject to the Jurisdiction of its Government, Her Majesty having taken upon Herself the Obligation of enforcing on their Part good Conduct and Obedience to the Law :

5. That the Reports of Her Majesty's diplomatic Servants show that Her Majesty has not been able to fulfil this Obligation : the Provisions of the Statutes authorizing Her Majesty's Consuls to try and punish British Subjects for Offences committed in Japan, and the Means available for carrying these Laws into effect, have proved altogether insufficient to prevent gross Outrages and Insults from being inflicted on the People of Japan by British Subjects and Persons assuming that Character :

6. That the Animosity against Foreigners excited in the Minds of the Japanese by these Outrages and Insults has increased the Repugnance long felt by the most powerful Classes among them to renewed Intercourse with European Nations, and has led to the Perpetration of some Murders and several daring and desperate Attacks upon Foreigners ; diplomatic Servants and other Subjects of Her Majesty having been among the Sufferers from these Acts of Violence :

7. That the Government of the Tycoon has professed the strongest Desire to prevent the Commission of these Crimes and to punish their Perpetrators, but has declared itself unable to do so ; nor does there appear to be any Reason to doubt the Truth of these Declarations, since Two Tycoons and a Regent of Japan have themselves been murdered, and One of the principal Ministers narrowly escaped the same Fate, owing to the Hostility they had incurred from being supposed to favour an increased Intercourse with Foreigners :

8. That in order to enforce a Demand made by Her Majesty's Government of Redress for the Murder of a British Subject it was found necessary to undertake hostile Operations against One of the Daimios, in the Course of which considerable Loss was experienced by Her Majesty's Ships and a large and flourishing Japanese Town was burnt to the Ground :

9. That this Experience of what has already taken place leaves little Hope for the future of its being possible to avert fresh Collisions between Her Majesty's Subjects and the Japanese if the existing Arrangements for regulating the Intercourse between them are maintained unaltered ; and if such Collisions should occur they must sooner or later lead to a War which would necessarily cost many Lives and much Money both to this Country and to Japan, and would probably bring upon the latter the heavy Calamities of general Anarchy and Confusion from the Destruction of its existing Government, while there would be no Means of creating any other Authority to replace it :

10. That, apart from all higher Considerations, the true Interests of this Country, and especially its permanent Commercial Interests, require that such calamitous Results should not be risked by maintaining the existing Treaty with Japan unaltered, and that it is desirable that the Provisions of this Treaty should be so modified as to place the future Intercourse of the Two Nations on a better Footing for the future :

11. That it would therefore be advisable that Her Majesty's Servants should without Delay enter into friendly Communication with the Government of Japan and with the Governments of other Nations having Treaties with Japan similar to our own, for the Purpose of determining what Changes it would be expedient to make in the Provisions of these Treaties :

12. That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to lay before Her Majesty the Substance of the foregoing Resolutions, and humbly to pray that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to take the same into Her serious Consideration, with the view of adopting such Measures as may be found best calculated to avert War between this Country and Japan, and to promote an Increase of Trade and friendly Intercourse between the Two Nations to their mutual Advantage.

Earl RUSSELL: My Lords, after the long and able speech which my noble Friend has made, I am, I confess, somewhat disappointed to find that he should have sat down without having thrown any light on what I thought was the main purpose of my noble Friend in addressing you—our relations with Japan might be amended. He thinks it desirable that there should be an increase of trade between the two nations, and I had hoped he was about to point out the means whereby this object might be obtained: but although he was profuse in his censures on the existing state of things, yet as to the manner in which that intercourse might be improved my noble Friend was very nearly silent. My noble Friend began his speech by finding fault with the manner in which our intercourse with Japan was begun. And here I must remark that, both on this subject and on the subject of what our policy should be, he aimed at subverting our policy, not only in that country but in China, and with regard to all Eastern nations. My noble Friend says that our treaty with Japan was obtained by force and intimidation. In the case of China, no doubt the treaty of Tien-tsin was brought about by our entering the Peiho with a considerable force; but my noble Friend is hardly correct in the assertion which he made in reference to Japan. Lord Elgin went to Japan with one steam frigate and, I believe, two gunboats, which is hardly such a force as could be fairly said to have so intimidated the Japanese Government and to have forced the treaty upon them. There were, I may add, other treaties made before that time. There was one entered into between Japan and America on the occasion when Commodore Perry went to that country with a considerable force; and I cannot see that Lord Elgin was so much to blame because he went with a frigate and two gunboats to make a similar treaty. Other nations, says my noble Friend, have followed the same policy of intimidation. Now, one of those Powers which have intimidated Japan is Switzerland, which my noble Friend will, I think, hardly contend is a Power calculated to inspire the Japanese with such fear as to force them to conclude a treaty of commerce. That being so, the foundation of my noble Friend's argument falls to the ground, for it appears that it was not by intimidation that we obtained the treaty, and that, even if it was obtained by force on our part, greater force had been employed on the part of other countries. But what, let me ask, have been the fruits of these treaties? One would have thought that if the origin of these treaties had been so objectionable, as my noble Friend describes, the fruits of the treaties would have been of a kind equally undesirable; but the results have been that, in the course of a few years, there is a commercial intercourse of foreign nations with Japan to the value of £7,000,000. What, let me ask, is that but the intercourse of friendship—an intercourse whereby the Japanese obtain what they want from foreigners, and foreigners what they want from them, to the mutual benefit of both. Is that the friendly intercourse which my noble Friend wishes to stop? Why, he declares himself that he wishes to increase the trade with Japan. But then, he says that the Japanese having been induced to make the treaty through fear, we entered into a stipulation that British subjects should be entitled to obtain admission to certain portions of the territory of Japan without being under the jurisdiction of the Japanese authorities, but that they should be amenable for any offences they might commit only to our own authorities. He complains of the law called the "extraterritorial law." But what, I would ask, has been the whole course of our intercourse with Eastern nations? What is the history of our intercourse with China and with Turkey? Have we not entered into arrangements with China of this very character? Would we be justified, then, in adopting an entirely new plan in regard to Japan, saying that the Japanese laws should be allowed to prevail in the case of any British subject who might be accused of having committed an offence against them? Your Lordships must bear in mind that the Japanese laws are most sanguinary. What should we say if we heard in England that a young English merchant had been brought before the Japanese tribunals subjected to torture, put to death, being disembowelled, and, in short, suffering all the horrid tortures which the code of the country inflicts? And what would be said if we were to admit the application of the Japanese law to British offenders, that all the relations of the criminal should be put to death for his offence? Is it desirable, under those circumstances, that we should abandon a plan which has now been acted upon for three centuries, in accordance with which, when we enter Oriental nations, we carry with us our own tribunals and our own notions of justice? When Japanese subjects commit an offence against the English we ask them to punish their own criminals; but when an Englishman commits an offence we do not surrender him up to be dealt with by the Japanese laws. In that respect we can, I think, make no alteration without incurring great danger; and I believe that the very danger which my noble Friend pointed out —that of getting into repeated disputes with the Chinese and Japanese authorities —would be promoted and not prevented by our taking the position which my noble Friend suggested in reference to our merchants in those parts. I cannot say, therefore, that in this respect the suggestion of my noble Friend would bring about any advantages; whilst, however, fully convinced of the advantages arising from our trade with China and Japan, I am obliged to admit with sorrow that that trade is undoubtedly accompanied by great abuses on the part of Englishmen themselves. Their manner and demeanour when living in those Eastern countries is not always what it ought to be. I this very morning received a letter from Sir Frederick Bruce, written in the same admirable tone and temper as so many others, in which he laments the insolence and disregard of Chinese customs, the want of courtesy, and the improper behaviour in many respects towards an inferior race, which characterizes some of our countrymen, and which he says is a disgrace to several who go apparently for the purposes of trade to China. The same thing, I am sorry to think, may be said in the case of Japan; nor is it confined to these two among Eastern nations.. I hope that in time to come these persons will be influenced by more civilized views, and more regard to the customs of the persons among whom they live. All that we can under the circumstances do is that which men like Sir Rutherford Alcock are disposed to do—that is, to refuse to take up the cause of any of these men who may bring trouble on themselves by their own misconduct, and thus show them that it is not because they belong to a powerful nation that they are to be countenanced in their misconduct. I know of no alteration in the treaty, of no particular provisions which could be introduced, which could remedy the present state of things; and we can only hope that while the commercial intercourse itself with Japan is productive of great benefit, the abuses which attend upon it will be in time removed by the exhibition of better conduct on the part of our own countrymen, who have the remedy entirely in their own hands. I would add that the Government of the Tycoon has shown every disposition—being fairly treated on our part—to do all that is necessary on their side to improve the trade between the two countries. But it is not attributable to our policy that there are great dissensions in Japan. There are the Prince of Satsuma, the Prince of Nagato, and many others of the high feudal aristocracy—one of them said to have 200,000 men under his command, and immense revenues—whose privileges and feudal powers were secured to them some two or three centuries ago. There is, besides, the Mikado, a sort of supreme spiritual chief, and there is the Tycoon, who is said by the best authorities to have the treaty-making power. How can we prevent these different authorities from quarrelling among themselves and from being jealous of one another? The Daimios say, and perhaps with truth, that the Tycoon has managed in providing that certain ports shall be the ports at which English ships shall enter, to take the greater part of the profits to himself, and to prevent the ports which belong to these Daimios from being the places of commerce for foreign merchants. If that be so, as it it well known that the profits of this trade are enormous, it is no wonder that these Daimios wish to have some share in it, and that many of them wish, in conjunction with the Mikado, to overpower the authority of the Tycoon. But that is not a matter with which the English are concerned; that is not a result for which British power is responsible. It is a matter that may at any time produce civil war —civil war not brought about by England, but by the dissensions and jealousies of the Japanese themselves. A noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Carnarvon) who brought forward the question of Japan last year, concluded—as, sitting in Opposition, it was perhaps natural for him to conclude — that we were about to do everything that was foolish upon this subject—he said that the Government were going to punish the Tycoon, as the Tycoon was our friend, and that the Daimio, who was our enemy, we intended to leave alone. Now, the fact is that we were quite as wise as the noble Earl opposite. We did say, no doubt, that the Tycoon ought to pay a considerable fine because he had allowed a public road to be the scene of a disgraceful murder on the part of one of the Daimios; but we called upon the Daimio himself to bring the murderers to justice, and pay his share of the fine. We did not, therefore, commit the folly that the noble Earl supposed we should commit. My noble Friend who brought forward this question to-night meant, it seems, to be particularly civil; but he told us that our conduct with respect to the murder of Mr. Richardson was against all principles of international law, against all principles of justice, and against good policy. For a particularly civil person, this, I think, was rather hard upon the Government. But I do not see the matter in that light. Here were three or four English people—one of them a lady—riding upon a road which was assigned by treaty as a road upon which British subjects were able to pass on foot or on horseback when they pleased. Being there when one of these great Daimios passed, they stood on one side of the road, where one of them was murdered, the lady and the others being attacked, and escaping with many bruises and wounds to Yokohama. We thought that was an injury which required some reparation, and we did not think it was contrary to the law of nations to ask for reparation. We said that the murderers ought to be tried; and as the Prince of Satsuma refused any redress, we sent ships to his harbour and took by way of reprisals two of his vessels. The Prince of Satsuma, I must say, behaved in one respect with great humanity, for he sent a notice to his own people that there would probably be some firing, and advised them to leave the town. The batteries of this town fired upon our men-of-war. What were our men-of-war to do? Were they not to return the fire? Were they to go off immediately as fast as they could without returning the fire, and with all the appearance, and, indeed, the reality, of running away from the forces of the Daimio? What would have been the consequence of such conduct? Why, my Lords, how unsafe would have been the life of every Englishman in Japan! The Admiral who was in command of the British squadron ordered fire to be opened. It was opened against those batteries; the batteries were in a great degree silenced; but as a high wind was blowing at the time, and the houses were entirely built of wood and paper, the town caught fire and a great part of it was burnt. Well, I think, though this was a lamentable occurrence, that a great deal too much horror was expressed at it. In consequence of the notice that had been given hardly any persons were killed except the soldiers in the batteries; there really was not that great mortality which has been so much lamented; the town has been since rebuilt, and people say that it is a handsomer town than it ever was before. I cannot believe, then, that that proceeding was of the character which my noble Friend states; and certainly with regard to the followers of Prince Satsuma, it was a good lesson for them, for they owned that they did not know that the English were so strong; that they should beware how they offended them again; and the Prince of Satsuma himself has shown since that time the most friendly disposition towards us. My noble Friend says that these collisions must lead to war. But is it more likely that war will result by inflicting some punishment upon the murderers of our people, or by allowing those murderers to go unpunished until there shall be a large accumulation of murders and other injuries? My belief is that the taking notice in this way of such an injury as a horrible murder is the way not to lead to future collisions and war, but rather to prevent them. We know very well what has happened with regard to the French. One of the Japanese princes, the Prince Nagato, as a French ship was passing through a narrow strait, fired upon it and inflicted considerable injury. The French Admiral thereupon attacked the battery, the Japanese soldiers ran away, the battery was destroyed, and every gun was made useless for the future. Here, then, according to my noble Friend, would have been the origin of a great war between France and Japan. But Japan thought better of it, and sent an Embassy to beg pardon for the outrage, and a new treaty has been made between the French and Japanese Government. Such was the effect of an order very similar to that for which I am so much blamed in the case of the Prince of Satsuma. I quite agree with my noble Friend that these Japanese are most ingenious people. This Prince of Satsuma himself has more than once been on board our steam-vessels, and has been very curious in making inquiries, and has bought several steam-vessels himself; and I am told—by Colonel Neale I think—that the Japanese would buy a foreign steam-vessel in a port, and that, the European crew being out of it, they would put their own crew on board and steam out of the port at once, with complete command of the machinery, as if they had been taught the use of it from their earliest youth. Nay, more—in another case one of our officers was receiving two Japanese officers of rank, and immediately they came on board they began discussing the merits of the Armstrong and Whitworth guns, showing great knowledge of all the mechanism of those guns. I am in hopes that, so far from leading to the stoppage of further intercourse between us, so far from leading to hostilities, the policy of Her Majesty's Government will lead to the maintenance of friendly relations with the Japanese; that their display of the more than ordinary anxiety found among Eastern nations to profit by European intercourse will establish that intercourse on a footing of mutual advantage; and that, though there may be on the part of some of the Japanese a good deal of murmuring like the rumbling of distant thunder, the advantage of commercial relations between the two countries will gradually be seen in Japan, and will gradually insure a friendly and a peaceful intercommunication. Coming to the last Resolution of my noble Friend, I must say I had expected from him information and instruction as to the way in which we should improve our relations with Japan. Had he pointed out any mode by which we could effect that object, Her Majesty's Government would have gladly availed themselves of my noble Friend's suggestions. But when he came to that part of his speech, after he had thought fit to blame every part of the policy of the Government of this country—not only of the present, but of former Governments—he said it belonged to Her Majesty's Government to find out the way in which an improvement could be effected. Now, my Lords, I must say I so far agree with this Resolution as to see much difficulty in the present state of affairs; but I think if we were to say to the Japanese that we should modify our treaty—that we were prepared to make new arrangements—I think the effect would be that which such a course would have upon other Eastern nations—we should only inspire the Japanese with the idea that we were afraid of their hostilities, and that we were ready to conciliate them by needless and unworthy concessions. I do not see, therefore, that we should gain by any measures of that sort. I am not at all reluctant to enter into some friendly relations with the Japanese, though I must remind your Lordships that friendly relations have been going on between the Government in this country and the Government in Japan, and also between our Minister in Japan and the Ministers of the Tycoon. Sir Rutherford Alcock was prepared to do everything that was courteous towards the Tycoon, and he showed himself ready to do anything which our laws enabled him to do in order to punish any young Englishman who went beyond the rights to which British subjects were entitled according to the terms of our treaty. My noble Friend has said that I have lately spoken as if this country was perfectly helpless. I am quite aware that this country can do great hurt to other countries; but I do not let out of sight that other countries may do some hurt to us. I own that I contemplate not only with repugnance, but disgust, such a state of things as boasting of nothing but the injury which we could do to other countries, while they, on the other hand, should be boasting of the injury which they could do to us. Certainly that is not a pleasant subject of contemplation; but we know we have power—all foreign nations know we have by our naval and military forces power—to inflict great hurt on any nation attacking us. My noble Friend says, that as regards this country and Japan, we are not behaving according to the laws of nations. I am afraid that for a very long time to come it will be necessary to keep a considerable naval force in the seas of Japan. There are, as I have said, various parties in Japan, and one of them is very likely to say they will not permit foreigners to come there any longer, and that they will drive them from Japan. That, no doubt, might lead to scenes of bloodshed; but I cannot see that we ought to retire from Japan for that reason, or forego those rights which are of great benefit to us and at the same time of great benefit to the Japanese. My belief is, that we should endeavour to behave justly, and on every occasion repair any wrong of which the Japanese may have reason to complain, but at the same time seek redress for any wrong which may be done by them to British subjects. Under existing circumstances, that is all I can say, while, of course, I should be glad that our relations with Japan could be closer and more secure. But we must recollect that this is a new commerce. The treaty only dates from, I think, 1858, and there is much to be smoothed away in regard to our relations with a people who for a long time would not admit foreigners into their country. At the same time, the commerce between the two nations has been in many respects rapid. During the first four years after the Treaty of Nankin our imports of silk from China amounted to 20,000 bales; in the first four years after our treaty with Japan our imports of silk from that country have been 25,000 bales. That shows a considerable willingness on the part of the Japanese to enter into commerce, and to establish those relations with us which may tend to the promotion of trade. It is impossible for us who have such commerce in every part of the world not to see that in Japan, as elsewhere, some misunderstanding may arise; and all the British Government can do is not to modify or alter those treaties which we have with the Japanese—not to say we will give further concessions in addition to those which we have already made. Last year we engaged to put off the opening of two ports, which were to have been opened this year, for seven years more, and we have shown every disposition to agree to any concession which the Japanese could reasonably ask for; but it appears to me that it would be more advantageous for all parties to go on steadily and quietly, but maintaining our rights, rather than to inaugurate a new system and policy, more especially if that new system and policy were in contradiction of all we have ever done in our dealings with Eastern nations from the time when we first had intercourse with them.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: My Lords, I feel bound to express my thanks to the noble Earl opposite (Earl Grey) for having brought this subject before your Lordships and the country as he has done. I watched closely the speech of the noble Earl, and have carefully considered his Resolutions, and it does appear to me that so far as possible he has avoided all unnecessary blame for the past, and has rather directed the attention of your Lordships to the future and its dangers, and the mode in which those dangers might be averted, than indulged in anything like recrimination in regard to events which have already taken place. I waited with great anxiety to hear the answer given by the noble Earl the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, confident that everything that could be said on the other side would be said with that terse and telling eloquence which the noble Earl always uses. I confess I have listened with great disappointment to that answer. So far as it concerns the removing from my mind the apprehension which the speech of the noble Earl (Earl Grey) had excited, I think the answers to the special points made by my noble Friend were not conclusive. The first and main answer, as I understand it, of the noble Earl to the objections taken by the noble Earl opposite (Earl Grey) to the system by which we undertook on our part to exercise our own laws against our own people in that distant country, and to leave the Japanese to exercise their laws against their own people, is that such is the universal custom of this country with regard to Eastern nations, and that the noble Earl who introduced this subject wished to sweep that entirely away. The noble Earl at the head of the Foreign Office then drew a picture of what would be the result if that arrangement was departed from and the Japanese left to execute their laws on our countrymen. But, my Lords, I distinctly understood the noble Earl (Earl Grey) proposed to guard against any such supposition. I understood him to say that at the principal ports and at the factories where we had our goods—at those places where we were able to enforce on our own people the reasonable obedience to the Japanese laws, that there he would maintain that principle; but that what he complained of was that we undertake what we cannot perform, because we undertake to throw around individual members of this country in all parts of Japan the ægis of the security of a British subject, and thus have led them to ignore in a most reckless manner the laws of Japan; that we have no power of preventing the breach of those laws, and scarcely any power of punishing them. My noble Friend argued—and I have waited to hear the point answered—that these two were correlative obligations; that where we undertake to protect our own people by our own laws we are bound to show we have sufficient power to make the people obey those laws to which by coming into the country they subject themselves, and to punish those who break them. Therefore the answer of the noble Earl the Foreign Secretary is not satisfactory. I see no reason why this country should confer that which the Government themselves have admitted tends to make our people act in a way that will provoke hostility—the power of recklessly asserting their supposed British independence—which is so dangerous an element in the character of our people. Then the noble Earl the Foreign Secretary said that he broadly denied that the treaties with Japan were chiefly brought about by intimidation, and he quoted Sir Rutherford Alcock in support of that position. But, if there is any point on which Sir Rutherford Alcock is more explicit and emphatic than another it is his declaration that these treaties were brought about by intimidation. He says the Americans went there, and appealed to what we were doing in China, alarming the minds of the Japanese by asking them whether they would bring all this upon themselves, they being unprepared. Then came the news of our successes in China, and the appearance of a small flotilla, which the Japanese took for the *avant courier* of a great fleet, and the treaties they entered into were distinctly in fear of this country. So strongly did Sir Rutherford Alcock feel this, that he says—

> "I know it is alleged that there is a party in the country who are in favour of progress and who desire to see the foreigner admitted into the country to trade, but I have never been able to find that it exists."

There are, he says, there, as everywhere else, two parties—one more extravagantly attached than the other to what they consider their own national habits. And he described them as being known in Japan as the toad-in-the-well party and the non toad-in-the-well party; but he says that the most liberal he had been able to find were hostile to doing away with restrictions against foreigners coming amongst them, and that feeling has increased everywhere. He says that whereas at first foreigners on going there were received in the houses of the poor with something of welcome and hospitality; but he adds, "I dare not say they would meet anywhere with such a welcome now." Therefore that which originally began in intimidation is continued now, according to Sir Rutherford Alcock's statement, under increasing disgust, only repressed through the terror of our violence. And, again, we were told by the noble Earl (the Foreign Secretary) that the burning of the Prince of Satsuma's town had been productive of good, and had led him to behave courteously and well since. When we know that he, in common with the other Daimios, is concerting a plan by which they hope, as they believe, to deliver their country—when we know that they are purchasing rifled cannon, and making every provision for that blow which they hope to strike—can we not see that the treaties have been granted with reluctance, that they have been extorted by violence, and that this is the preparation for the certain vengeance which is so much more a characteristic of the Japanese than concession? This is really the strength of the statement of my noble Friend (Earl Grey). The perpetual complaint of the more thoughtful Japanese has been that we are hurrying things too fast. "We grant," they say, "that it may be well, as you tell us, that we should become a trading community, that we should increase our wealth by dealing with the nations of the West; but there must be time for such a trade to grow up. At present it is but an injury to us; at every turn you take our vegetable wax, and you do not leave enough for our own people; you have tricked us as to our gold and exported it in masses, though we have treaty obligations to the contrary; you have suffered your people to insult us and you have set up a shadow man to evade the stipulations of our treaty. All this you have done because you will barter to a degree which we as a people cannot bear the introduction of your commerce and your merchandise. Give us time;"—that is a note sounded in their representation that must reach every heart. What they in reality say is, "If you are to be enriched by this sudden traffic, have you no regard for us? Can you not feel for our sufferings? Is it just to force this upon us that you may a little sooner acquire so much more wealth?" My noble Friend the Secretary for Foreign Affairs did not attempt to answer, and I think he did not because he felt he could not answer it, the allegation of the exceeding danger we are running of absolutely destroying the internal Government of Japan by the course we are now taking. Can it be the intention of this country to reduce Japan to the miserable state of an utterly ungoverned anarchy? Yet that must be the effect if you shake the existing power and cannot substitute another. All the injuries that have been brought upon China must come upon Japan, and many of them with tenfold severity, if you succeed in your policy. We have heard to-night of the great jealousies between the different parties in the Government of Japan. I believe, as far as there exists any difference between the Tycoon and Mikado it could be easily removed; but there is a fierce feud amongst the Daimios, and a continuous tendency to resist the power of the Tycoon, when the Tycoon seems to commit the country to what they consider steps fatal to its welfare. It is said that every step of these treaties has been written in the blood of successive Tycoons. Not one of the treaties has been executed that has not been followed by the poisoning or assassination of the Minister who signed it, and the banishment and degradation of all his subordinates. Does this show that the treaties have been gladly entered into by the Japanese? Does it not tend at once to prove that the treaties were forced upon them by acts of intimidation? What must be the result of continuing such measures? First, the breaking down of the wealth and power of the only central controlling authority which tends to keep these different feudal chieftains in any measure of order. Then, to national dissension among themselves and the misery of the whole Native population. And in the midst of that what attitude are we to assume? Are we to occupy the country, to administer its revenues, to administer its justice, to reform its laws — in short, to make it a part or dependency of our own country, or are we to leave it in the midst of its anarchy? What is to become of your trade if you leave it in a state of anarchy? And how, if you took the other course, are you to have a force sufficient in that remote country to operate amidst a hostile people united against you, with every advantage by nature for repelling invasion? How are you to make head against them except at a cost which I believe the people of Great Britain will not knowingly incur, in order that they may a little hasten the growth of commerce in Japan? It is on these points that the speech of the noble Earl opposite (Earl Grey), which I think exhausted the subject, remains unanswered; and I feel with him, that having passed through all these considerations, which I may call considerations of expediency, we come to the still stronger grounds of the natural principles of right. I maintain that we have no right, no authority, in the sight of Him who governs the universe, to force on an independent people by arms a treaty of commerce which they refuse. I maintain that having established that commerce, we have no right whatever to undertake engagements as to our own subjects which we cannot fulfil, and that the treaty, as it is now constructed, does lead this country to undertake to make its subjects do that which it has no power to make them do. The natural instincts of a people stand ready to avenge themselves when they find we cannot make our subjects obey the laws which they were bound to obey and we have undertaken to enforce. When reading Sir Rutherford Alcock's letter and book I found the greatest efforts were made by the authorities to induce our people to abstain for three days from making use of a certain road where the Daimios were passing, it being contrary to their law that foreigners should meet them. Although every other road was open for the pleasure of our people they refused to comply with the request of the authorities, although the use of that road was not necessary either for business or pleasure. We have no right to undertake for these people what we have not the power to exact; and I, for one, believe that introducing into the commerce of this country such doubtful and, I may say, such unjust principles, is the way not to its final extension, but is the surest way to lead to its ruin. There is an eating canker upon every extension of national prosperity that is founded on injustice, which by a law more certain than the returns of any mercantile adventure, avenges the cause of right and justice upon the people by whom those principles have been violated. It is written, and will be fulfilled—"Woe unto him that buildeth his chamber on unrighteousness and his house upon wrong."

THE DUKE OF SOMERSET said, he did not think it was necessary to go back to the origin of the treaty with Japan; but he would remind their Lordships that a treaty was obtained in the first instance by the American Government, and all that we and other nations asked was to be put on the same footing as the Americans. He entirely concurred with the noble Earl opposite (Earl Grey) as to the importance of our showing forbearance and moderation in our dealings with the Japanese, and in regretting the misconduct of many Europeans in that country. No doubt there had been many cases of gross tyranny perpetrated towards the Natives of Japan, not by Englishmen only but by other Europeans; but that was a question quite apart from the treaty. The noble Earl said they should make a new treaty with Japan; but whilst he said that, his Resolutions affirmed that we on the one side and the Tycoon on the other could not enforce the present one. Then of what use would it be our entering into fresh negotiations with them for another treaty? His (the Duke of Somerset's) main objection to the Resolutions was that, if adopted, they would inevitably lead to war; for if we were to depart from our present treaty rights the Japanese would say we had given them a great advantage—that they had obtained a great victory, and that all they had to do was to insist on further concessions. The objection raised by the British and French Admirals to the erection of the batteries at Yokohama was, he thought, very well founded, for those batteries would, as they stated, have placed the lives and the property of foreigners there at the mercy of the Japanese. The House would remember that when Admiral Hope went to the Peiho, batteries were insidiously raised, and his ships being allowed to come in quite close were then suddenly fired into. If we had allowed these batteries to be erected at Yokohama the Europeans would have been in a similar manner entirely at the mercy of the Japanese, and the English and French Admirals felt it their duty to resist their construction. The noble Earl said that Her Majesty's Government protected British subjects wherever they went in Japan. That was not the case. It was an entire mistake. What Her Majesty's Government did was to protect them at Yokohama, and along a road which by treaty they had a right to use.

EARL GREY: For twenty-five miles.

THE DUKE OF SOMERSET: Yes. He had seen a great many persons who had returned from Japan, and they complained that they were kept just to one spot, and that they could only go up and down that one road to get a little exercise. The noble Earl had said that foreigners could go into the interior quietly for the purpose of studying botany; but that was not the case. He sent a gentleman there for that purpose, and when he got to Yokohama he was willing to submit to anything for the love of science; but he was sent back, and the Japanese authorities would not let him go anywhere. The noble Earl also said that the Daimios had a great objection to trade, and looked upon traders with contempt; but there also he was totally wrong. The noble Earl's speech was full of errors from the beginning to the end. The fact was Satsuma was jealous. He did not object to trade, but said the Tycoon was getting all the profit out of the trade, and that he ought to share in it. Here was this proud Daimio, who could not bear trade, longing to share in the profits of it. The noble Earl asked, by his tenth Resolution, that the provisions of the treaty might be so modified as "to place the future intercourse of the two nations on a better footing." But how were Her Majesty's Government to do that when they could not obtain the rights secured to them by the treaty already in existence? In his opinion the best way would be to keep the treaty already made, and by firmness on the one hand and forbearance on the other, its provisions might be fairly carried out. We had certain rights by the treaty in Japan, and the Japanese knew it, and admitted it. Satsuma's people admitted that we had a right to inflict punishment for the murder, and that they were liable for it; and so far from the burning of their town having had an ill effect, it had had a most excellent effect, and when the people came back they were ready to enter into another treaty. As for the burning of the town, the Japanese attached little importance to this loss as it could be rebuilt in a few days. He saw a gentleman a short time ago who came from Yokohama, who informed him that whilst at Yokohama he saw a large establishment used for the education of young Japanese ladies burnt down on the Monday, and to his surprise it was all built up again on the Friday following. That was a specimen of how rapidly these paper and wooden houses were burnt down and rebuilt. He confessed he was sorry to hear the attacks that had been made upon Admiral Kuper, and he felt certain that however much they might wish to complain of the Government, they ought not to blame an officer who had strictly performed his duty. When Admiral Kuper heard of the attacks that were made upon him in Parliament he forwarded to him a letter, in which he expressed his great regret that such attacks should have been made upon him in his absence. He stated that at the time he deeply regretted that in firing on the batteries he should have destroyed the town, adding, that when he forwarded his despatch to the Government he certainly did not refer to that regret so much as he ought, because two of his officers were killed by his side on the bridge of the steamer, and he wrote the despatch in a hurry immediately after. He, however, did express his regret, and he had frequently since done so, for the sufferings of the Japanese. They were an industrious and amiable people, and if they could be separated from some of the Daimios who were hostile to all foreigners, they would be very fond of trade, for he had been informed by letter that many of the Daimios put the people to death because they traded with Europeans ; and notwithstanding the danger they ran they would continually bring down their goods and silks in order to trade with the foreigners ; which, so far from showing that they hated trade, proved that they were fond of it. He (the Duke of Somerset) had thought it his duty to justify Admiral Kuper's conduct from the attacks that had been made upon it, feeling that he had only been actuated by a strict regard to his duty, which had compelled him to fire upon the batteries. The noble Earl objected to his firing on the batteries, and thought he should have ran away. [Earl GREY : No, no !] When the Japanese fired on our ships, was our Admiral to return it or not ? Was he to run away ? Nothing was so injurious as not to deal effectually with these people, and the French had just had a difficulty with the Japanese in consequence of one of their ships having fired upon them. The fact was it was very difficult to deal with the Japanese. We knew but little of their habits and prejudices, and it was not very easy to go on with them amicably. We must have occasional outbreaks and misfortunes of this kind with the Japanese unless we were prepared to leave the country. But how could that be done ? The Americans, the French, the Russians, the Prussians, the Swedes, the Dutch, and, in fact, all the European nations, were trading under the same treaty rights, and were we to run all round Europe, and ask the different nations to give up their treaty rights also ? Certainly not. It could not be done. If we withdrew from Japan we should leave all the other nations there, and instead of having a hold on Japan we should have none, and they would trade with us under the American flag. Lord Elgin said we required a force in that country as much to keep our own people in order as the Japanese. He believed the best course to pursue was to adhere faithfully to the treaty, and at the same time practise all moderation and forbearance towards the Japanese ; and while punishing those who misbehaved themselves, to hold the Japanese Government strictly to the fulfilment of their obligations.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON said, the noble Earl and also the noble Duke had acted somewhat inconsistently, for they had both of them devoted a considerable portion of their speeches to the affair of Kagosima, which his noble Friend (Earl Grey) had distinctly stated he would not then enter into, as it was a very large question, and had already been discussed this Session by their Lordships. The speeches, however, of the noble Earl and the noble Duke had been devoted to disinterring that old question. He fully admitted the great difficulty in which the Government were placed in dealing with the question of the treaty with Japan. The fact was, that during the last few years the class of traders who had gone out to Japan had been of an inferior order. In former years those who traded with China were persons of respectability and influence, connected with large firms—houses of immense wealth and responsibility ; but now most of those who went to China and Japan were small traders—lawless and reckless men, who were allured there simply and solely by the enormous profits that were to be made on those coasts. Those were the men who committed outrages in Japan, and in defiance of treaty obligations established settlements for the purposes of contraband and illicit trade. The noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell) said he lamented these outrages, and asked how they could be prevented. He (the Earl of Carnarvon) submitted that it was the bounden duty of Her Majesty's Government to exercise as far as possible a check and a restraint through the Foreign Office ; and to show that he was not speaking at random, he would refer to a recent case of a very atrocious description which had taken place in Japan. An outrage was attempted on the person of a young Japanese girl by an Englishman. He was reproved at the time for his conduct, but a few months after he was promoted. That was a case for the interference of the Foreign Office, which might have exercised a wholesome restraint by marking its deep sense of the wrong that had been committed. He was afraid that it was not always the foreign traders who were to blame for such conduct, because the papers which had been laid upon the table with regard to China showed that the Consuls themselves, who were really placed there for the purpose of exercising judicial power, and to maintain fair dealing between man and man, very often acted more like partizans than judges, and were frequently guilty of very high-handed and violent conduct. The argument of his noble Friend (Earl Grey) went to that complaint, for he would either place in the hands of the Consuls greater power, or by some local tribunal enable justice to be dealt out alike in all cases. He concurred in all that had fallen from his noble Friend (Earl Grey) on the question of what was called "extra-ritoriality," which had already led to great mischiefs in China, and was still going on in that country. The system was mischievous to all concerned. It sapped and undermined the Native authority, and did not establish a complete and satisfactory authority in its stead. Its direct result was the extension of political still more of territorial right, and every morsel of ground annexed involved a fresh body of troops. They were drawing severely on their resources as regards men; and when they calculated their army in India, in the colonies, and in England, he must say he would be a bold man that would say those resources were unlimited and inexhaustible. While acknowledging all the difficulties and abuses that existed in China, and which, indeed, could not be denied, they seemed deliberately involving themselves in precisely the same difficulties in Japan. The state of things was almost identical in the two countries, with this exception, that while in China they had to deal with a nerveless, weak, tame-spirited people, they had in Japan to deal with a military, warlike, and vigorous race, second probably to none in the East except the Sikhs. There was also the same condition of things, the same lawlessness, the same powerlessness of the consuls to restrain outrage, the same difficulty with regard to export and import duties, the same aversion on the part of the Natives to receive us, the same determination on our part to force ourselves upon them by means of treaties extorted from them, which they accepted for the moment, but with the distinct determination to violate their engagements when the first opportunity offered. He remembered reading in one of Sir Frederick Bruce's despatches a statement to this effect, that "the conclusion of a treaty with an Oriental nation was not the termination, but really the beginning of the difficulties with which they had to deal," and that was the precise truth. They had found this in China, and would find it in Japan; and Sir Frederick Bruce went on to say that "even measures of a beneficial and progressive character, extorted by force against the will of the population in such countries, were of very little avail." Well, the noble Earl said matters after all were improved. Kagosima had been burned down, and the noble Earl seemed to make rather merry over it. It was true that Kagosima had been burnt down, and that for the moment there was peace; but he defied any one who had read the papers upon this subject to say that it was more than a temporary breathing space. All through the Correspondence matters went from bad to worse, fresh murders and fresh acts of incendiarism were committed, the very Legation was in a state of siege, with stockades, guards, and camp fires lighted at night; in fact, the state of things was something between peace and war. The noble Earl did him the honour to allude to some observations which he made last year, and said that he spoke, as might have been expected, from a Member of the Opposition. Now, much as he valued party Government, he regarded this question of Japan as much too grave a one to be treated as a party matter. It was one of the most serious questions that could engage the attention of Parliament, and he thought it unfortunate that the country was not thoroughly alive to its importance. But, unfortunately, while our attention was distracted by other matters nearer home, we had little time to devote to matters which were growing up so many thousand miles away in China and Japan affecting our relations with those two countries. The noble Earl complained of his having said that the Government were putting a pressure upon the Tycoon, who was their friend. It was true that he did say that, and he maintained that that was the real state of the case. The only person whom the Government were touching was the only one in the State who was favourable, and who they acknowledged had, so far as he could, dealt fairly with them. He was at variance with a great many of the Daimios, who were continually attempting to subvert his authority; and thus the Government, by the course which they were taking, were playing the game of their enemies. It was perfectly clear that a great constitutional revolution was going on in Japan. About two centuries and a half ago the constitution was altered. Since that time the power of the Mikado had been in abeyance, the power of the great Daimios had been neutralized by their factions, and consequently the power of the Tycoon had been supreme. Now, for the first time, there was a change. The present Mikado, who was a young and ambitious man, was recovering some of his former power; of the Daimios some were making common cause with him, and others were bitterly and vehemently opposing the Tycoon, who, on account of the favour which he had shown to foreigners, had become probably the most unpopular man in Japan.

From all these causes we were, by interfering, as we had done, in danger of pulling down about our ears the whole fabric of the existing Government in Japan, which, bad or good, was at least a Government, and of having to undertake the responsibility of governing the country ourselves. That was a danger from which the Government had escaped in China owing to circumstances which they could not have anticipated, and for which they have not themselves to thank. He agreed substantially with everything which had fallen from the noble Earl and with all his Resolutions. The only one about which he entertained any doubt was the last but one, which proposed that our Government should enter into friendly communication with the Government of Japan and other Powers for the purpose of revising the treaty. If he thought that that Resolution was intended to compel the Government to take instantaneous action he could not support it; but as he believed that that was not its meaning he had no hesitation in accepting it according to the spirit rather than the letter, and agreeing to it as well as to the others.

Earl GREY said, that his noble Friend had rightly interpreted the meaning of his 11th Resolution. Throughout the discussion the Members of the Government had not contested these two facts—that the treaty being reciprocal, we were bound to enforce good conduct on the part of our own subjects in Japan, and that we had utterly failed to do so. That was established both by the statement of Sir Rutherford Alcock and by the despatches of the noble Earl himself. The noble Duke (the Duke of Somerset) charged him with inconsistency, because he asked that as the treaty could not be enforced it should be revised. There was nothing inconsistent in his proposal. There were parts of the treaty which neither the Japanese nor ourselves could enforce, and therefore he proposed that they should be modified. The noble Earl (Earl Russell) had complained that he had suggested nothing for the future, but in another part of his speech he said that he had suggested too much.

The Earl of Carnarvon

On Question, Whether to agree? their Lordships *divided*—Contents 11; Not-Contents 30: Majority 19.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

CONTENTS.

Canterbury, Archbp.

Carnarvon, E.
Grey, E. [*Teller.*]
Nelson, E.
Romney, E.
Verulam, E.

Hawarden, V.

Lincoln, Bp.

Dinevor, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway*).
Wynford, L. [*Teller.*]

NOT-CONTENTS.

Westbury, L. (*L. Chancellor*).

Somerset, D.

Ailesbury, M.

Caithness, E.
Clarendon, E.
Ducie, E.
Granville, E.
Russell, E.
Saint Germans, E.

Sydney, V.
Torrington, V.

Chichester, Bp.
Cork, &c. Bp.
Down, &c. Bp.

Camoys, L.
Clandeboye, L. (*L. Dufferin and Claneboye*).
Dartrey, L. (*L. Cremorne*).
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Leigh, L.
Monson, L.
Overstone, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough*). [*Teller.*]
Rivers, L.
Rossie, L. (*L. Kinnaird*).
Seymour, L. (*E. St. Maur*).
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stratheden, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)
Talbot de Malahide, L.
Wodehouse, L.

House adjourned at a quarter before Nine o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, July 1, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Supply — *Resolutions* [June 30] *reported**.

Supply — *considered in Committee* — Civil Service Estimates.

Public Bills — *Resolutions in Committee* — Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans); Registration of Deeds (Ireland) [Stamps]*.

Ordered—Courts of Justice Money*; Courts of Justice Site*; Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension*; Militia Ballot Suspension*.

First Reading — Improvement of Land Act (1864)* [Bill 187] (*Lords*); Courts of Justice Money* [Bill 188]; Courts of Justice Site* [Bill 189]; Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension* [Bill 190]; Militia Pay and Clothing*; Militia Ballot Suspension*.

Second Reading—Indemnity [Bill 97].

Committee—Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans) [Bill 191]; Cranbourne Street* [Bill 154]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland)* [Bill 100]; Divorce and Matrimonial Causes (Amendment)* [Bill 162] (*Lords*); Street Music (Metropolis) [Bill 90].

Report—Cranbourne Street* [Bill 154]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland)* [Bill 100]; Divorce and Matrimonial Causes (Amendment)* [Bill 162] (*Lords*); Street Music (Metropolis) [Bill 90].

Third Reading—Factory Acts Extension* [Bill 55]; Inclosure (No. 2)* [Bill 170]; Railways (Ireland) Act Amendment* [Bill 173]; Tests Abolition (Oxford) [Bill 18], and *passed.*

WEST RIDING ASSIZES.

QUESTION.

Colonel SMYTH said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, in the event of the next Assizes for the West Riding of Yorkshire being held at Leeds, the maintenance of prisoners in the Leeds Borough Gaol, in accordance with the Notice in the *Gazette* of the 10th instant, will be a charge upon the County Rate of the West Riding, there being ample accommodation for such prisoners in the West Riding Prison at Wakefield?

Sir GEORGE GREY, in reply, said, he could not give a positive opinion on the point. Hitherto the prisoners committed for trial at the Assizes for the West Riding had been sent to York Castle. [Colonel Smyth: No; Wakefield.] That was after trial. He believed the fact to be, that whereas the county had been put to the expense of maintenance of prisoners committed for trial at York Castle, those prisoners would now be sent to Leeds instead, but they would have to be paid for as before by the county. The class of prisoners at present sent to Wakefield would continue to be sent to Wakefield.

INDIA—OFFICERS OF THE INDIAN ARMY.—QUESTION.

Captain JERVIS said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whether, as by Clause 65 of his Despatch, dated the 17th day of June, No. 194, he recognizes that portion of the Report of the Commission on Memorials of the Indian Officers which stated that the organization given to the newly created Staff Corps has, contrary to the Parliamentary Guarantee, caused extensive supercession of the Officers remaining with their regiments; and as by paragraph 66 he admits that a complete remedy for this supercession must be found either in the withdrawal of the rank given to the Staff Corps or in granting such army rank to the Officers of the Indian Army, as shall restore them to a relative position, as regards the Staff Corps Officers, which they held at the formation of that corps; whether he considers that giving Brevet rank to the local Army, such rank in India giving no addition of pay whatever, restores the relative position of the Officers of the Indian Army to that of the Staff Corps, the latter possessing substantive rank with pay proportionate to their rank; and whether he considers this arrangement carries out the pledge which he gave that he would adopt the Report of the Commissioners in its integrity? Whereas the Staff Corps are on the full pay of their respective substantive ranks, whilst the local Army is to have Brevet rank without increase of pay, it is placing the local Army on the same footing as the Staff Corps to make the promotion from the rank of Lieutenant Colonel to Colonel to depend on an Officer having been five years on the full pay of a Lieutenant Colonel, as laid down in paragraph 69; and on what principle the Brevet rank of the Ordnance Corps in India is to be only local, as laid down in paragraph 70, the Parliamentary Guarantee extending to the Ordnance Corps as well as the rest of the Army?

Colonel SYKES said, he would also beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, whether he will lay upon the table of the House a Return comprising the names of all Officers of the Indian Armies who had substantive rank given them by the East India Company, irrespective of promotion by regimental seniority, since the year 1800? Whether, in reference to paragraph 69 of the Despatch of the Secretary of State to the Governor General of India, dated June 17, 1864, the Army rank proposed to be given to regimental Officers after specified periods of service is to proceed *pari passu* with promotions to substantive rank in the Staff Corps, and whether he considers such Army rank a just equivalent for the substantive rank given to Staff Officers? And whether with reference to paragraph 76 of the same Despatch, all the Lieutenant Colonels in the Regimental Lists of the Indian Armies and Staff Corps are to be struck off immediately, and promotions made regimentally, according to the standing of the Regiment for the Line step, in conformity with the usages of the service?

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, that he had given no pledge to adopt the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Memorials of Indian Officers, for the simple reason that the Commissioners had carefully abstained from making any recommendations at all. They only stated what they considered to be the interpretation of the Parliamentary guarantee in regard to the organization given to the newly-created Staff Corps, and the alleged supercession of the Officers remaining with their regiments, and he frankly accepted that opinion. But that guarantee had no reference whatever to the employment or pay of the Officers, and therefore when the Officers of the local Army received brevet rank, he considered that this was a sufficient fulfilment of the guarantee in their regard, although the brevet rank carried with it no additional pay. The rank given to regimental Officers in respect to length of service had no connection with substantive rank in the Staff Corps. All the Officers in the Indian Army, whether of the Staff Corps or not, would receive their army rank in respect of length of service. The Officers of the Indian Army would stand in exactly the same relative seniority to each other as they did on the day that the Staff Corps was formed. With regard to the Ordnance Brevet rank being only local, he thought that the Ordnance Corps in India had received greater advantages than almost any other corps, and that they had not the slightest grievance to complain of.

NAVY—THE COURSE OF THE "GLADIATOR."—QUESTION.

Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE said, he rose to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether the opinion of Vice Admiral Fitzroy, President of the Meteorological Department of the Board of Trade, has been taken as to the winds and currents which prevail in the Mid-Atlantic in the months of July, August, and September; and, if so, whether he will lay that opinion upon the table of the House; he might say, in explanation, that Admiral Fitzroy presided over a Department which had the winds and currents particularly under their consideration;—and whether the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty are aware that the facts set forth in Captain Maury's Trade Wind Chart for the month of August are in every respect opposed to the information given to the House by the noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty, on the authority of the Hydrographer of the Navy?

Lord CLARENCE PAGET replied, that the Admiralty had not consulted Admiral Fitzroy; they had consulted their own Hydrographer. With regard to the latter part of the Question of the hon. Baronet, he had to state that the Admiralty regulations for the transport of the troops, so far from being in opposition to Captain Maury's views, were in exact accordance with them. Captain Maury's work gave the average passage of more than twenty sailing vessels for every month in the year for a distance of 820 miles on both sides of the line, and the result was that in the month of August, when the variable winds prevailed, the passage was made at the rate of 120 miles a day, and in March and November at the rate of 140. so that no great delay might be expected,

Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE said, he wished to know, Whether the noble Lord will obtain the opinion of Admiral Fitzroy, and lay it upon the table?

Lord CLARENCE PAGET: We are quite satisfied with the opinion of our own Hydrographer.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

HUDSON'S BAY TERRITORY.—PAPERS MOVED FOR.

Mr. ARTHUR MILLS said, he rose to call attention to the present condition of the territories claimed by the Hudson's Bay Company, and to move an Address for Copies of all Correspondence which had taken place between the Imperial and Canadian Governments respecting the Western Boundaries of Canada, and of any Memorials forwarded to the Colonial Office from the inhabitants of the Red River Settlement. He did not propose to enter into the question of the rights of the Hudson's Bay Company, which had so often been the subject of inquiry in Parliament. It was generally admitted, he believed, that the territory claimed by the Company, comprising 1,500,000 square miles, was granted by a charter of Charles II. at a time when it did not belong to the British Crown. It was now admitted that in 1670 the vast territory now claimed by the Company was in the possession of the Crown of France, and was occupied by a French Company under a charter dated thirty or forty years before that of Charles II. It was notorious that by the Treaty of Ryswick, in 1696, it was admitted in the face of Europe that the territory belonged to the Crown of France. By the Treaty of Utrecht, in 1713, it was admitted that three-fourths of the territory belonged to France. It was not until the Treaty of Paris, in 1763, when Canada was ceded to England, that this territory became the property of the Crown of England. The territory was, therefore, granted by Charles II. to the Hudson's Bay Company 100 years before it became the property of the British Crown. It was also true, by the concurrent testimony of all our eminent legal authorities, from Lord Mansfield to Lord Westbury, that a prescription of 200 years, supported by Acts of Parliament reciting the rights of the Company, cured the defects of the title, however bad and rotten it might have been originally. Therefore, the question was one which was no longer open to dispute; at any rate, it would be unpractical and a mere waste of time to discuss the question now. But there was a question connected with this territory which was not altogether irrelevant at the present time. There was a tract of country containing 60,000 or 70,000 square miles, which—according to the evidence of witnesses examined before the Parliamentary Committee in 1857, including Sir George Simpson, Governor of the Hudson's Bay Company, and who had every interest to represent the territory as barren; Captain Palliser, who was officially appointed to inquire into the state of the country; Professor Hinde, also appointed to make the inquiry—comprised some of the most fertile land in the whole continent of North America. That territory was now practically shut up from colonization. It was perfectly true that this fertile territory was separated from Canada by a very barren and inhospitable tract of 500 miles, between Lake Superior and Lake Ontario. It was also true that up to this time no effort had been made to colonise that territory, and that the natural barrier which lay between it and the other possessions of the Crown was an impediment to colonization. The question now was, what openings offered themselves for the settlement of that territory. It was admitted by all that the connection of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by land by a continuous chain of settlements would be of immense advantage both in regard to the territories themselves and to our own interests in North America. The opening of the China trade through British territory would be of vast commercial importance. There was also no doubt whatever of the political importance of doing all in our power to form a bond of union among all our territories in North America. But the serious question was, who was to pay the costs of the operation? He apprehended the House of Commons was not prepared to spend any portion of the public money for founding Colonies in that part of British America; and he also apprehended that they would be very reluctant to give an Imperial guarantee to other parties who might be willing to undertake the task. But it so happened that in this instance the colony of Canada had come forward and expressed its readiness to undertake some share at all events of this large financial responsibility. He would briefly state how the case stood at the present moment. From the correspondence laid on the table it appeared that the colony of Canada was willing to guarantee 4 per cent upon £250,000, to be raised for the purpose of connecting the western frontier of Canada with the Red River Settlement; but the Colonial Government said they would undertake this obligation only on the condition that the boundaries of Canada should be properly defined. The hindrances to this arrangement were interposed by the Hudson's Bay Company. Last year that Company appeared in a new dress, but it had not lost its ancient character. They refused to go before any tribunal for arbitration—they would not open the question of boundary in any shape or form—but stood upon their ancient rights, which they were prepared to uphold. Thus Canada was baulked in her efforts by obstacles interposed by the Hudson's Bay Company. The question was not whether we were to upset the charter—not whether Great Britain should undertake the expense of founding a Crown colony in Canada, but whether England was prepared to allow an obstruction to intervene between the colonization of that country and a colony which had manifested its readiness to undertake so important a share of the financial burden. In reply to an application from the Canadian Government for co-operation in this matter, Mr. Dallas wrote as follows:—

"While fully admitting the force of the above arguments, and the immediate necessity of some

> arrangements being come to, I am reluctantly compelled to admit my inability to meet the Government of Canada in this forward movement, for the following reasons:—The Red River and Saskatchewan valleys, though not in themselves fur-bearing districts, are the sources from whence the main supplies of winter food are procured for the northern posts, from the produce of the buffalo hunts. A chain of settlements through these valleys would not only deprive the Company of the above vital resource, but would indirectly, in many other ways, so interfere with their northern trade, as to render it no longer worth prosecuting on an extended scale. It would necessarily be divided into various channels, possibly to the public benefit, but the Company could no longer exist on its present footing."

The Earl of Carnarvon, writing on behalf of the Imperial Government, proposed to the Hudson's Bay Company the policy of acquiescing in the reference desired by the colony of Canada. He said—

> "Before deciding finally upon the course to be pursued, he desires to place once more the question before the Hudson's Bay Company, with a sincere hope that on a fuller consideration they may see the expediency of modifying the determination which your letter announced. Where on all sides interests so great and various are concerned, the wisest and most dignified course will be found, as Sir E. Bulwer Lytton has on previous occasions pointed out, in an appeal to and a decision by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, with the concurrence alike of Canada and of the Hudson's Bay Company. If the adoption of such a procedure be advantageous to the interests of all parties concerned, Sir Edward cannot but think it would be particularly for the interest of the Hudson's Bay Company. It would afford a tribunal pre-eminently fitted for the dispassionate consideration of the questions at issue; it would secure a decision which would probably be rather of the nature of an arbitration than of a judgment; and it would furnish a basis of negotiation on which reciprocal concession and the claims for compensation could be most successfully discussed."

The question was, whether the Hudson's Bay Company were to be allowed to stand in the way of the public advantage? He believed that Parliament would not consider it right that the Hudson's Bay Company should stand in the way of establishing settlements, especially when those who were to derive the benefit of them were prepared to bear their full share of the burden involved in making them. He had brought the question before the House in the hope that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies would state that no obstruction to the plan would be offered on the part of Her Majesty's Government. He was quite aware that there were good reasons why Great Britain alone should not undertake the responsibility of planting a colony in that quarter. He was fully

aware that there were great difficulties yet in store with respect to the boundaries between British North America and the United States—there were questions arising respecting the defence of our colonial possessions—respecting the Red River Settlement—and there was a strong probability that that Settlement would have a large influx of immigrants from the States. It appeared to him that if the opportunity were afforded of helping on the federal union of our North American colonies, enabling the colonists to unite themselves by commercial intercourse with the Atlantic and the Pacific, not only would our trade with China be opened, but a chain of settlements would be formed binding the colonists more closely together. While he believed it would be inexpedient that England herself should undertake a new settlement in North America, he nevertheless thought that a policy which would enable the existing colonies to unite themselves by a chain of settlements between the two oceans, would be wise, dignified, and prudent—regard being had to the time when the vast territory to which he referred would contain self-supporting communities. Although the political difficulties were considerable, he believed that those difficulties might be overcome. The question was one of considerable importance; and he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would indicate some means by which the differences between Canada and the Hudson's Bay Company might be cleared up by a reference to the Judicial Committee of Council or some other tribunal before which the questions could be tried; because, if they stood over, the time might come when Canada might say, "We offered to bear our part of the cost; impediments were offered; we were not allowed to settle our boundaries, we could not go forward, and were prevented from doing that which we were desirous of accomplishing." There were, moreover, quite enough points of argument between ourselves and our neighbours in North America (such as the San Juan question, and others) standing over for adjudication, without adding to them "Hudson's Bay and Red River questions" for future controversy. On all these grounds he sincerely hoped that the settlement of this vast and fertile territory would not be left to the chances of desultory immigration, and that no hindrance at all events would be offered to those who might be prepared to undertake its colonization on the part of the Imperial Government.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copies of all Correspondence which has taken place between the Imperial and Canadian Governments respecting the Western Boundaries of Canada, and of any Memorials forwarded to the Colonial Office from the inhabitants of the Red River Settlement,"—(*Mr. Arthur Mills,*) —instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. WATKIN said, the few words with which he should trouble the House could be offered rather as evidence in the case than as intended to convey any peculiar views of his own. He had understood that the hon. and learned Gentleman, the Mover of the Resolution, had laid down the proposition, upon what authority he knew not, that Canada was ready to assume the cost and responsibility of founding a new colony in the vast territory belonging to or at least in the possession of the Hudson's Bay Company; a colony, in fact, which would become one of a great chain of communities between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Mr. ARTHUR MILLS explained that what he had meant was merely that Canada was ready to be responsible for a large proportion of the cost of establishing telegraphic and other communication across the continent.

Mr. WATKIN: Really the hon. Gentleman, before bringing so large a question before the House, ought to have taken more pains to be accurate. All that Canada had proposed to do was to contribute so much a year, about £10,000, in aid of the construction of a telegraph, and towards providing the means of a postal and passenger transit across the continent. And at the instance of the late Colonial Minister, the Duke of Newcastle, a proposition had been made in May, 1863, which, if at once accepted, would have led to the achievement of that great object. The Duke communicated that proposition in a despatch bearing that date, to both Canada and British Columbia; and Canada, after keeping the despatch unanswered from May, 1863, to the end of February, 1864, at last declined to proceed, and on not over creditable grounds. The House might remember that the late Government of Canada went out of office early in March last, and on the eve of leaving office they drew up the minute refusing their assistance. Possibly they might not have replied at all, but in the month of February the Colonial Office informed them—as the papers now before the House showed—that British Columbia regarded the proposals with deep interest, and only waited for the decision of Canada in order to forward, as was expected, a favourable reply. Knowing, then, that their refusal would throw over the whole project—for, if refused, British Columbia could not comply—the late Government entirely backed out of their own proposal. And on what ground? why, that the Duke's despatch proposed the erection of a telegraph only. Now, a reference to the despatch itself would show that this plea was unfounded; and he might state that personal explanations had been given to the members of this very Government, so that the House could only assume that those who then guided the affairs of Canada did not desire, as represented by the hon. Member, to see so truly Imperial a work carried out with vigour and certainty. In fact, in their hands and by their delays and excuses and unwillingness, Canada, and Canada only, had stood in the way. The blame, therefore, he regretted to say, must, so far, rest with Canada and not with Her Majesty's Colonial Office or with the Hudson's Bay Company, as was, no doubt, upon erroneous information alleged by the hon. Member. The fault, however, attached to the Government and not to the people of Canada. But the question before the House was much larger, and it involved consequences demanding the most serious and anxious consideration of Parliament. The question came to this—Was this vast territory, above four times as large as Great Britain, worth the attention of the Colonial Office and deserving of the care of that House? Was it worth the while of the House and the Government to consider the future settlement and destiny of a vast and fertile region capable of containing from thirty to fifty millions of free people? The time has almost come when the House must decide whether that region should be peopled with British subjects, or become part of the American union. Regarding the question as affecting Imperial interests—and the consideration of those interests only could guide the House—he felt assured that hon. Members would desire to preserve this territory to the British Crown. Let the House bear in mind that it was considering a portion of the earth's surface at least as large as Russia in Europe. Then came the practical question—could this territory be governed and defended by Canada, or ought it to become a separate and distinct colony under the control of the Crown? Now, so far from Canada, as a whole, desiring to hold itself responsible for the establishment and defence of a new colony, the great bulk of Canadian statesmen — especially in the present state of Canadian finance and Canadian defence—would oppose it. Canada could not just now afford the risk, and it must be remembered that the very men who had repudiated the Duke's despatch, and had backed out of the overland communication, had been in all ways backward as regarded the military defence of the colony itself. They, at least, after refusing to provide adequately for the defence of Canada, would not take the new burden of defending an additional border of 1,500 miles alongside the United States. But the House would bear in mind that a question had, with more or less vehemence, agitated the minds of the Canadian people, namely, that of "Representation by Population." When the union of Lower and Upper Canada was declared, the population of Lower Canada much exceeded that of Upper Canada. Now, however, the population of Upper Canada exceeded that of Lower Canada by some 300,000; and a party in Upper Canada asked for a proportionate representation. Such a measure would of course enable Upper Canada to rule over and destroy the individualization of Lower Canada. Therefore, all French-speaking Canadians, and a large number of the most loyal people in both sections of the province, opposed a change leading inevitably to universal suffrage and the extinction of the political influence of an educated minority. Now, if the Hudson's Bay territory were added to Upper Canada, that portion of the province would overbear the remainder, and all the old contests of race and language would be revived, even perhaps to the end of civil war. He entirely forebore to speak about title, that would settle itself; it was a purely legal question. The question before the House was one of Government. The hon. Gentleman talked of the rights of Canada—meaning, he supposed, that Canada could and would govern, and, if govern, defend. Now Canada was a country 1,500 miles long and 500 to 600 miles broad. It had a population strewn over this area of only 3,000,000—or less than the population of London. Yet, forsooth, the hon. and learned Gentleman proposed to charge this small population with the defence and Government of a new country nearly twice as big as its own, notwithstanding that Fort Garry—the chief settlement of the Hudson's Bay territory—was 1,000 miles from the nearest place at present deserving the name of a settlement belonging to Canada. But while the hon. Gentleman advocated a chain of settlements, forming ultimately one continuous British population between the two oceans, he deprecated any Imperial expenditure on account of such an Imperial purpose. His proposal on behalf of Canada was unauthorized and must break down. It was imperative that any new colony must be founded upon the *prestige* of the British Empire and its flag. No other foundation would preserve British influence. Either that must happen or a rapid process of Americanization would go on. Already the country was being squatted over by American citizens and soldiers, while the Colonial Office did nothing. But the hon. Gentleman referred to the cost of founding new colonies. Now, the people of the United States founded new communities, and organized their Government, without saddling the Union itself with any permanent expense whatever; they derived their resources from the sale of lands and the taxation of the settlers. And in so fine a region as this, if the British Government could not found a new colony without coming to the Imperial Exchequer except for temporary advances or assistance, the fault must be attributed to mismanagement and incapacity at the Colonial Office. As regarded the alleged impediments to the settlement of the Hudson's Bay territory, he must repeat that the late Canadian, and not the Imperial Government, was responsible. The monied and commercial classes here in England were ready to co-operate liberally; but the confidence in the *bona fides* of Canada must be first restored. Was it not extraordinary that in the year 1864 a private company of fur traders should rule and govern about a fourth of the whole North American continent, and that a charter of Charles II. should permit such a private company in London to levy war with Indian tribes, to build fortifications, and to have, in fact, if they thought fit, an army of defence?

Unless Her Majesty's Government were prepared to take more immediate and practical action, nothing could prevent the alienation of this territory, which ought to become in every sense an integral part of the Empire. The House had had to listen to much discussion for years past; the time for action had arrived. Was the House prepared longer to allow the matter to drift its own way; to permit American squatters to secure the most valuable lands, and American influence to predominate, when by hoisting the British flag and giving to the people of Red River the moral influence of the British Crown, they could render this territory one of the most valuble and hopeful of all the British dependencies?

MR. CARDWELL said, he would offer no objection to the production of any papers that remained of the copious Correspondence already presented on the subject. He trusted, however, under these circumstances, that his hon. Friend would not expect him to enter at length into the question she had raised; for if he were to go through the whole history of the matter, he would enter a territory as vast as that of the Hudson's Bay Company. In 1857 a Committee of that House, which had been appointed to inquire into the subject, recommended that Canada should be permitted, if she thought proper, to annex the territories in question, so that they might thereafter form a part of the Canadian possessions; and acting on that suggestion the Colonial Secretary submitted certain propositions to Canada and to the Hudson's Bay Company. The Government, acting under the advice of the Law Officers of the Crown, felt it was impossible to dispute the validity of a charter which had existed for two centuries; but they made the very suggestion alluded to by his hon. Friend — that the question of the western boundaries of Canada should be referred to the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Hudson's Bay Company assented; but Canada demanded that the Privy Council should consider, not merely the question of boundaries, but the whole validity of the charter. To this proposition the Company naturally would not consent. The noble Lord who was then Colonial Secretary was succeeded by the right hon. Baronet the Member for Hertfordshire (Sir E. Bulwer-Lytton) who, under the advice of the Law Officers of the Crown, informed the Canadian Government that if they wished to challenge the charter of the Company they must do so by a *scire facias* in the Court of Queen's Bench. The Canadian Government, however, refused to take any steps to settle the question. The right hon. Gentleman gave full notice that in that case he should feel at liberty to endeavour to settle the question by negotiation. In 1862 negotiations were commenced with his noble Friend the Duke of Newcastle by a company who proposed to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by means of telegraphic and postal communication. Ultimately the Hudson's Bay Company became united in interest with the persons who promoted that scheme, and the negotiations were carried to this point—that it was agreed the Hudson's Bay Company should be compensated for their interest in the territory out of the proceeds of the sale of portions of the land. The principle was adopted, but the details were not settled. At that stage of the matter he (Mr. Cardwell) succeeded to the office he had now the honour to occupy. He had anticipated the desire expressed by the hon. Gentleman, that every facility should be afforded to Canada to take part in the negotiations on this subject. He had informed the Company that if any colony was to be founded in that territory provision for the settlement and good government of the new colony must be made by themselves, by the Canadian Government, or by the Crown; and he renewed the offer made on the recommendation of the Committee of 1857. At the same time he had called on the Canadian Government, if they were not disposed to take upon themselves the responsibility, to state distinctly what were their views on the boundary question, in order that negotiations might be set on foot for the amicable settlement of the dispute. This question involved points of very great difficulty. It was connected with chartered rights of great antiquity. The matter before the House was also connected with the position of the intercolonial railway, which still remained in suspense in Canada, and it was connected, moreover, with the proposal that Canada should maintain at her own expense communication by telegraph and post road with the point at which the telegraph of the Hudson's Bay Company should join the Canadian system. Canada had not yet given her adhesion to that proposal; and the question of the Canadian guarantee of half the cost of the telegraph was also still in abeyance, which was likewise the case with the proposal that the other half should be guaranteed by Vancouver's Island and British Columbia. It also remained undecided whether, if a new settlement were to be established, it should be founded at the expense of the present Hudson's Bay Company, of Canada, or of the Imperial Exchequer. Canada would shortly receive from him an offer based on the recommendations of the Committee of 1857. But the matter was one of great importance, and would have to be maturely considered. With the view of bringing the whole affair to a satisfactory result, he had written to his noble Friend the Governor General of Canada a despatch which, as an answer to the Motion of the hon. Member for Taunton (Mr. Arthur Mills) he would be glad to lay on the table. He invited the Canadian Government to state whether they were prepared to accept the conditions recommended by the Committee of the House of Commons; and, if not, to intimate what their views were respecting the question of the western boundary? That difficult question it would be his endeavour to bring to a satisfactory conclusion; but all he would say at present was that no pledge would be given on his part without the previous knowledge and consent of the House.

Mr. LYALL said, it was not true that the Hudson's Bay Company had sent out telegraphic wires for the purpose of connecting Minnesota with the Red River Settlement, and thereby increasing the influence of the United States in the Hudson's Bay territory. The Directors who came into office a year ago took into consideration the subject of communication between Columbia and Canada in association with the question of communication with China, and they had sent out wires for that purpose. But certainly if Canada were not prepared to do her part in overcoming the natural difficulties of the country between her and the Red River Settlement, it would be necessary for the Company to connect their telegraph with Minnesota, from which they were only distant about fifty miles. With respect to the new government of the Company, they were by no means disposed to retard colonization; they waited, however, for roads and other communications; and it was felt, moreover, that greater powers than were given by their proprietary charter must be obtained by the Company in order to establish good order in the settlement. The whole subject was under the consideration of the Colonial Office, and he trusted that an extended colonization of a great territory would be promoted.

Colonel SYKES urged the great importance of communication with British Columbia. We could not get there at all except by Panama and Cape Horn. So that Columbia were connected with Canada, what mattered whether the communication were effected by the colony of Canada or by an independent Company? The result would be that a direct communication with China would be established. The undertaking was one of great importance; and if it could be effected by a little pressure upon the Hudson's Bay Company it would be politic for the Government to exercise it. The hon. Gentleman who brought the question forward was entitled to the thanks of the House for so doing.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

LUNATIC ASYLUMS IN IRELAND.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. BLAKE rose to call the attention of the Chief Secretary for Ireland to the necessity which exists for amending the Laws relating to the administration of Lunatic Asylums in Ireland, and for making better provision for the care of Imbeciles confined in the Union Workhouses; and to inquire whether he will introduce a Bill next Session to remedy the defects complained of? For the last three years he had each Session called the attention of Government to the serious defects which existed in the moral treatment, with a few exceptions, in the Lunatic Asylums of Ireland; and in his efforts to have a proper system introduced, he had never been fortunate to obtain much support from the Irish Members. Nevertheless, the question had gained ground, and some good results had followed. He should do the Chief Secretary for Ireland the justice to say that the representations which he had made to him on the subject had not been disregarded, as he had given a good deal of attention to it, both by visiting asylums and endeavouring, as far as he could, to effect a reform in the direction which he had frequently pointed out to him as most necessary. He considered it was only just towards the Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums, as well as towards some of the Managers of these institutions in the country, to say that within the last two years an undoubted improvement had taken place in many of the asylums, so far as regarded increased suitable occupation and amusement for the patients, although in some much remained to be done. It was also very pleasing to see in the last published Report of the Inspectors, that that portion of the treatment in each of the asylums had a prominent place in their remarks. On the present occasion he would only allude to it incidentally in suggesting some legislation which he thought would materially aid the carrying out improved moral treatment. If the suggestions he was about to offer for amending the laws relating to Lunatic Asylums had not the merit for the most part of originality, they had at least what was much better, which was the fact of many of them being so manifestly necessary that they had been recommended for adoption by much higher authority than he was. Nearly all would be found in the Report of the Royal Commissioners appointed in 1857 to inquire into the state of the Irish Asylums, which consisted of men of great ability and eminence, amongst them one of the foremost physicians in the empire, Dr. Corrigan. Subsequently the noble Lord the Member for Cockermouth (Lord Naas), then Chief Secretary for Ireland, introduced a Bill, in which also might be found many of his (Mr. Blake's) suggestions on the present occasion. The Royal Commission recommended that the asylums should be under the direction of a central board, to consist of three salaried members, who should also act as Inspectors—two to be of the medical profession, one of the legal. To that recommendation he would add three more Commissioners, who should be salaried, so far as paying them one or two guineas each for every time they attended a meeting of the board: this would not entail a cost of more than a couple of hundred a year, and would be certain to secure a punctual attendance. To this Commissioner he would delegate nearly all the duties now performed by the Privy Council in reference to asylums, and would, in certain cases, give the Lord Lieutenant a veto. As things then stood, nearly all the control devolved on the Inspectors; as the Lord Lieutenant and the Privy Council must necessarily be influenced by their recommendations; and without at all intending to disparage those gentlemen, for whom he entertained the highest respect, he thought it would be far better to have some other gentlemen associated with them in the direction of the asylums, especially as their duties would every day increase from the additional asylums in progress of construction. The present board of control would, of course, merge into the new Commission. He thought that, for purposes of inspection, Ireland ought to be divided into two districts, assigning one to each Inspector, who would thus have a greater responsibility than at present, and more inducements to forward the asylum intrusted to him. It would promote a desirable emulation, as each Inspector would naturally endeavour not to have the asylum of his district inferior to those of his colleague. Power should also be given to the Lord Lieutenant to appoint for particular purposes, when occasion called for it, a special Commissioner to hold investigations and report. This would prove most useful at times when there might be a great difference of opinion between a local board and the Inspectors, and when it would be desirable to have the assistance of a person who would be certain to be totally unprejudiced. Two-thirds of the governors of asylums ought to be appointed by the grand jury, and in certain instances by town councils; or, in the event of transferring the maintenance of lunatics to the poor rates—as ought to be done—the appointment to be made by the guardians. One-third of the boards might be left to be nominated by the Lord Lieutenant, which would be always sufficient to secure a fair representation from the gentry. It was manifestly unfair, that whilst the asylums were maintained from grand jury rates, that that body had no voice whatever in appointing those who were to administer them. There were many other objections to vesting such power in the hands of the Government. Dr. Nugent, in his evidence before the Royal Commission, stated that the governors were usually appointed on the recommendation of the Inspectors. Such a practice was most undesirable. It was for the interest of the asylums that the governors should in every respect be wholly independent of either Inspectors or local medical officers. If the Government were usually guided in their selection by the recommendation of the Inspectors, it was not going too far to assume that the latter, in their turn, were often influenced in their selection by the local officers; and it was only natural that the latter would not recommend any one likely to be unfriendly to them, or who would not accord in their views. He believed the independence and efficiency of many local boards was much impaired by the mode in which they were appointed. To a board constituted in the way he had suggested, he would give the appointment of all the superior officers, subject to the approval of the central board or the Lord Lieutenant. On this subject the Royal Commissioners justly observed—

> " As regards the appointment of superior officers, resident and medical physician, &c., we consider they should be left to the governors. The evidence we have received is to a great, perhaps preponderating extent, opposed to this power being given to the governors. But, as a general principle, we do not see why the executive Government should interfere in these matters, or that its interference has, or is likely to lead to, a better selection of officers than would be made by the local authorities. It is true, as has been stated, that the appointment of these officers may tend to local contention, and that private feeling may prevail to the prejudice of the institution. We think there is not a little reason to believe that political influence might lead to an equally unfortunate result."

Out of the 4,506 patients in asylums, only 1,135 were returned as probably curable; and of the 3,371 incurable, there were many in a state of hopeless idiotcy, and, unfortunately, occupied the place of many insane confined in gaols or workhouses, or with their families, who, if placed early under curative treatment, might have a chance of recovery, which was lessened every hour they were out of the asylum. Some arrangement ought to be made by which many of the hopeless tranquil cases, where the mind had sunk into fatuity or idiotcy, belonging to two or more counties, could be sent to special institutions, and thus relieve the asylums of their care, and make room for hopeful cases. Power should be given to magistrates to commit dangerous lunatics direct to asylums, instead of sending them to prison, where they could not be so well cared for, or have the same chance of recovery. Boards should be empowered to receive and enforce payment from patients capable of contributing in the whole or part for their maintenance. There was considerable doubt as to the law on the subject, which ought to be settled. In some places, boards sought and obtained payment from parties capable of paying, whilst elsewhere they considered themselves not entitled to do so. A great burden was, therefore, thrown on the ratepayers—for example, at Limerick there appeared to be seven patients well able to pay who were supported out of the rates. Boards should also be empowered to send strange lunatics to their own localities. In the larger towns, particularly seaports, persons after only residing a short time, or perhaps only passing through, were sent to the asylum, and became a charge on a district to which they did not belong. Central boards should have the power of fixing the dietaries of asylums. The quantity and description of food was a most important element in the treatment of insanity, and on no account should be left to the discretion of local boards, who, as a rule, could not be competent to determine what should be given to patients. The dietary table in various institutions varied considerably; and in some instances the Inspectors had remarked on the insufficiency. These gentlemen and the other Commissioners should have the power of absolutely determining on the dietary; and on them should also devolve the duty of laying down regulations for the moral treatment, and ordering to be provided all necessary appliances for the occupation and amusement of the patients. The judicious employment and recreation of a lunatic was the most important part of the curative treatment; and those who, like the Inspectors, were supposed to be best informed as to what was necessary to soothe and restore the diseased mind to its healthy state, should have as ample powers to have everything provided for the purpose as to insist that good and sufficient medicine was furnished for the bodily ailments of the patients. It would be most desirable if the Inspectors would, as he believed they were bound to do by Act of Parliament, furnish to each member of the local boards a copy of the Report relative to his own asylum. The expense would be very small, and the probable advantages considerable, as governors would then be made aware of the state of progress and requirements of their asylum, of which many knew very little. Many governors never even once attended the asylum from their appointment—often extending over a period of twenty years; several others, perhaps, once in two or three years. There ought, therefore, to be an enactment by which governors who, not being either ill or away from the locality, absent themselves from a certain number of stated meetings in succession, should forfeit their position on the board. As some medical officers of asylums excused themselves from taking their patients outside the asylum for exercise and recreation, on the ground that it would be illegal to do so, the practice ought to be legalized, as, with proper precaution, there was little or no danger to be apprehended, and the gratification and advantage to the patients was considerable. No doubt the system pursued in an asylum should be a good one before patients were brought to that tranquil, orderly state when they could be trusted outside ; indeed, it was a great test of their progress ; and it was, therefore, a great pity that incompetent or inefficient medical officers were afforded an excuse which their convenient interpretation of the law furnished them for not following the example of more zealous and better qualified officers. While on this point of the subject, he would allude to the great necessity in all future appointments of resident medical officers in making a theoretical and practical knowledge of the treatment of insanity an absolute condition ; and that no one should be eligible unless he produced a certificate of having, for at least six months, resided in or attended and watched the practice in an hospital for the insane for that period. Besides this, they should undergo an examination before the Inspectors without whose certificate of competency they could not be appointed. As a rule, under every Government political influence went before every other consideration in making the appointments, and the unfortunate lunatics were the sufferers. Means of clinical instruction should be provided in some of the larger asylums. The criminal one would probably be best, as being altogether under Government control. There was nothing the Royal Commissioners more strongly urged than the absolute necessity which existed for clinical instruction ; but this recommendation, as well as others equally useful, had been totally disregarded. The chaplaincy question was one which imperatively called for legislation. Fortunately, the only instance where a board had persisted in refusing to appoint a chaplain was that of Belfast ; but even that was sufficient to call for the interference of the Legislature. He believed, without exception, every eminent authority concurred in recommending judicious religious ministration as a most important agent in promoting the happiness and recovery of the insane ; in fact, an essential link in the chain of curative treatment. Some few boards in Ireland had for a time resisted the appointment of chaplains — sometimes supported in their views by the medical officers — but they gradually gave in, and all had acknowledged that beneficial results had followed. Belfast alone still stood out. The Commissioners had closely inquired into the question, and reported strongly in favour of chaplains being appointed. The Inspectors, in their annual Reports, did the same. Successsive Lord Lieutenants had made the appointments ; but, owing to the state of the law, the board successfully resisted the payment of the salaries. The Catholic and Protestant Bishops, and, he believed, one Presbyterian member of the board, were in favour of chaplains. On yesterday he had a conversation with the Right Rev. Dr. Knox, Protestant Bishop of Down, on the subject, who told him that whilst the Protestant chaplain had been acting, his flock appeared to derive much comfort and benefit, and no unpleasantness of any kind had occurred. His Lordship also stated that he had written to all the asylums in Ireland to ascertain whether the appointment of chaplains had turned out satisfactorily, and the answers were in the affirmative. From the communications the Most Rev. Dr. Denvir had favoured him with on the subject, he found him equally anxious as the Protestant Bishop to be enabled to afford the portion of his congregation in the asylum spiritual ministrations. He trusted, therefore, with all this concurrent testimony on the subject, that the Chief Secretary for Ireland would give an assurance that Government would take steps to afford the poor inmates of the Belfast Asylum the same means of religious consolation that the insane of every institution of the kind in the empire were in possession of, with acknowledged comfort and advantage. There was only one more reference he would make to Lunatic Asylums. In whatever Bill might be introduced to amend the laws relating to them, there ought to be a clause placing their maintenance on the poor rates. It was a strange and unjust anomaly that, while a sane pauper was maintained at the joint expense of landlord and tenant, he would, if he became insane, become chargeable altogether on the tenant. Having occupied so much time on the subject of Lunatic Asylums, he should touch very briefly on the second part of his Motion relative to idiots. For that unfortunate class there was, unhappily, no adequate provision for their care in Ireland. They were, unfortunately, very numerous, being nearly equal to the lunatic class ; and whilst for the latter there were sixteen public asylums and several others in course of construction, besides many private institutions, there was not a single one for idiots. The pauper ones were placed in workhouses, and the others were at large or with their families, but no effort whatever was made to endeavour to cultivate those faculties of their mind which were not obliterated. Until lately it was thought that this unfortunate class were incapable of cultivation, but experiment had proved the contrary. The hon. Member having read a description of the improved condition of the patients at Earlswood, many of whom had been so far instructed as to be able to go out and earn their living, and an extract from the Report of the Census Commissioners in 1861, proceeded to say that he could not conclude without thanking the House for the very patient hearing they had given him on a subject which he felt conscious was far from being generally interesting; but he trusted his having trespassed at such length would be excused when he assured them that bringing such subjects before Parliament was almost the only way of having evils remedied or reforms accomplished. He hoped he would receive an assurance from the right hon. Baronet that he would introduce measures next Session to remedy the laws relating to Lunatic Asylums, and also to initiate something for the benefit of the more unfortunate class of whom he last spoke. The right hon. Baronet would probably tell him that much that he had suggested regarding lunatics could be accomplished by the Privy Council rules. No doubt that was true, but he respectfully asked why the Privy Council did not do what was necessary? If they did so, there need not be legislation on all the points he had touched on; and an act would only be required for what the Council could not effect. Although he felt he had but feebly pleaded on behalf of those for whom he felt the deepest compassion and interest, he ventured to hope that he had made it manifest to the House that humanity and policy alike called on us to endeavour to mitigate still further the misfortunes of those whom Providence in its wisdom had visited with the most fearful of all afflictions.

Mr. BAGWELL said, he doubted the expediency of giving the appointment of officers to the governors of asylums, as owing to the violence of party feeling in Ireland they could not be sure that in every case the best men would be employed. He was not fond of central boards, and any change in the direction of striking off governors who did not attend ought to be made very carefully, as the ratepayers of outlying districts were not the less entitled to representation. He believed that the Irish Lunatic Asylums were in general very admirably conducted; but there was one point to which he attached very great importance—namely, the training of the resident physician. He thought these officers should receive a special training, and that they should acquire a practical knowledge of the treatment and cure of the insane by residence and study in some of the great lunatic establishments in England.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, he willingly bore testimony to the zeal and humane spirit which had actuated his hon. Friend the Member for Waterford in bringing the matter before the House. He could not, however, agree with his hon. Friend that further legislation on this subject was needed. The fact that this subject had not been lost sight of by the Irish Government was proved by the circumstance that since 1821 fifteen separate Acts of Parliament had been passed specially dealing with the treatment of the insane poor of Ireland. He quite concurred with the hon. Member for Clonmel in thinking that the resident physicians should be educated with a more especial eye to the duties they had to perform; but even in the present day, with the aid of the consulting physicians, they were able to deal with the unfortunate persons under their charge in a manner much more satisfactory than was formerly the case. Not having been able to catch as accurately as he could desire the observations which had fallen from the hon. Member for Waterford, the written outline of the points in which he felt interested, furnished by his hon. Friend, would enable him to deal in detail with those various matters. As regarded the appointment of a central board, his idea was that the local authorities, with the supervision of the central Government, ought to have the main direction of the institutions. Dr. Nugent and Dr. Hatchell, the present Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums, performed their duties to the satisfaction of the public, and he was always anxious that the poor inmates should be treated with every consideration. Under the existing rules and regulations the Lord Lieutenant had power to direct a special inquiry, and only recently a case occurred at

Clonmel which Dr. Hatchell was sent down to investigate.

Mr. BLAKE said, what he contemplated was the appointment of a special Inspector, distinct from the regular officials.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, he did not think the division of Ireland into districts like those rendered compulsory by the Prisons Act would be advisable in the case of Lunatic Asylums. It was important that it should not be known beforehand what Inspector was to hold the inquiry. With regard to appointments, it was proposed in 1859 by the Ministry of that day to vest these in the governors; but the measure was strongly opposed by Liberal Members, and the present arrangement, which gave to each of the political parties in turn a share of the patronage, was, he thought, preferable. There were 16,000 of these poor creatures altogether in district Lunatic Asylums, poor houses, gaols, and private asylums. A great many boards were taking steps for affording recreation and amusement to these poor patients. It was also of great importance that chaplains should be provided for these institutions. That subject had occupied the attention of successive Lord Lieutenants. The Earl of Clarendon, the Earl of Eglinton, the Earl of St. Germans, and the present Lord Lieutenant, agreed that every Lunatic Asylum ought to have a chaplain attached to it. The Belfast Asylum was now the only one without a chaplain. Representations had been made to the board of the asylum that the patients ought to have the advantage of devotional services, but the board had hitherto resisted these appeals. Bearing in mind the great advantages that had resulted in other establishments from the services of clergymen of different denominations, he could not but think it very desirable that the deficiency should be supplied. At Londonderry, after holding out for a long time, the board agreed to make the trial. They had since reported that the effect of the ministrations of the chaplain upon the minds of the poor patients was most remarkable. It was thought that religious controversies might arise; but Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, and Episcopalian ministers attended at different hours, and the proceedings were conducted with perfect harmony. The majority of the cases in these asylums were chronic, and the patients were collected and rational, except in regard to the particular delusion in which their insanity was manifested. In the Report presented to the Lord Chancellor by the Commissioners of Lunacy in England, of whom Lord Shaftesbury was chairman, it was stated that the patients looked forward with pleasure to the performance of Divine service, and regarded their exclusion from it as a privation. They added that the prayers of the Church exercised a soothing influence even upon insane hearers. A great deal had been done of late to promote the cure and comfort of this unhappy class of persons. There were at present seventeen Lunatic Asylums in active operation. Six other Lunatic Asylums were now being built; so that the complaints that these patients were placed in gaols would soon be obviated. When these six additional Lunatic Asylums were opened, 235 of the 389 insane persons now confined in gaols would be removed to them, leaving the balance in the Dublin district. He had been in communication with the grand juries, and something would, he hoped, be done to relieve the Richmond Asylum from the pressure that fell upon it from the Dublin district. The imbeciles confined in the union workhouses in Ireland were not less than 2,400, two-thirds of whom were women. They were for the most part in a state of harmless imbecility, and it would be better to leave them there. The Boards of Guardians were giving them an increased dietary, and it was not desirable to establish large asylums for the reception of these hopeless idiots. The cost of a patient in a Lunatic Asylum averaged £20, while the cost of an insane pauper in a union workhouse was only £10. To transfer these harmless imbeciles from the workhouse to the Lunatic Asylum would, therefore, be attended by great expense, without any corresponding good. He trusted that after this explanation the hon. Gentleman would not press the subject any further.

Colonel DUNNE said, he did not agree with the right hon. Gentleman in the satisfaction which he expressed with reference to the centralized power. They were unanimous in Ireland in their wish to manage their local affairs themselves. In his own county they were most anxious to have the appointment of the governors, or some of the governors, because they wanted to check extravagance; but though he had been many years a Member of Parliament, the Irish Executive had taken care that he should have nothing to do with the management of the Lunatic Asylum in his county. He desired to draw attention to one point, which was the difficulty that existed at the present moment in getting a criminal lunatic removed to an asylum. He hoped the Government would take the subject into consideration, in order to remedy the inconvenience.

Colonel FRENCH said, he agreed with almost all that had fallen from the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary, and that no unfortunate people were better taken care of than the lunatics of Ireland. He thought, however, that the taxpayers ought to have some control over the appointment of governors and medical officers.

Mr. CORBALLY bore testimony, as governor of an asylum, to the fact that the inmates were well cared for. The only fault he had to find with the management of the institutions was the difficulty of getting people in. When a person was suddenly struck with madness, a week or a fortnight might elapse before he could be got into an asylum. He would suggest that, as medical officers were at hand, a certificate of insanity might be obtained without delay, and the afflicted person removed at once to the institution.

INNS OF COURT.—PAPERS MOVED FOR.

Mr. GRANT DUFF: Sir, the Commission to whose Report I wish to call, or rather to recall, the attention of the House, was appointed on the 5th of May, 1854, and reported on the 10th of August, 1855. During that period, and for some time after it, the mind of the country was so wholly engrossed by the Russian war, that it had no time or thought to spare, even for matters so closely touching its daily life as those to which the present Lord Chancellor and other Members of this Commission hardly less distinguished had been devoting so much of their scanty leisure. The Report, which goes to the root of the question, as to what guarantees society has a right to demand for help in legislation, as well as for the intelligent and efficient administration of the law, treats of the discipline of the property and of the educational system pursued in those great and ancient institutions, the Inns of Court. With regard to the first of these subjects, I shall say nothing, because it is already in other hands. With regard to the second, I shall only say what every one will agree to, that it is a most truly lamentable thing that so large an amount of gross revenue as that possessed by the Inns of Court should produce such a very small amount of available net income which can be applied to promote the study of law and jurisprudence; and I am sure many will think that the Commissioners were right in saying that, having regard to the great value of the site of these institutions, a doubt arises whether some mode might not be devised of rendering their property more productive, without departing from the purposes for which these societies were formed. I mean to confine myself to the third subject discussed in the Report—that is, to the part which the Inns of Court ought to take in facilitating and guarding the access to the bar. This subject has been frequently discussed in Parliament during the last twenty years, and I think I may say that the invariable result of its discussion in this building has been some reform in that gloomy but most important quarter of this great city, which stretches from Gray's Inn to the river. In the year 1846 Mr. Wyse moved for a Committee to inquire into the state of legal education in Ireland, and it was made an instruction to that Committee that it should inquire also into the state of legal education in England. The result was a most interesting Report, which was presented in August, 1846. Some time appears then to have been allowed to pass, in order that it might be seen whether the Inns of Court meant to take any steps to remedy the extraordinary and altogether disastrous state of things which had been disclosed by the evidence, and had been severely condemned by the Report; but I find from *Hansard* that on the 4th of July, 1848, a gentleman whom many of us will remember taking an important part in our discussions, and sitting on the other side of the House—I mean Mr. George Anthony Hamilton—asked whether anything was being done to carry out the suggestions of the Committee, and was informed, in reply, that the Inns of Court were holding conferences with the view of effecting a reform. The subject seems to have slumbered, as far as this House was concerned, till April, 1852, when my hon. Friend the Member for Dumfries elicited from the Attorney General of that day the very agreeable information that the Inns of Court had made a very real beginning of improvement by establishing a Council of Legal Education, by creating five readerships, by allowing such students as desired it to present themselves for examination, and encouraging them to do so by the offer of various rewards. No one of any authority doubted that this was a step in the right direction, but many thought that the Inns had not gone nearly far enough, and in the latter part of the Session of 1852 a short discussion took place in another place, in which Lord Campbell, while apologizing for more not being done, very clearly showed it to be his opinion that the then recent changes could only be considered as an instalment, while Lord Brougham and Lord Lyndhurst declared, in the strongest possible way, that the examination at the threshold of the bar should be not voluntary, but compulsory. The name of Lord Lyndhurst leads me to observe that the country owes about as much gratitude for what of good has been done with regard to this question to one party as to the other; and the fact that it was Mr. Napier, so well known in connection with Lord Derby's Irish Administration, who took the next step, and moved for the Commission of 1854, further illustrates that observation. The Commission of 1854 echoed to a great extent the recommendations of the Committee of 1846, and, above all, brought into strong relief the point on which I wish chiefly to fix the attention of the House—that no one should be called to the bar who has not gone through some systematic training in the theory as well as the practice of law, and passed a satisfactory examination. This is a question with regard to which the opinions of very few individual Members are of much value, and what I want to impress upon the House is, not that the dominant party in the Inns of Court has opposed itself to what seemed to me, or to others, to be sound principles, but that they have put themselves in opposition to a perfectly overwhelming weight of legal authority. Of course no one considers that a compulsory examination, taken by itself, is a matter of very extraordinary importance; but it is of extraordinary importance as being the indispensable complement of the whole system of legal education proposed by the Committee and Commission. Without it that system cannot possibly be worked, and must remain all but a dead letter. I have said that I wish to put the question chiefly on the ground of authority. Still I wish to state, in a few words, the arguments which seem to my mind to be decisive. I can understand free trade in law; I can understand the bar being a monopoly; but our present system combines all the disadvantages of free trade and of monopoly. It is a monopoly for the advantage of the barrister, without any better guarantee for the public than would be obtained if any one who pleased might exercise the profession of advocacy. We have, it cannot be sufficiently often repeated, no real guarantee at this moment for the competency of a barrister. Let us see how the system works with regard to the three classes into which the members of the bar may be divided—those, namely, who go to the bar with a view to practice; those who are called chiefly with a view to the various appointments which are by law or custom confined to members of the bar; and those who are merely nominal barristers. With respect to the first of these classes, it may be said that the fact of their being in practice is of itself a sufficient guarantee. Well, supposing I were to admit that it is a sufficient guarantee for their being up to the requirements of ordinary business, it will not be contended that there exists any guarantee for their having the enlargement of mind which is necessary when they come to the higher walks of the profession—when they come to be Judges or law-makers. Is it not perfectly notorious that men who succeed sufficiently well as practitioners often fail egregiously in these other capacities? Have not Judges often been the worst enemies of law reforms, and do not the pages of the evidence taken before the Committee of 1846 and the Commission of 1854 afford abundant proofs that the truth of what I am now saying is generally acknowledged? With respect to the second class, you have not even the guarantee of practice. Read Lord Brougham's evidence before the Committee of 1846, and you will see how difficult he found it to put his hand upon men who had been fitted by systematic training to undertake the duties of Colonial Judges. Read Mr. Norton's very interesting evidence in the same blue-book, and you will see in how very difficult a position is a Judge who, knowing only a little English law, and having had no scientific training in jurisprudence, is suddenly sent to a colony. I think, Sir, we hardly realize how important a question this is in relation to the management of our colonies. If ever there were lawyers who ought to be grounded in the general principles of jurisprudence, which underlie all laws, it should surely be the lawyers of England. A few remarkable sentences, which I shall ask leave to read to the House, will bring this before it in a way far more vivid than I can do. They were written some time ago, but matters have not much altered since, and English barristers have still to deal either as Colonial Judges or as practitioners before the Privy Council with the widely distinct systems to which I am going to allude:—

> "At this moment there are few of the systems of legislation, either of ancient or modern times, which are not in force as living law in the British Empire—Menu and Mohammed, beside the civil rights of the Hindoo and the Mussulman, and an appeal from India compels our Privy Councillors to consult the Koran and the Puranas as authorities at Whitehall. In the Norman Isles, the severed portions of the domain of the Conqueror, the barbaric custumal framed by his justiciars still guides the grand bailiff and the seneschal who dispense the equity of Rollo, now forgotten, in the hall of Rouen. Canada cherishes the volumes which have been cast forth from the Palais de Justice, and the legitimate representatives of the proud and learned Presidents of the Parliament of Paris are found in the court-house of a colonial town. Banished from the flowering meadows of the Seine, the ordonnances expounded by St. Louis, under the oak tree at Vincennes, constitute the tenures of land on the Gulf of St. Lawrence. In the opposite hemisphere, we bestow an equal protection upon the Codes of Napoleon. Our Sovereign appoints her alcaldes and her corregidores in the Indies of Columbus, while her landrosts in Southern Africa are guided by the placets of the departed Republic of the Netherlands."

It is enough to have spoken of Colonial Judges. I pass over a host of other appointments, in the nomination to which favour or political interest has much to do. I come, then, to the third class, a very large one, that of nominal barristers. It is a class which has numerous representatives on the magisterial bench, numerous representatives in this House, numerous representatives in general society; and for the interest of this class, and of all connected with it, it is above all desirable that there should be some systematic training, and an effective examination, otherwise their attaining the degree of barrister is a mere useless form, without advantage to themselves, and of serious detriment to all who, on the strength of it, conclude that they have necessarily any tincture whatsoever of legal learning. There are many other arguments: one might point to the absurdity of examining candidates for the line of the army, and not examining candidates for the one profession which gives in this House the title of learned. One might point to the void in the shelves of an English library where works on jurisprudence should be, and where Bentham, Austin, Maine, and the younger Stephen look wistfully around for companions. One might ask how long are we to wait for that great blessing, a codified law, if we do not begin to train lawyers, who will be inclined to work, or able to work a code. All these, however, and many more, with which I will not weary the House, are set forth in the blue-book which records the labours of this Commission, and by it, as by the Committee of 1846, a compulsory examination is pronounced indispensable. Such, then, being the recommendations of the Select Committee and of the Royal Commission, backed by those of our greatest legal luminaries, what have the Inns of Court done? Have they adopted them? Have they instituted a systematic training, followed by a compulsory examination? Far from it. The history of their action in this matter is as follows:—In 1856, the Council of Legal Education met, and reported unanimously in favour of compulsory examination. They supported their recommendation by a document signed by all the readers, and supporting the same views without the slightest reservation. In May 1859, the Committee of the Four Inns appointed to reconsider the whole subject of Legal Education made their Report, and insisted in the strongest terms on the necessity of a compulsory examination, and proposed that it should embrace precisely the same subjects which were suggested by the Royal Commission. This report is signed by the present Lord Chancellor, and marks the period of greatest advance in the history of this question. But now a change came. Lincoln's Inn took upon itself to oppose the recommendations of the committee appointed by the Four Inns, and passed, by a majority of its members, in November, 1859, resolutions condemnatory of the proposed compulsory examination. Somewhat later they declared open war with the two Templars, and on the 4th of July, 1860, a committee of Lincoln's Inn made a report which contemplated the establishment of a system of education distinct from theirs, the great cause of quarrel being, of course, the compulsory examination. Then followed negotiations, the result of which was that Lincoln's Inn carried its point, and succeeded in persuading the other Inns, against their own better judgment, to be parties to the issuing of the consolidated regulations, by which the students of these societies are now governed, dated Michaelmas, 1863. In them I find many good things and several improvements; but I also find a heavy blow and great discouragement to the cause which I advocate, in the fact that, under these regulations, a student of the Inns of Court is now qualified to be called to the bar if he has attended lectures and private classes of two of the readers for a year, or if he has spent a year in chambers, without having passed an examination. We all can imagine, and many of us know from experience, that the mere obligations of attending a year's lectures does not imply the acquisition of any knowledge whatsoever, and that a large number of the students occupy themselves with matters quite alien to those about which the reader desires to interest them. In short, they look upon the obligation to attend lectures, not as a means of acquiring legal knowledge, but as a sort of corvée, which it is their right to evade in every possible way. Again, many of us have passed a year in chambers, and we know that doing so may imply very great assiduity, absolute idleness, or anything between these two extremes. On the other hand, an examination, which is even decently conducted, at least guarantees some modicum of knowledge and power of application in the candidate for admission to the bar. I bring this subject forward in the most friendly spirit to the governing bodies of the Inns of Court, but my respect for them does not prevent my calling upon them to set forth, for the information of the public, those strong reasons of principle and expediency which have induced them to disregard, in a most essential point, the unanimous recommendation of a Select Committee, the unanimous recommendation of a Royal Commission, the unanimous recommendation of the Council of Legal Education, the unanimous recommendation of all the readers of all the Inns of Court, the opinions of Lord Brougham, Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Westbury, backed by those of eminent lawyers too numerous to mention. In May, 1856, and again in May, 1857, the Report of the Commission was alluded to in this House. It has not, I think, been mentioned since. On the latter occasion, the Attorney General of that day more than hinted that, if the Inns of Court would not carry out the views of the Commission, the Government would be obliged to do so. I do not ask the Government to take any action now. I had infinitely rather that reform came from within, but, if it does not, I beg to give notice that I will next year bring forward this Motion in another form.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of any Correspondence that may have passed between the Government and the Inns of Court, with regard to the Report of the Commission on the Inns of Court,"—(*Mr. Grant Duff,*)

—instead thereof.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. NEATE said, that the difficulty of dealing with the Inns of Court was that they claimed to be associations of private individuals, and repudiated all responsibility. They denied that there was any process for compelling them to discharge their duties. In fact, they might be described as squatters upon the legal constitution. They had acquired title by prescription. He had the honour of being a member of one of the Inns of Court, and he had had a good deal of correspondence with them. When a man had once become a member of one of the Inns of Court, it would not allow him to withdraw without requiring him to enter into an obligation which it had no right to impose. Now, if a man wished to renounce his privileges in an University he had only to write to the bursar of his college to take his name off; but a man was not allowed to retire from an Inn of Court without entering into a covenant that he would not practise anywhere as a barrister.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he understood the hon. Member who had brought forward the question not to make any attack upon the Inns of Court, but only to complain that they had not carried out the recommendation of the Royal Commission, that a candidate for the bar should pass a preliminary examination before being admitted. He would remind him that with respect to that question a good deal could be said on both sides. He confessed that his own inclination was in favour of compulsory examination; but there were reasons which influenced the benchers in arriving at a different conclusion, and which were still to a great extent under consideration. It should be borne in mind that all who were called to the bar were not necessarily practitioners, or persons who intended to practise. Many only intended to qualify themselves for performing their duties as magistrates, or as chairmen of Quarter Sessions. He might instance many Members of that House, among whom were some of its greatest ornaments, who were called to the bar but never intended to practise. It had been considered by the Inns of Court that if they imposed a strict examination, such as the hon. Member required, it might have the effect of deterring such persons from becoming candidates for admission to the bar, and would therefore be prejudicial not only to the bar but to the public. As the hon. Member said, that if the Government did not take up the question he would bring it forward again, probably the most convenient time for discussing it would be on that future occasion. He (the Solicitor General) could only say further, that it did not appear to him that the Government were called upon at present to take any steps in the matter. He believed that the Inns of Court thoroughly represented and had the full confidence of the profession. If the Inns of Court did not fairly represent the bar, nor conduct themselves to the satisfaction of the great body of the profession, they would have heard complaints from the profession, but he was not aware of any such complaints having been made. With regard to the complaint of the hon. Member for Oxford (Mr. Neate), he believed that it was unfounded. He understood the case to be this—if a barrister wished to take his name off the books of his Inn, it was necessary that he should undertake that he would not practise at all as a barrister, and for that purpose they took from him some security. The Government would be willing to produce any papers in their possession on the subject if the hon. Member would indicate them; but he hoped he would be satisfied with his explanation and not press his Motion.

Amendment *negatived.*

ROYAL FORESTS IN ESSEX.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. COX rose to call the attention of Her Majesty's Government to the terms of a Resolution of the Select Committee on Royal Forests in Essex which sat in the Session of 1863. It might be in the recollection of the House that in February, 1863, it was agreed to present an Address to Her Majesty praying that Crown forestal right existing within fifteen miles of the metropolis should not be disposed of, nor encroachments thereon be permitted. The encroachments which had been going on were, however, continued; the public paid no attention to the rights of the Crown, and the Government paid no attention to the Vote of the House. A Committee was afterwards appointed to inquire into the subject, and by it a most elaborate Report was presented to the House. The Members of the Committee, of whom he was one, were nearly equally divided in opinion. The minority, in which also he was included, thought it better to leave the whole thing as it was; the majority, on the other hand, were in favour of enclosing certain parts of the land which had not before been used by the public, and of retaining portions which it was proved they had been in the habit of enjoying. He now admitted that he had changed his view; and, together with another hon. Member of the Committee who was one of the minority, had come to the conclusion that the majority was right. It might be objected that no inclosure at all should be made; but though that was his former opinion he did not now go to that extent. He thought, however, that unless something were done soon to preserve a portion of the forest in question to the public there would be no forest left, and not only would the Crown lose its right but the public be deprived of the privilege they had long enjoyed. One of the Resolutions of the Committee to which he had referred was to the effect, that a considerable part of the forest having been enclosed without consideration of Crown rights, the Crown be recommended to take immediate steps to ascertain its rights and to abate such inclosures. As yet, however, as was admitted recently by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury, no steps had been taken by the Government to carry the Resolution of the Committee into effect, or to prevent any further enclosures taking place. The Committee further recommended that the sanction of Parliament should be obtained

> "For the inclosure of the remaining portion of the forest, to ascertain the rights of the several parties interested, and to make provision for securing an adequate portion of the forest for the purposes of health and recreation, for which, it has been proved to your Committee, this forest has from time immemorial been enjoyed by the inhabitants of the neighbourhood and the metropolis."

It would be said, perhaps, by the Government, where was the money to come from with which to carry the recommendation into effect? He would tell the Government in reply that the Crown held 2,000 acres, which had been taken out of the forest, and which were worth £100 an acre, and to those the public had some claim.

This would be seen from the fact that Fairlop Oak was situated, and Fairlop Fair was accustomed to be held, on the very spot in possession of the Government, and from which land the Government were deriving a revenue of £4,000 or £5,000 a year. The public by usage had a right to the portion of the forest referred to, and as this portion was worth at least £200,000, the Government could not say they had not the funds with which to carry out the recommendations of the Committee. Further, after paying the expenses of draining and fencing, this land yielded a profit of £15,000 on the sale of the timber. He therefore called on the Government to stop the encroachments that were being made on the forest, and to carry into effect the recommendations of the Committee. In conclusion, he begged to move—

"That, in the opinion of this House, Her Majesty's Government should at once take the necessary steps to carry into effect the Recommendation of the Select Committee on Royal Forests (Essex) in Session, 1863, and which Recommendation was as follows: 'To obtain the sanction of Parliament for the inclosure of the remaining portion of the forest; to ascertain the rights of the several parties interested; and to make provision for securing an adequate portion of the forest for those purposes of health and recreation for which, it has been proved to your Committee, this forest has from time immemorial been enjoyed by the inhabitants of the neighbourhood and the metropolis.'"

MR. SPEAKER: The House having already resolved "that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," it is not competent for the hon. Member to move any further Amendment to the Motion that I do leave the Chair.

MR. PEEL said, that the hon. Member, in complaining of the Government for not carrying out the Recommendations of the Committee, had not made allowance for the difficulties in which they were placed; but if the course they had adopted had not been satisfactory to the hon. Member, it had satisfied the House. In February last year the House voted an Address to the Crown, praying it to give directions that no sale to facilitate inclosures should be made of Crown lands or forestal rights within fifteen miles of the metropolis. The recommendation of the Select Committee, however, was that the lands should be inclosed, and that the rights of the Crown in Epping Forest, which were merely those of keeping and hunting deer over open spaces, but which prevented inclosure as long as it remained, should be sold. In this conflict between the Report of the Committee and the Resolution of the House, the Government had felt it their duty to follow the latter as long as it continued unrescinded. The Address to the Crown had been agreed to, he must remark, rather in opposition to the opinion of the Government, who thought that it was scarcely fitting that the forestal right of the Crown over Epping Forest, the soil of which was private property, should be used as an instrument for converting that private property into public property; and they were advised by the Law Officers that it would be very difficult to institute successful legal proceedings for the purpose of abating bit by bit encroachments over a considerable space. Moreover, they had also doubted whether it would not be subversive of the principle of the Acts relating to the land revenues of the Crown, that a large expenditure should be incurred in asserting rights which, when vindicated, would be productive of no income to the Crown. The Committee of last Session in their Report recognized the force of the objections made by the Government, and expressed an opinion that to employ the forestal rights of the Crown to obstruct the process of inclosure would not only be a course doubtful in point of justice, but one which, judging from the experience of the past, was likely to fail in securing the desired object. He was inclined to think it would be advisable that some Resolution, such as that which the hon. Member had wished to move, should be adopted by the House; but he took exception to the words stating that Her Majesty's Government ought at once to take the necessary steps for carrying out the recommendation of the Committee of last year. It would not be in the power of the Government to do that. The question was not one merely as to disposing of the forestal rights of the Crown. If that were all, they could, no doubt, either sell those rights to the owners of the soil or obtain in exchange for them some equitable equivalent for the benefit of the public. But the Committee recommended that open spaces in the forest should be inclosed, subject to the reservation and acquisition of an adequate portion for the health and recreation of the inhabitants of the metropolis. As the law now stood, it rested with the owners and others interested in these open spaces to originate the proceedings for inclosure, and the Government had no compulsory power to require any open space to be inclosed.

It was a difficult question, too, from what source the means of purchase should be derived. The hon. Member had endeavoured to dispose of that difficult question by saying that the Government could, without coming to that House, appropriate 2,000 acres to the purpose of a public park in Epping Forest. The £200,000 which the hon. Member said was the value of the Crown property in Epping Forest, was however as much portion of the landed revenue of the Crown as any other, and the Crown had no power to divert that amount to the purposes contemplated. It was very undesirable that the House should commit itself indirectly or by implication to the making of any grant for the acquisition of that portion of the forest which it was desired to procure. The question was actually under discussion between the Treasury and the Metropolitan Board at the present moment, and a letter had been written to that Board from which, as it had been already moved for, he might be permitted to read the following extract :—

> "Their Lordships are even more unable to act upon the second alternative proposed by the Committee" (that now recommended by the hon. Member). "Parliament, by the Act 14 & 15 *Vict.* c. 42, which separated the Departments of Woods and Forests and Land Revenues and of the Commissioners of Public Works, assigned certain Royal Parks in the neighbourhood of London to the management of the latter department, in order that they might be maintained principally for the recreation of the inhabitants of the metropolis, and left all other portions of the landed property of the Crown under the management of the Commissioners of Woods, in order that during Her Majesty's reign the revenues should be administered for the benefit of the Exchequer. By this Act Parliament decided the extent to which the recreation of the inhabitants should be provided for from public funds, and, it may be added, that it has very liberally provided by annual Votes for the maintenance and embellishment of the metropolitan parks and gardens. Not only, however, does the Act of 1851 define the extent to which public aid should be afforded for this, but the enactment above quoted clearly throws upon the Metropolitan Board the duty of providing any additions to the public parks which circumstances may require. My Lords, therefore, before they decide upon any further proceedings on this subject, wish to ascertain whether the Metropolitan Board is disposed to take any measures for obtaining Parliamentary powers for the inclosure of Epping Forest as a place of recreation under the authority of the enactment in question (18 & 19 *Vict.* c. 120, s. 144, and 19 & 20 *Vict.* c. 112, s. 10). If they should be disposed to do so, my Lords will be prepared to consider any arrangements for the cession of the rights of the Crown which may be necessary for effecting the objects in view. Two courses presented themselves to the Committee as applicable to the remaining portion of Waltham Forest—one is to discontinue the sale of the forestal rights of the Crown, vigilantly to maintain these rights without regard to the question of cost, for the purpose of preventing all future inclosures, and to preserve the forest in its present extent and wild uninclosed condition. Your Committee are of opinion that to employ the forestal rights of the Crown for the purpose of obstructing that process of inclosure to which the Lords (Commons?) and copyholders of the manors comprised within the forest are entitled, in common with all other persons similarly situated, would not only be a course of doubtful justice, but might in accordance with the experience of the past fail in securing the desired object."

A reply had been received from the Metropolitan Board, asking for further information before deciding upon the proposition made to them; and therefore he was not in a position to state what course the Government might decide upon taking, with a view to carry out the suggestion of the Committee as to setting aside an adequate portion of Epping Forest. He hoped the hon. Gentleman would be satisfied with this explanation.

MR. PEACOCKE preferred wild forests to tame parks, and would rather see Epping Forest kept in its present wild state by asserting the forestal rights of the Crown than that portions of it should be inclosed in the manner proposed. It was far more enjoyable for residents in the neighbourhood, and for visitors from London in its existing condition ; while, as a question of economy, the 7,000 acres still uninclosed could be purchased for £30,000, and at least £70,000 or £80,000 would be required to lay down 100 or 150 acres, in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee. The right hon. Gentleman said it would be an expensive process to act upon the Crown forestal rights and to abate inclosures ; but this he looked on as a frivolous excuse. Did the right hon. Gentleman imagine that no corresponding expense would be entailed upon the encroachers, or that any person would like to engage in a lawsuit with the Crown ? Moreover, if the Crown were successful in one suit there need be no apprehension that other suits would follow. The inclosures going on at the present moment, he believed, were taking place upon grounds over which the Crown had parted with its forestal rights. In such cases the power of the House no longer existed ; but the hon. Gentleman who had brought forward this subject was bound, he thought, to give some evidence in support of his views, and likewise to account for his own change of opinion.

The present position of the question was most unsatisfactory, and he hoped the hon. Member for Lambeth, who carried a Motion with regard to it a few evenings ago, would at the commencement of next Session move for a Committee to inquire into the whole subject of open spaces, with which might be advantageously coupled a further inquiry into the general working of the Inclosure Act.

SIR JOHN TROLLOPE said, the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down was virtually the author of the Select Committee — [Mr. PEACOCKE: No] — having carried a Resolution preventing the sale of forestal rights over Epping Forest. He (Sir John Trollope) had been appointed a member of that Committee, and he was bound to say that the interest of the Crown, and the consequent protection which it was calculated to afford, seemed in this case to be almost infinitesimal, extending as it did only to the right of keeping deer in the forest and consequently to herbage for them. The real question was as to the persons in whom the right to the soil was vested. The real right to the soil was vested in these, and if they could agree to go to the Inclosure Commissioners, under the General Act, they could at once obtain an inclosure, and the rights of the Crown would be preserved by a small allotment; but it was the lords of the soil, the commoners, and the copyholders who were the proper persons to stir in the matter. They had nothing whatever to do with the public. The public might squat upon it, or live the life of gipsies upon it, but they had no right to interfere with its ultimate appropriation. The Committee recommended larger allotments for purposes of public recreation and enjoyment than the Inclosure Commissioners had the power to award. They recommended that from 150 to 200 acres, not lying altogether, but separated by intervals of space, should be allotted to the public in this manner. There was a great difficulty in dealing with Epping Forest in that respect. If, for example, a larger allotment was set out than usual, it must be vested in some body which would improve it and keep it in proper condition. This was what ought to have been done in Chigwell. There fifty acres were appropriated to the public that were neither drained, levelled, nor inclosed; no monies were provided for those purposes; they were useless for recreation, and, unless they were placed under the care of the Board of Works or the Metropolitan Board, it would be impossible to make this land useful for the public at large. As he took a somewhat utilitarian view of this subject, he could not agree with his hon. Friend (Mr. Peacocke) as to the value of the land in its present wild and unimproved condition. It was covered with brushwood, with tangled briars and thorns, and nineteen-twentieths of it was useless except to feed a few scrubby cattle and miserable ponies. It was a disgrace to our civilization that within fifteen miles of the metropolis 7,000 acres of land should be allowed to remain in such a state when it might so easily be turned to some useful account. Let any one visit the forest in unfavourable weather and the result would be that he would leave his upper garments on the bushes and his shoes in the mud. The Committee took the practical view of this subject, and the hon. Member for Maldon the poetical and sentimental. He (Sir John Trollope) introduced a clause in the Report, which was, however, negatived, giving to the Government Department the credit he thought it deserved for the improvements it had made in Hainault Forest, which now produced £4,000 a year, whereas formerly the same land scarcely produced barely £500. If a similar improvement were made in Epping Forest it would be conducive to the public interest as well as to private advantage.

MR. DOULTON said that, having regard to the Resolution come to the other evening respecting open spaces, the proper plan would be to appoint a Committee to inquire into the subject, and the present matter would then properly form part of the inquiry, and he should move early next Session for such a Committee. His object was to preserve the forest in its wild and uncultivated condition, because that formed its greatest attraction in the eyes of those for whom it was desirable the forest should be preserved. If the Motion of the hon. Member for Finsbury had gone to a division, he should certainly have voted against it, not only because it was antagonistic to the vote of the other evening, but on account of the expense of laying out this park, and also the annual cost of the maintenance of a park of 7,000 acres. The proper course was to refer the matter to a Select Committee, to investigate not only the open spaces and commons in the neighbourhood of the metropolis, but also the state of Epping and other forests. The rights of the Crown in regard to Epping Forest were very small, it was true; but if the Crown would only retain the rights it possessed, that would be the best guarantee that the forest would be preserved in its present state for the inhabitants of the metropolis. He would remind the hon. Member that no one was more energetic than he in opposition to the expenditure on Kennington Park, which was infinitely small in comparison with that which the hon. Member now proposed to lay out in connection with Epping Forest.

DENMARK AND GERMANY.
EARL RUSSELL & THE CONFERENCE.

Lord **BURGHLEY** said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he can explain the statement which appeared in *The Times* of Tuesday, the 28th of June, to the effect that the President of the Council of the Lower House of the Rigsraad, in answer to a question upon the Conference, made the following reply ?—

> " The Danish Plenipotentiaries were instructed to accept the line of demarcation of the Schlei, and to agree to a fortnight's prolongation of the armistice should England firmly adhere to that line. Earl Russell promised that neither would he make a proposal himself, nor support the proposal of any other Plenipotentiary which would be less favourable to Denmark, unless Denmark herself should consent to such new proposals. Earl Russell nevertheless proposed, in the sitting of the Conference on the 18th, that the question should be submitted to arbitration, although Denmark did not consent to this proposal."

Viscount **PALMERSTON**: Sir, there is no inconsistency in the assurance of my noble Friend and the course which he took. The statement is not absolutely correct. It is very easy to substitute one word for another, and so to alter the meaning. My noble Friend did not say he would make no proposal. What he stated was, that if the Danes would agree to the line of the Schlei, he would not himself propose any other line, or support any other line if it was proposed by any other Power; and to that engagement he adhered. But when, at last, it was found that the Danes would not consent to any line north of the Schlei, and that the Germans would not consent to any line south of Apenrade, it then became necessary either to give up the whole thing in despair, or to make the proposal which, in concert with the other neutral Powers, my noble Friend made—not for another line, but that an arbiter should be appointed to whom should be referred the question pending between the parties. That arbiter might have determined on the line of the Schlei, or the line of the Apenrade, or he might have determined on some other line. But, unless my noble Friend had been prepared to abdicate his functions, it was impossible for him to say that he would make no other proposal with a view to a peaceful settlement of the matters in dispute. I may take advantage of this Question to explain another misunderstanding which has arisen. My noble Friend stated in another place the other day that henceforward no trust could be reposed in the German Powers. That statement, I know, has hurt the feelings of the persons concerned, and has been interpreted in a way not intended by my noble Friend. He by no means intended to say that any assertion and any declaration of the German Powers was not trustworthy, inasmuch as it was not given truthfully or with a sincere intention; but what he meant—as, indeed, the context of his statement clearly shows—was that the German Powers have upon more than one occasion been driven from their original intention by a pressure which they were unable to resist, and that, therefore, you could not be sure that any intention, however sincerely and truthfully stated at the time, was one that the German Powers would be able to maintain against the pressure which might be brought to bear against them. That was my noble Friend's meaning: and he, like myself, is very sorry that the words spoken should have been interpreted in a different sense, and should have given pain to parties for whom my noble Friend and the Government are naturally disposed to show the greatest possible consideration and respect.

Mr. **NEWDEGATE**: Did I understand the noble Lord to say that the line of the Schlei and Dannewerke was the line proposed by Earl Russell and supported by the neutral Powers?

Viscount **PALMERSTON**: Yes; that appears on the Protocols.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

Supply *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £3,750, Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

Mr. **HADFIELD** said, the Ecclesiastical Commission ought to be able to pay all expenses out of their own funds, and the Vote was objectionable.

MR. PEEL said, when that portion of the business of the Commissioners which arose under the Church Building Acts was transferred to their management by the 19 & 20 *Vict.* c. 55, Parliament decided to provide the means for paying the expenses which should be incurred under the Act, and the Commissioners had no power to pay such expenses except out of money voted by Parliament.

MR. W. WILLIAMS also objected to the Vote, and said he should support his hon. Friend if he went to a division.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, the opposition to the Vote showed how inconvenient it was that the Church Building Acts had not been consolidated. If that had been done, the charge in question might have been removed.

MR. HADFIELD said, the objection to the consolidation was that the new parish churches should be thrown upon a church rate.

Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) £11,224, to complete the sum for Temporary Commissions.

In reply to Colonel FRENCH,

MR. PEEL stated, that the item for English and Irish Law Courts was to pay the expense incidental to the Commission appointed to consider the expediency of assimilating the practice and procedure of the Irish Law Courts to those of the English Law Courts.

Vote *agreed to.*

(3.) £22,689, to complete the sum for Patent Law Expenses.

(4.) £11,152, to complete the sum for Fishery Board, Scotland.

(5.) £2,000, Trustees of Manufactures, Scotland.

(6.) £37,948, to complete the sum for Dues under Treaties of Reciprocity.

(7.) £2,220, to complete the sum for Inspectors of Corn Returns.

(8.) £500, Boundary Survey, Ireland.

(9.) £680, Malta and Alexandria Telegraph, &c.

MR. PEEL, in reply to Mr. TORRENS, said, that the working of the Malta and Alexandria line had been twice interrupted, once in last year and again in the present year; but the cable had been repaired, and the line was now in good working order, and was realizing large receipts at the present time.

Vote *agreed to.*

(10.) £12,457, to complete the sum for Civil Contingencies.

COLONEL FRENCH said, that the item of £982 constituted a large expenditure for the repairs and inclosure of the British burial ground at Varna. With regard to the sum of £315 10*s.* 6*d.* for Mr. J. Morrin, of the Rolls Office, Dublin, for extra duties and expenses in connection with editing and publishing the first two volumes of the *Calendar of Patent and Close Rolls in Ireland*, there were certain people, himself among the number, who disputed the capability of Mr. Morrin for the work. A great many errors had been detected in the work in question.

MR. W. WILLIAMS said, that £552 was to be paid for fees connected with the installation of Prince Alfred as a Knight of the Garter. That was not, in his opinion, a charge which ought to fall on the public purse.

MR. PEEL said, the condition of the cemetery at Varna was such that it had become necessary to go to some expense for an inclosure. As to the case of Mr. Morrin, he was aware that charges of inaccuracy had been brought against his work; but it was not a question on which the Treasury could form an opinion of their own. It had been arranged that the Master of the Rolls in England should appoint two competent persons to inquire into the matter.

SIR JERVOISE JERVOISE asked for information as to when and where the outlay for the inspection of sheep, with a view to the prevention of disease, had been incurred, and whether the persons employed were duly qualified.

MR. H. A. BRUCE said, that two years ago the prevalence of small pox in sheep excited great alarm in certain districts of England, and the Government appointed two most experienced and competent gentlemen, Professor Simonds and Dr. Marsden, to inquire into the matter.

COLONEL FRENCH, in reference to the charge for an inspection of the drainage works on the banks of the Shannon, said, he wished to ask a question on the subject. The Shannon Commissioners had spent a sum of £300,000 in deepening the Shannon. On the ground that the works executed by that Commission were to effect great improvements in the Shannon districts, the land in the vicinity had been taxed for the entire cost. The work was entirely a Government one; but its effect had been to increase the inundations, and so do positive injury to the properties of those who were made to pay for it. He wished to know what was the intention of the Government with reference to the matter, now that they were in possession of the Report of Mr. Bateman, the engineer who had recently been appointed to inspect the works.

MR. PEEL said, that a number of gentlemen in the West of Ireland having represented to the Government that the inundations had been increased by the works executed by the Shannon Commissioners, the Treasury, though they did not concur in that view, agreed to appoint Mr. Bateman, the eminent engineer, to inspect and report upon the works. Mr. Bateman's expenses were to be paid by the Government; but there was a distinct understanding with the gentlemen at whose request the inspection had been made, that any works which Mr. Bateman might recommend should be undertaken by the landed proprietors at their own cost. The Report of Mr. Bateman, which was an able one, bore out the view which all along had been taken by the Treasury, and showed that the works executed by the Shannon Commissioners, so far from having aggravated had mitigated the evils complained of. Mr. Bateman had recommended additional works, which would cost £250,000; but he had not heard what steps the local gentry had taken to have those works executed.

COLONEL FRENCH said, the agreement between the proprietors and the Treasury was that the former should pay for any improvements which Mr. Bateman might recommend, and which had not been included in the works which the Shannon Commissioners had been appointed to carry out; but it had never been intended by the proprietors that they should pay over again for what the Shannon Commissioners were bound by their contract to perform.

Vote *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported on *Monday* next; Committee to sit again on *Monday* next.

THAMES EMBANKMENT AND METROPOLIS IMPROVEMENT (LOANS).

COMMITTEE.

Resolutions *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER moved the following Resolutions:—

> "That it is expedient to authorize the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to guarantee the repayment of any money that may be borrowed under the Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement Acts, together with the interest thereon; and to cause advances to be made out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland of such sums as may be necessary for the repayment of such principal and interest, in aid of any other moneys applicable for that purpose under the said Act.
>
> "That the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt be authorized to advance the money which, by the Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement Acts, the Metropolitan Board of Works is authorized to raise."—(*The Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

The Resolutions were strictly limited to the objects expressed—they were purely financial, and he was not about to ask the Committee to sanction any new expenditure or undertake any new works. The Legislature had by Act of Parliament provided for the outlay of certain sums upon the embankment of the Thames, and the question now was how the money was to be raised. The Metropolitan Board of Works had power to raise money, and found that they could raise it at the rate of 4½ per cent; but when they raised a greater sum a short time ago for executing the main drainage works they obtained the guarantee of the Government, and by means of it were able to borrow from the Bank of England at the rate of £3 15*s.* per cent. They were of opinion that they had a claim upon the Government for similar assistance in regard to the embankment of the Thames and the improvement of the metropolis in connection with it. What they said was that of late years the metropolis had been called upon to undertake very heavy burdens, although until recently it had not possessed any local resources beyond the coal and wine dues, and that it contained a great mass of Government property which made no contribution to its improvement. He might add, on his own part, that the whole charge of metropolitan improvements, though those improvements were of the most permanent character, was laid upon the temporary and fugitive occupiers of the metropolis. The consumers in the metropolis paid in the shape of coal and wine dues, and the ratepayers sustained a very heavy charge, but those who had the greatest and most permanent interest in the improvement of the metropolis—namely, the ground landowners, did not pay a single farthing. He mentioned that, not for the purpose of proposing any change, but to illustrate the position in which the Metropolitan Board of Works found themselves placed. On receiving the application of the Board for a Government guarantee, he took means to satisfy himself of the sufficiency of their resources; but the question arose whether they should be limited to the Bank of England, or whether they might not be permitted to ask advances from the National Debt Commissioners. As a general rule the Commissioners invested in whatever was guaranteed by Parliament, and, being satisfied that the present was a case in which the guarantee of Parliament should be given, he thought it would be proper to take power to make advances to the Metropolitan Board from the funds at the command of the Commissioners. Such would be the object of the Bill which he was about to introduce, and he had only to add that plenty of time would be given for the consideration of the measure before the second reading. In addition to the security of the coal and wine dues, there would be the collateral security of the rates of the metropolis; and there was no doubt that between the Bank of England and the National Debt Commissioners the Metropolitan Board of Works would get all the money they required for this undertaking, or about £2,500,000.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU asked, Whether there was any provision made for the contingency of the Thames Embankment costing far more than was contemplated by the Metropolitan Board of Works. In that event, how would they raise the additional sum required?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER apprehended that they must come to Parliament.

In reply to a question from Mr. WILLIAMS,

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that 4½ per cent was the rate of interest at which the Metropolitan Board of Works would be able to borrow without the guarantee of the Government. With that guarantee they could borrow from the Bank of England at 3¾ per cent.

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, he could not of course give a decided opinion on the scheme without seeing the Bill; but he thought the Metropolitan Board had a fair claim to the assistance that could properly be afforded to them by the Government. It was now proposed that the Government should afford them an amount of indirect financial assistance. Since the establishment of that Board it had conducted the business intrusted to it in a manner that justified the confidence which the inhabitants of the metropolis were now prepared to repose in it, and he thought the plan proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer beneficial.

MR. T. J. MILLER said, the great value of that measure was, that it would save the metropolis the difference between 4½ and 3¾ per cent interest on the money raised for this work. It was a matter of comparative indifference to the Metropolitan Board of Works, whether the money was raised at 4½ or 3¾ per cent; but the great object which that Board had in view was to effect the greatest amount of improvement in the metropolis at the smallest expense to the inhabitants generally. There could be no doubt as to the security for the repayment of the loan.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, he could not admit that it was a matter of indifference to the Metropolitan Board of Works whether they raised this money at 4½ or 3¾ per cent, and that it would only affect the ratepayers. The hon. Member for Bath (Mr. Tite) the other day stated before the Committee on Subways that the rates of the Metropolitan Board of Works had reached their utmost legal limit, and consequently the Board could lay no heavier rates on the metropolis. It had also reached its utmost legal limit in borrowing. But by the present measure it would obtain a larger sum than it otherwise could do for carrying on certain works. The boon granted by the Bill would be a boon entirely to the Metropolitan Board of Works, and not one to the metropolis at all; and unless the House were satisfied that the money would be wisely expended, and that those persons would obtain the contracts who sent in the lowest tenders, he did not think that additional powers ought to be given to that Board.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, the House need not then concern itself with the question, whether the tenders were properly taken or the estimates sound? Their security was based first on the wine and coal dues, and, secondly, not merely on the present rating powers of the Metropolitan Board of Works, but also on the new rating powers which the Bill about to be introduced would give to the Board.

Mr. KINNAIRD asked, whether the right hon. Gentleman would not take some step for carrying out his own most fair suggestion — that the taxation for these improvements should be shared by those who would permanently benefit by them ?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER thought the time had not come when a proposal of that kind should be made.

Mr. Alderman SALOMONS maintained that, as this measure would enlarge the borrowing powers of the Metropolitan Board of Works, the Government ought to take care that the money was likely to be wisely and economically applied.

Resolutions *agreed to.*

(1.) *Resolved,*

That it is expedient to authorise the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to guarantee the repayment of any money that may be borrowed under the Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement Acts, together with the interest thereon ; and to cause advances to be made out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, of such sums as may be necessary for the repayment of such principal and interest, in aid of any other moneys applicable for that purpose under the said Act.

(2.) *Resolved,*

That the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt be authorized to advance the money which by the Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement Acts the Metropolitan Board of Works is authorized to raise.

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported on *Monday* next.

INDEMNITY BILL—[Bill 97.]

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. HADFIELD said, he had an Amendment to propose. The Bill itself, which, contrary to usual practice, had been circulated among Members, was a perfect curiosity. It recited no less than twelve Acts of Parliament, most, if not all of which, he believed, had been repealed by subsequent Acts of Parliament. Among them was the 25th of *Charles* II., which required an oath against Transubstantiation. Another required a declaration that the signer would upon no pretence take up arms against the King ; and yet in 1688 all classes took up arms to get rid of a tyrant. There was a declaration against the oath called the Solemn League, and an Act of the 30th of *Charles* II. disabled Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament. Another Act extorted an oath not to injure the Church. He would, therefore, beg to move the Amendment of which he had given notice.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "considering the long period during which yearly Indemnity Bills have passed, on account of the non-compliance with the requirements of Acts of Parliament made and passed in times of political excitement and trouble (some of them two hundred years ago), imposing oaths and declarations as stated in the Indemnity Bill, a Select Committee be appointed to consider and report first of all whether a complete and effectual Indemnity can be given by Parliament for all omissions to the present time ; and, in the next place, whether the time has not arrived to repeal so many of the said requirements as are useless and no longer required for the present times,"—(*Mr. Hadfield*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. PEEL said, that whatever objections might be offered to the oaths and declarations to which the hon. Member referred, there was nothing antiquated in the present declarations. As far as he knew, there was no declaration at present in force of an earlier date than 1828, when the old declaration against Transubstantiation was repealed, and another form of declaration enacted instead. In the same manner the old oaths of allegiance, supremacy, and abjuration were repealed in 1858, and a short oath appointed in lieu of them. The mistake which the hon. Member made was in supposing that because those oaths and declarations were repealed, therefore the original Acts imposing them were also repealed. That was not so ; the Acts remained in force, and they had to be read as if they contained the new form of declaration or oath. He very much agreed with the hon. Member in his desire to see the repeal of the Acts themselves ; he did not believe that any of the security which the Church or State had enjoyed during the last 100 years was derived from their existence on the statute-book. He, however, could not understand why the hon. Member proposed an Amendment to this Bill, because it took the same direction as the hon. Gentleman desired to go, the only difference being that it did yearly what the hon. Member desired to see done once and for all. If the Committee were appointed, it would be impossible to pass the Indemnity Bill this Session, and great inconvenience would result from the old Acts being revived. He suggested that if the hon. Member thought it better to proceed by way of Committee than by a Bill, as he had hitherto done, he should move, next Session, for the appointment of a Select Committee, a course to which the House would probably assent; but the effect of referring this Bill to a Select Committee would be altogether to prevent it passing this Session. He hoped, therefore, that the hon. Member would withdraw his Amendment.

MR. HADFIELD said, he must press his Amendment.

MR. SOTHERON ESTCOURT said, he hoped the hon. Member would withdraw his Amendment, for unless he did so the Indemnity Bill might run the risk of not passing this year. Surely the hon. Member did not intend that the persons who had not taken the oaths should be liable to the pains and penalties to which they would be subjected unless the Bill passed into law. If the hon. Member would next Session bring forward the grievances which he believed persons laboured under from the experience of the present law, and point out how changes could be made, he might then properly ask for a Select Committee; but it would not be proper to stop the progress of the Bill in order that the hon. Member might obtain a Select Committee in this manner. This would be to prevent a present remedy to evils about which they were all agreed. At this period of the Session it would be better to allow the Bill to pass as usual, and if the hon. Member moved for a Select Committee next Session he would meet with support on that side of the House.

MR. HADFIELD said, he would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *Monday* next.

TESTS ABOLITION (OXFORD) BILL.

[BILL 18.] THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

SIR WILLIAM HEATHCOTE: Sir, in moving that this Bill be read a third time upon this day three months, I do not intend to enter at any length into a discussion of the merits of the Bill, or of its object or probable results. All of these subjects have already been discussed at considerable length, and hon. Gentlemen have expressed their opinions upon them. What I desire to do is to call attention to the position of the Bill, to the course of proceeding with regard to it, and to the results growing out of these proceedings. For the purpose of my argument I am willing to suppose that every Gentleman in this House will adhere to the opinions he has previously expressed on the Bill. What I wish to point out is, that if the different parties in this House do adhere to the opinions previously expressed, the decision ought to be different from that of former divisions, and the Bill ought to be rejected.

Throughout its progress there have been three distinct opinions as to the proper mode of dealing with it. The hon. Member who introduced it (Mr. Dodson) and those who agreed with him, were desirous that the Bill should pass as introduced, and were unwilling to accept any Amendment. On the other hand there were those on this side the House who thought that the difficulties of legislating on the subject were out of all proportion to any advantages to be derived from the proposed change, or to any disadvantages intended to be removed. We therefore not only objected to the Bill as it stands, but declined to take on ourselves the responsibility of proposing Amendments; which, however, we were ready to consider if proposed by others. The third section, headed by my right hon. Friends the Home Secretary and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, while they emphatically declared that the Bill could not pass in the form in which it was introduced by the hon. Member for Sussex, said that it was without much difficulty capable of Amendments which would make it in their opinion useful, and they accordingly voted for the second reading, with an intimation that they should oppose it in future stages, if not so amended. That is the position in which the Bill stands. The second reading was carried by a small majority, and was supported by many holding the views of the right hon. Gentlemen opposite. Time went on and no Amendments appeared. We took it for granted that notice of Amendments would have been given by the other side. None appeared, however, and we asked the House to refuse to go into Committee on the ground that no notice had been given of those Amendments, which the right hon. Gentlemen opposite, supporters of the Bill, admitted to be necessary. The House, nevertheless, went into Committee. A considerable interval of time elapsed, and plenty of time was allowed for notice of Amendments. Still none appeared. The Bill has gone through Committee in its original state; and now, on its third reading, it stands in precisely the same form as that in which it was introduced. I make no complaint of that. It was very natural that the hon. Gentleman who brought in the Bill should not desire to amend it; and if he had accepted Amendments at all, it would probably have been only because he would have preferred them to losing his Bill. Neither do I complain of my right hon. Friends for not bringing forward Amendments. I know that they had applied themselves to the framing of important Amendments and had found the difficulties insurmountable, and that they thought it better to abandon the attempt. I do not complain of either side; but I do say if this Bill was supported on its second reading by a considerable number of Members only on the faith of expected Amendments, of which it was alleged to be capable, and if it has gone through so far without attempt at amendment, that I am then entitled to claim the votes of the right hon. Gentlemen, and all who sympathize with them, and to ask them to assist me in rejecting the Bill on the third reading. It is for the hon. Member for Sussex (Mr. Dodson) to consider whether it would not be better for him at some other time to frame and introduce a measure more likely to receive general support. For the present, at any rate, I venture to think that the course which I recommend is the best.

On the present occasion I rest my opposition on these special grounds; but, in addition, I will ask the House to remember, as a matter of fact, that the Bill does not now stand in such a form as will put Oxford in any way in the same position as Cambridge. It will put Oxford in a situation very much in advance, as my hon. Friend (Mr. Dodson) would call it, but, as I think, in a very much worse position; and hon. Members who will support the third reading will do so on the distinct understanding that they are doing what has not yet been sanctioned for either University. On these grounds I beg to move that the Bill be read a third time this day three months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Sir William Heathcote.*)

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 150; Noes 140: Majority 10.

AYES.

Acton, Sir J. D.
Adeane, H. J.
Anstruther, Sir R.
Ayrton, A. S.
Aytoun, R. S.
Bagwell, J.
Baines, E.
Baring, rt. hon. Sir F.T.
Baring, T. G.
Bass, M. T.
Baxter, W. E.
Beaumont, W. B.
Biddulph, Colonel
Black, A.
Bonham-Carter, J.
Bouverie, rt. hon. E. P.
Brand, hon. H.
Bright, J.
Bruce, rt. hon. H. A.
Buchanan, W.
Buller, Sir A. W.
Bury, Viscount
Buxton, C.
Caird, J.
Calthorpe, hon. F. H. W. G.
Cardwell, rt. hon. E.
Cavendish, Lord G.
Childers, H. C. E.
Clay, J.
Clifford, C. C.
Collier, Sir R. P.
Colthurst, Sir G. C.
Cowper, rt. hon. W. F.
Cox, W.
Craufurd, E. H. J.
Crawford, R. W.
Dalglish, R.
Davie, Colonel F.
Dent, J. D.
Dering, Sir E. C.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Douglas, Sir C.
Doulton, F.
Duff, M. E. G.
Dunbar, Sir W.
Dundas, F.
Dundas, rt. hon. Sir D.
Enfield, Viscount
Ennis, J.
Esmonde, J.
Evans, T. W.
Ewart, W.
Fermoy, Lord
Finch, C. W.
Finlay, A. S.
Fitzwilliam, hn. C.W.W.
Foljambe, F. J. S.
Forster, W. E.
Fortescue, hon. F. D.
Fortescue, rt. hon. C.
Gaskell, J. M.
Gibson, rt. hon. T. M.
Gilpin, C.
Goldsmid, Sir F. H.
Gower, hon. F. L.
Greene, J.
Gregson, S.
Grenfell, H. R.
Grosvenor, Lord R.
Gurdon, B.
Hadfield, G.
Hankey, T.
Hartington, Marquess of
Hayter, rt. hn. Sir W.G.
Headlam, rt. hon. T. E.
Hodgson, K. D.
Howard, hon. C. W. G.
Hutt, rt. hon. W.
Jervoise, Sir J. C.
King, hon. P. J. L.
Kinglake, J. A.
Kinnaird, hon. A. F.
Knatchbull-Hugessen, E.
Layard, A. H.
Lawson, W.
Lefevre, G. J. S.

Locke, J.
Mackinnon, W. A. (Lym)
Maguire, J. F.
Marjoribanks, D. C.
Martin, P. W.
Martin, J.
Massey, W. N.
Merry, J.
Mills, J. R.
Mitchell, T. A.
Moffatt, G.
Moncreiff, rt. hon. J.
Monsell, rt. hon. W.
Morris, D.
Neate, C.
O'Hagan, rt. hon. T.
O'Loghlen, Sir C. M.
Padmore, R.
Paget, C.
Paget, Lord C.
Paxton, Sir J.
Peel, rt. hon. Sir R.
Peel, rt. hon. F.
Pinney, Colonel
Potter, E.
Price, R. G.
Pugh, D.
Ramsden, Sir J. W.
Ricardo, O.
Robartes, T. J. A.
Robertson, H.
Rothschild, Baron M. de
Russell, H.
Russell, F. W.
Scholefield, W.
Seely, C.
Seymour, A.
Shelley, Sir J. V.
Sheridan, H. B.
Smith, J. A.
Smith, M. T.
Stansfeld, J.
Steel, J.
Stuart, Colonel
Sykes, Colonel W. H.
Taylor, P. A.
Tollemache, hon. F. J.
Tomline, G.
Tracy, hon. C. R. D. H.
Villiers, rt. hon. C. P.
Vivian, H. H.
Vyner, R. A.
Watkin, E. W.
Watkins, Colonel L.
Weguelin, T. M.
Western, S.
Whalley, G. H.
Whitbread, S.
White, J.
White, hon. L.
Williamson, Sir H.
Winnington, Sir T. E.
Wood, rt. hon. Sir C.
Woods, H.

TELLERS.

Dodson, J. G.
Goschen, G. J.

NOES.

Adderley, rt. hon. C. B.
Astell, J. H.
Baring, A. H.
Bathurst, A. A.
Bective, Earl of
Beecroft, G. S.
Bentinck, G. C.
Beresford, rt. hon. W.
Beresford, D. W. P.
Bramley-Moore, J.
Bramston, T. W.
Bremridge, R.
Bridges, Sir B. W.
Bruce, Sir H. H.
Bruen, H.
Burghley, Lord
Cairns, Sir H. M'C.
Cargill, W. W.
Cave, S.
Cecil, Lord R.
Chapman, J.
Cobbold, J. C.
Cole, hon. H.
Cole, hon. J. L.
Copeland, Mr. Ald.
Corry, rt. hon. H. L.
Curzon, Viscount
Damer, S. D.
Dickson, Colonel
Du Cane, C.
Duncombe, hon. W. E.
Dunne, Colonel
Du Pre, C. G.
Egerton, Sir P. G.
Egerton, hon. A. F.
Egerton, hon. W.
Estcourt, rt. hn. T. H. S.
Fane, Colonel J. W.
Farquhar, Sir M.
Farrer, J.
Fellowes, E.
Fitzgerald, W. R. S.
Fleming, T. W.
Floyer, J.
Gard, R. S.
George, J.
Gladstone, rt. hon. W.
Gower, G. W. G. L.
Greenall, G.
Grey de Wilton, Visct.
Griffith, C. D.
Grogan, Sir E.
Hamilton, Lord C.
Hamilton, I. T.
Hardy, G.
Hartopp, E. B.
Harvey, R. B.
Hervey, Lord A.
Hassard, M.
Hay, Sir J. C. D.
Hesketh, Sir T. G.
Heygate, Sir F. W.
Heygate, W. U.
Hill, hon. R. C.
Holford, R. S.
Holmesdale, Viscount
Hopwood, J. T.
Hotham, Lord
Humberston, P. S.
Hume, W. W. F.
Humphery, W. H.
Hunt, G. W.
Jolliffe, rt. hn. Sir W. G. H.
Jones, D.
Kekewich, S. T.
Kendall, N.
Kerrison, Sir E. C.
King, J. K.
Knatchbull, W. F.
Knightley, R.
Langton, W. G.
Lefroy, A.
Leslie, C. P.
Leslie, W.
Lever, J. O.
Longfield, R.
Lopes, Sir M.
Lygon, hon. F.
Mainwaring, T.
Malcolm, J. W.
Malins, R.
Manners, rt. hon. Lord J.
Miller, T. J.
Montgomery, Sir G.
Mordaunt, Sir C.
Morgan, O.
Mowbray, rt. hn. J. R.
Mundy, W.
Naas, Lord
Newport, Viscount
Nicol, W.
Noel, hon. G. J.
Pakenham, Colonel
Palk, Sir L.
Palmer, Sir R.
Papillon, P. O.
Peacocke, G. M. W.
Peel, rt. hon. Gen.
Pennant, hon. Colonel
Phillips, G. L.
Powell, F. S.
Powys-Lybbe, P. L.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Rogers, J. J.
Rowley, hon. R. T.
Selwyn, C. J.
Smith, A.
Smith, S. G.
Smyth, Colonel
Somerset, Colonel
Somes, J.
Stanhope, J. B.
Stracey, Sir H.
Sturt, Lt.-Col. N.
Surtees, H. E.
Thynne, Lord E.
Thynne, Lord H.
Tottenham, Lt.-Col. C. G.
Trefusis, hon. C. H. R.
Trollope, rt. hon. Sir J.
Turner, C.
Vance, J.
Vyse, Colonel H.
Walcott, Admiral
Walker, J. R.
Walpole, rt. hon. S. H.
Walsh, Sir J.
Watlington, J. W. P.
Wyndham, hon. P.
Yorke, J. R.

TELLERS.

Heathcote, Sir W.
Northcote, Sir S.

Main Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."

Lord ROBERT CECIL said, the House had been taken somewhat by surprise, and had come to a division earlier than had been expected owing to the remarkable policy of Her Majesty's Government. It would be remembered that the Government were in a position of some embarrassment on account of the course taken on the second reading of this Bill. When the Bill was passing the second reading the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Home Department, who he saw had now returned to the House, and the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer supported the Bill, and the ground they gave for supporting it was, not that they agreed with the Bill as a whole, or in its most important clauses, but that they objected to the principle of indiscriminate resistance, as they were pleased to call it; and they told the House that, although they should like to see certain alterations in the Bill—such as the striking out of the clauses that allowed those who were not members of the Church of England to vote in Convocation—still they should support the Bill for the sake of other clauses of very inferior importance that it contained. On that plea they supported the Bill; and they gave the House to understand that they intended to support Amendments in Committee which would make the Bill such as they desired to see it. They gave the House to understand that they gave no support or countenance to the principle of a Bill which handed over the government of the Universities for educational purposes to Dissenting Masters of Arts. But in Committee there were proposed none of those Amendments which the Government foreshadowed. The right hon. Member for Oxford University (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) was absent on that occasion [*Cries of* "Divide!"] Surely they would allow him to proceed to discuss the matter especially when the small majority just announced was gained by a snapped division. This Bill was not debated on going into Committee, and they could not object to the discussion of it now. They might, at all events, be well excused for deliberately considering all the events before they came to a further expression of their opinion. This was a measure such as had never passed the House of Commons before. It absolutely handed over the Government of the University to those not of the Church of England. Those on the opposite side might think that was a desirable measure, but they could not say it was a measure of that insignificance that it was to be dispatched in ten minutes. What he wanted was to draw their attention to the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department, who having given the House to understand on the second reading that Amendments would be moved in Committee, and who in Committee abstained from moving any such Amendments, now in the third reading, when the division was called for, the right hon. Gentleman who was the representative of the Government for the purposes of this Bill, and to whose Department the measure specially belonged, would not give an opinion on this important matter, but walked out of the House. He (Lord R. Cecil) did not think that a Bill of this character ought to pass without some explanation from the responsible Minister of the Crown. It was hardly dealing fairly with the House of Commons to hold out opinions on the second reading and then not to follow them up by his conduct. At all events, the right hon. Gentleman who had warned them against "indiscriminating resistance," had given them a good idea that evening of what discriminating resistance was. It meant promising to oppose a Bill when no great party struggle was in prospect, and not opposing it when party votes became of consequence. "Discriminating resistance" was discriminating in point of time; it was resistance when it suited. But, at all events, some gratitude was due to those, whoever they might be, who enriched their native language. "Running away" was a coarse and vulgar term. It was now called "discriminating resistance." They had had lately a good many specimens of "discriminating resistance." We should soon have to discuss a foreign policy in which "discriminating resistance" had been shown. ["Question."] Surely it was material to show how perfectly consistent the foreign policy of the Government was, whether they were dealing with the domestic or the foreign question. In each case they promised to render help when it was convenient, and when it ceased to be convenient they walked out of the House. ["Divide, divide!"] He saw that the House was not much inclined for discussion. He only rose to draw attention to the conduct of one of the chief members of Her Majesty's Government, and he trusted that before the House finally decided on this important question the right hon. Gentleman would explain the course which he had pursued.

SIR GEORGE GREY: I am quite ready to afford the noble Lord the explanation which he asks, but in doing so I must disclaim the character in which he has spoken of me as the representative of Her Majesty's Government on this occasion. In the previous discussion upon this Bill I spoke only my own individual opinions; and in speaking these opinions I did not, as the noble Lord has imputed to me, promise to oppose this Bill at any stage. I agreed with the principle of the Bill, but I said that I thought my hon. Friend (Mr. Dodson) would act wisely if instead of asking what I thought Parliament would not be likely to grant—if instead of pressing the Bill in a shape in which I felt that it could not ultimately pass—he would consent to the introduction of Amendments which would place Oxford on the same footing as Cambridge. I was prepared to go further and to give to Masters of Arts a right to vote, for Members of Parliament as members of Convocation. I thought that that would have been a more prudent course, and would have resulted in the acceptance by Parliament of a Bill which would have done justice to those who are now excluded from privileges which they have a right to enjoy. I did my best by private communications with my hon. Friend to induce him to agree to such a modification of the Bill, and I have reason to believe that if he had consented to it there were those on the opposite side actuated by a spirit very different from that of the noble Lord, who would have met my hon. Friend in a spirit of generous conciliation, and that a Bill would have passed through Parliament which would have been a great amendment of the existing law. Not objecting to the principle of the Bill I did not feel myself bound to vote against it on the third reading. I should willingly have seen the Bill in another shape, but I never promised to oppose it, I never promised to introduce Amendments, I did not wish to press those Amendments against the judgment of my hon. Friend, and I thought that I was only taking a course which became me in not recording a vote either against or in favour of the Bill, but in walking out of the House when the Question was put. The noble Lord says that this is not a fitting question to be disposed of in ten minutes. Why did not the noble Lord, who was here when the Amendment was moved by the hon. Baronet the Member for the University of Oxford, rise in his place, and state the ground upon which he was opposed to the third reading of the Bill? Now that the Amendment has been negatived, he is taking a most unusual course in order to gain the advantage of the votes of any hon. Members who may happen to come down to the House. He had a right to comment upon my conduct if he thought fit to do so. I have stated the reasons which influenced me, and I hope that the House will not think that I have acted improperly.

Lord JOHN MANNERS: The right hon. Gentleman says that when he spoke the other day he expressed only his individual opinion, and did not speak as the organ of the Government. I suppose that he has to-night again spoken in his individual capacity, and consequently, up to the present moment, we have not been favoured with the opinions of Her Majesty's Government upon this Bill. But who, let me ask, is the Member of Her Majesty's Government who speaks to the House upon this subject merely in his individual capacity? It is the Home Secretary. And in whose Department, I should like to know, are questions affecting the Universities of this land, if not in that of the Home Secretary? If the right hon. Gentleman tells us—as I conclude he means to tell us — that Her Majesty's Government have really no opinion as a Government upon this important Bill, I am perfectly willing to believe the statement, and I shall not go through the useless form of expressing at it a surprise which I do not feel. But I hope it will go forth to the country that upon a measure affecting one of the most famous and venerable Universities of the land Her Majesty's Government express no opinion, have no opinion, and, so far as the Department charged with the affairs of the Universities is concerned, do not even give a vote upon this important measure. With respect to what the right hon. Gentleman has said about my noble Friend not rising after my hon. Friend the Member for the University of Oxford (Sir William Heathcote), I must say that I never heard a more unjust or a more unfounded charge. My hon. Friend had stated the objections to the Bill in very clear and precise terms, and no one rose to answer him — not even a Member of Her Majesty's Government. Was my noble Friend the Member for Stamford to rise and beat the air—to fight with shadows when no one had replied to my hon. Friend? It was unnecessary for him to occupy the attention of the House merely to support what had been so well said by my hon. Friend. But, after the course which Her Majesty's Government have taken, he was quite justified in making the observations which he has done with reference to their conduct; and when this scene is described, when this debate is read to-morrow, it will not redound to the credit of the Government.

Sir MINTO FARQUHAR said, that the House was placed in a very remarkable position. Early in the evening the right hon. Baronet (Sir George Grey) declined to answer a question asked by his noble Friend the Member for Northamptonshire (Lord Burghley) with reference to Denmark, in the absence of the noble Lord at the head of the Government; and now no reply had been given to the speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for the University of Oxford. The right hon. Gentleman the other Member for that University was on the Treasury Bench, and he was perfectly astonished that he had given no explanation of the course which he intended to pursue. The position in which the House was placed at present was a very remarkable one. When a debate took place the Members of the Government sat still and made no reply, and hon. Gentlemen who sat behind them thought it prudent to hold their tongue. He hoped that this occasion would not be forgotten, and that the House would go to another division upon this important Bill.

Mr. NEATE rose to address the House; but the cries for a division were so continuous, and the confusion so general, that the hon. Member sat down without proceeding.

Mr. COLLINS also rose to speak; but the interruption was so great that the hon. Member could not be intelligibly heard.

Main Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 170; Noes 170.

AYES.

Acton, Sir J. D.
Adeane, H. J.
Anstruther, Sir R.
Antrobus, E.
Ayrton, A. S.
Aytoun, R. S.
Bagwell, J.
Baines, E.
Baring, rt. hn. Sir. F. T.
Baring, T. G.
Bass, M. T.
Baxter, W. E.
Beaumont, W. B.
Bellew, R. M.
Berkeley, hon. Colonel F. W. F.
Biddulph, Colonel
Black, A.
Bonham-Carter, J.
Bouverie, rt. hon. E. P.
Brand, hon. H.
Bright J.
Bruce, rt. hon. H. A.
Buchanan, W.
Buller, Sir A. W.
Bury, Viscount
Buxton, C.
Caird, J.
Calthorpe, hn. F. H. W. G.
Cardwell, rt. hon. E.
Cavendish, Lord G.
Childers, H. C. E.
Cholmeley, Sir M. J.
Clay, J.
Clifford, C. C.
Clifford, Colonel
Clive, G.
Collier, Sir R. P.
Colthurst, Sir G. C.
Cowper, rt. hon. W. F.
Cox, W.
Craufurd, E. H. J.
Crawford, R. W.
Dalglish, R.
Davie, Colonel F.
Dent, J. D.
Dering, Sir E. C.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Douglas, Sir C.
Doulton, F.
Duff, M. E. G.
Duff, R. W.
Dunbar, Sir W.
Dundas, F.
Dundas, rt. hon. Sir D.
Enfield, Viscount
Ennis, J.
Esmonde, J.
Evans, T. W.
Ewart, W.
Fenwick, H.
Fermoy, Lord
Finch, C. W.
Finlay, A. S.
Fitzwilliam, hn. C. W. W.
Foljambe, F. J. S.
Forster, W. E.
Fortescue, hon. F. D.
Fortescue, rt. hon. C.
Gaskell, J. M.
Gibson, rt. hon. T. M.
Gilpin, C.
Goldsmid, Sir F. H.
Gower, hon. F. L.
Greene, J.
Gregson, S.
Grenfell, H. R.
Grosvenor, Lord R.
Gurdon, B.
Hadfield, G.
Hankey, T.
Hartington, Marquess of
Hayter, rt. hon. Sir W. G.
Headlam, rt. hon. T. E.
Henderson, J.
Hodgson, K. D.
Howard, hon. C. W. G.
Hutt, rt. hon. W.
Jervoise, Sir J. C.
King, hon. P. J. L.
Kinglake, J. A.
Kinnaird, hon. A. F.
Knatchbull-Hugessen, E.
Layard, A. H.
Langton, W. H. G.
Lawson, W.
Lefevre, G. J. S.
Lee, W.
Lewis, H.
Locke, J.
M'Cann, J.
Mackinnon, W. A. (Lym)
Maguire, J. F.
Marjoribanks, D. C.
Martin, P. W.
Martin, J.
Massey, W. N.
Merry, J.
Mills, J. R.
Mitchell, T. A.
Moffatt, G.
Moncreiff, rt. hon. J.
Monsell, rt. hon. W.
Morris, D.
Neate, C.
O'Hagan, rt. hon. T.
O'Loghlen, Sir C. M.
Padmore, R.
Paget, C.
Paget, Lord C.
Paxton, Sir J.
Peel, rt. hon. Sir R.
Peel, rt. hon. F.
Pinney, Colonel
Potter, E.
Powell, J. J.
Price, R. G.
Pugh, D.
Ramsden, Sir J. W.
Ricardo, O.
Robartes, T. J. A.
Robertson, D.
Robertson, H.
Rothschild, Baron M. de
Russell, H.
Russell, A.
Russell, F. W.
Russell, Sir W.
Scholefield, W.
Seely, C.
Seymour, A.
Shafto, R. D.
Shelley, Sir J. V.
Sheridan, H. B.
Smith, J. A.
Smith, M. T.
Stacpoole, W.
Stansfeld, J.
Steel, J.
Stuart, Colonel
Sykes, Colonel W. H.
Taylor, P. A.
Tollemache, hon. F. J.
Tomline, G.
Tracy, hon. C. R. D. H.
Villiers, rt. hon. C. P.
Vivian, H. H.
Vyner, R. A.
Warner, E.
Watkin, E. W.
Watkins, Colonel L.
Weguelin, T. M.
Western, S.
Whalley, G. H.
Whitbread, S.
White, J.
White, hon. L.
Williamson, Sir H.
Winnington, Sir T. E.
Wood, rt. hn. Sir C.
Woods, H.

TELLERS.

Dodson, J. G.
Goschen, G. J.

NOES.

Adderley, rt. hon. C. B.
Angerstein, W.
Anstell, J. H.
Baring, A. H.
Bateson, Sir T.
Bathurst, A. A.
Bective, Earl of
Beecroft, G. S.
Bentinck, G. C.
Benyon, R.
Beresford, rt. hon. W.
Beresford, D. W. P.
Booth, Sir R. G.
Bramley-Moore, J.
Bramston, T. W.
Bremridge, R.
Bridges, Sir B. W.
Bruce, Sir H. H.
Bruen, H.
Burghley, Lord
Cairns, Sir H. M'C.
Cargill, W. W.
Cave, S.
Cecil, Lord R.
Chapman, J.
Cobbold, J. C.
Cole, hon. H.
Cole, hon. J. L.
Collins, T.
Copeland, Mr. Ald.
Corry, rt. hon. H. L.
Curzon, Viscount
Damer, S. D.
Dickson, Colonel
Du Cane, C.
Duncombe, hon. W. E.
Dunne, Colonel
Du Pre, C. G.
Edwards, Colonel
Egerton, Sir P. G.
Egerton, hon. A. F.
Egerton, hon. W.
Estcourt, rt. hon. T. H. S.
Fane, Colonel J. W.
Farquhar, Sir M.
Farrer, J.
Fellowes, E.

Sir Minto Farquhar

Fergusson, Sir J.
Fitzgerald, W. R. S.
Fleming, T. W.
Floyer, J.
Franklyn, G. W.
Gard, R. S.
George, J.
Gladstone, rt. hon. W.
Gore, J. R. O.
Gore, W. R. O.
Gower, G. W. G. L.
Greenall, G.
Grey de Wilton, Viscount
Griffith, C. D.
Grogan, Sir E.
Hamilton, Lord C.
Hamilton, I. T.
Hardy, G.
Hartopp, E. B.
Harvey, R. B.
Hervey, Lord A.
Hassard, M.
Hay, Sir J. C. D.
Hesketh, Sir T. G.
Heygate, Sir F. W.
Heygate, W. U.
Hill, hon. R. C.
Holford, R. S.
Holmesdale, Viscount
Hood, Sir A. A.
Hopwood, J. T.
Humberston, P. S.
Hume, W. W. F.
Humphery, W. H.
Hunt, G. W.
Ingestre, Viscount
Jolliffe, rt. hon. Sir W. G. H.
Jones, D.
Kekewich, S. T.
Kelly, Sir F.
Kendall, N.
Kerrison, Sir E. C.
King, J. K.
Knatchbull, W. F.
Knight, F. W.
Knightley, R.
Langton, W. G.
Lefroy, A.
Legh, W. J.
Lennox, Lord G. G.
Lennox, C. S. B. H. K.
Leslie, C. P.
Leslie, W.
Lever, J. O.
Longfield, R.
Lopes, Sir M.
Lygon, hon. F.
Macdonogh, F.
Mainwaring, T.
Malcolm, J. W.
Malins, R.
Manners, rt. hn. Lord J.
Miller, T. J.
Montgomery, Sir G.
Mordaunt, Sir C.
Morgan, O.
Morgan, hon. Major
Mowbray, rt. hn. J. R.
Mundy, W.
Naas, Lord
Newdegate, C. N.
Newport, Viscount
Nicol, W.
Noel, hon. G. J.
Pakenham, Colonel
Palk, Sir L.
Palmer, R. W.
Palmer, Sir R.
Papillon, P. O.
Peacocke, G. M. W.
Peel, rt. hon. General
Pennant, hon. Colonel
Phillips, G. L.
Powell, F. S.
Powys-Lybbe, P. L.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Rogers, J. J.
Rowley, hon. R. T.
Sclater-Booth, G.
Scourfield, J. H.
Selwyn, C. J.
Smith, A. (Herts)
Smith, S. G.
Smyth, Colonel
Smollett, P. B.
Somerset, Colonel
Somes, J.
Stanhope, J. B.
Stracey, Sir H.
Sturt, Lt.-Col. N.
Surtees, F. E.
Taylor, Colonel
Thynne, Lord E.
Thynne, Lord H.
Tottenham, Lt.-Col. C. G.
Trefusis, hon. C. H. R.
Treherne, M.
Trevor, Lord A. E. H.
Trollope, rt. hon. Sir J.
Turner, C.
Vance, J.
Vansittart, W.
Verner, E. W.
Vyse, Colonel H.
Walcott, Admiral
Walker, J. R.
Walpole, rt. hon. S. H.
Walsh, Sir J.
Walter, J.
Watlington, J. W. P.
Whitmore, H.
Wyndham, hon. P.
Yorke, J. R.

TELLERS.

Heathcote Sir W.
Northcote, Sir S.

Whereupon, the numbers being equal, Mr. Speaker stated that after the votes that had been taken this evening, the House would not be surprised if he desired to afford them another opportunity of deciding the Question themselves; this they would be able to do on the Question, "That this Bill do pass;" on the present stage he declared himself with the Ayes.

Question put, "That this Bill do pass."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 171; Noes 173: Majority 2.

AYES.

Acton, Sir J. D.
Adeane, H. J.
Anstruther, Sir R.
Antrobus, E.
Ayrton, A. S.
Aytoun, R. S.
Bagwell, J.
Baines, E.
Baring, rt. hn. Sir F. T.
Baring, T. G.
Bass, M. T.
Baxter, W. E.
Beaumont, W. B.
Bellew, R. M.
Berkeley, Colonel hon. F. W. F.
Biddulph, Colonel
Black, A.
Bonham-Carter, J.
Bouverie, rt. hon. E. P.
Brand, hon. H.
Bright, J.
Bruce, rt. hon. H. A.
Buchanan, W.
Buller, Sir A. W.
Bury, Viscount
Buxton, C.
Caird, J.
Calthorpe, hon. F. H. W. G.
Cardwell, rt. hon. E.
Cavendish, Lord G.
Childers, H. C. E.
Cholmeley, Sir M. J.
Clay, J.
Clifford, C. C.
Clifford, Colonel
Clive, G.
Coke, hon. Colonel
Collier, Sir R. P.
Colthurst, Sir G. C.
Cowper, rt. hon. W. F.
Cox, W.
Craufurd, E. H. J.
Crawford, R. W.
Dalglish, R.
Davie, Colonel F.
Dent, J. D.
Dering, Sir E. C.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Douglas, Sir C.
Doulton, F.
Duff, M. E. G.
Duff, R. W.
Dunbar, Sir W.
Dundas, F.
Dundas, rt. hon. Sir D.
Enfield, Viscount
Ennis, J.
Esmonde, J.
Evans, T. W.
Ewart, W.
Fenwick, H.
Fermoy, Lord
Finch, C. W.
Finlay, A. S.
Fitzwilliam, hn. C. W. W.
Foljambe, F. J. S.
Forster, W. E.
Fortescue, hon. F. D.
Fortescue, rt. hon. C.
Gaskell, J. M.
Gibson, rt. hon. T. M.
Gilpin, C.
Goldsmid, Sir F. H.
Gower, hon. F. L.
Greene, J.
Gregson, S.
Grenfell, H. R.
Grosvenor, Lord R.
Gurdon, B.
Hadfield, G.
Hankey, T.
Hartington, Marquess of
Hayter, rt. hn. Sir W. G.
Headlam, rt. hon. T. E.
Henderson, J.
Hodgson, K. D.
Howard, hon. C. W. G.
Hutt, rt. hon. W.
Jervoise, Sir J. C.
King, hon. P. J. L.
Kinglake, J. A.
Kinnaird, hon. A. F.
Knatchbull-Hugessen, E.
Layard, A. H.
Langton, W. H. G.
Lawson, W.
Lefevre, G. J. S.
Lee, W.
Lewis, H.
Locke, J.
M'Cann, J.
Mackinnon, W. A. (Lym)
Maguire, J. F.
Marjoribanks, D. C.
Martin, P. W.
Martin, J.
Massey, W. N.
Merry, J.
Mills, J. R.
Mitchell, T. A.
Moffatt, G.
Moncreiff, rt. hon. J.
Monsell, rt. hon. W.
Morris, D.
Neate, C.
O'Hagan, rt. hon T.
O'Loghlen, Sir C. M.
Padmore, R.
Paget, C.

Paget, Lord C.
Paxton, Sir J.
Peel, rt. hon. Sir R.
Peel, rt. hon. F.
Pinney, Colonel
Potter, E.
Powell, J. J.
Price, R. G.
Pugh, D.
Ramsden, Sir J. W.
Ricardo, O.
Robartes, T. J. A.
Robertson, D.
Robertson, H.
Rothschild, Baron M. de
Russell, H.
Russell, A.
Russell, F. W.
Russell, Sir W.
Scholefield, W.
Seely C.
Seymour, A.
Shafto, R. D.
Shelley, Sir J. V.
Sheridan, H. B.
Smith, J. A.
Smith, M. T.
Stacpoole, W.
Stansfeld, J.
Steel, J.
Stuart, Colonel
Sykes, Colonel W. H.
Taylor, P. A.
Tollemache, hon. F. J.
Tomline, G.
Tracy, hon. C. R. D. H.
Villiers, rt. hon. C. P.
Vivian, H. H.
Vyner, R. A.
Warner, E.
Watkin, E. W.
Watkins, Colonel L.
Weguelin, T. M.
Western, S.
Whalley, G. H.
Whitbread, S.
White, J.
White, hon. L.
Williamson, Sir H.
Winnington, Sir T. E.
Wood, rt. hon. Sir C.
Woods, H.

TELLERS.
Dodson, J. G.
Goschen, G. J.

NOES.

Adderley, rt. hon. C. B.
Angerstein, W.
Astell, J. H.
Baring, A. H.
Bateson, Sir T.
Bathurst, A. A.
Bective, Earl of
Beecroft, G. S.
Bentinck, G. C.
Benyon, R.
Beresford, rt. hon. W.
Beresford, D. W. P.
Booth, Sir R. G.
Bramley-Moore, J.
Bramston, T. W.
Bremridge, R.
Bridges, Sir B. W.
Bruce, Sir H. H.
Bruen, H.
Burghley, Lord
Cairns, Sir H. M'C.
Cargill, W. W.
Cave, S.
Cecil, Lord R.
Chapman, J.
Cobbold, J. C.
Cole, hon. H.
Cole, hon. J. L.
Collins, T.
Copeland, Mr. Ald.
Corry, rt. hon. H. L.
Curzon, Viscount
Damer, S. D.
Dickson, Colonel
Du Cane, C.
Duncombe, hon. W. E.
Dunne, Colonel
Du Pre, C. G.
Edwards, Colonel
Egerton, Sir P. G.
Egerton, hon. A. F.
Egerton, hon. W.
Estcourt, rt. hon. T. H. S.
Fane, Colonel J. W.
Farquhar, Sir M.
Farrer, J.
Fellowes, E.
Fergusson, Sir J.
Fitzgerald, W. R. S.
Fleming, T. W.
Floyer, J.
Franklyn, G. W.
Gard, R. S.
George, J.
Gladstone, rt. hon. W.
Gore, J. R. O.
Gore, W. R. O.
Gower, G. W. G. L.
Greenall, G.
Grey de Wilton, Visct.
Griffith, C. D.
Grogan, Sir E.
Hamilton, Lord C.
Hamilton, I. T.
Hardy, G.
Hartopp, E. B.
Harvey, R. B.
Hervey, Lord A.
Hassard, M.
Hay, Sir J. C. D.
Hesketh, Sir T. G.
Heygate, Sir F. W.
Heygate, W. U.
Hill, hon. R. C.
Holford, R. S.
Holmesdale, Viscount
Hood, Sir A. A.
Hopwood, J. T.
Humberston, P. S.
Hume, W. W. F.
Humphery, W. H.
Hunt, G. W.
Ingestre, Viscount
Jermyn, Earl
Jolliffe, rt. hon. Sir W. G. H.
Jones, D.
Kekewich, S. T.
Kelly, Sir F.
Kendall, N.
Kerrison, Sir E. C.
King, J. K.
Knatchbull, W. F.
Knight, F. W.
Knightley, R.
Langton, W. G.
Lefroy, A.
Legh, W. J.
Lennox, Lord G. G.
Lennox, C. S. B. H. K.
Leslie, C. P.
Leslie, W.
Lever, J. O.
Longfield, R.
Lopes, Sir M.
Lygon, hon. F.
Macdonogh, F.
Mainwaring, T.
Malcolm, J. W.
Malins, R.
Manners, rt. hn. Lord J.
Miller, T. J.
Montgomery, Sir G.
Mordaunt, Sir C.
Morgan, O.
Morgan, hon. Major
Mowbray, rt. hon. J. R.
Mundy, W.
Naas, Lord
Newdegate, C. N.
Newport, Viscount
Nicol, W.
Noel, hon. G. J.
Pakenham, Colonel
Palk, Sir L.
Palmer, R. W.
Palmer, Sir R.
Papillon, P. O.
Peacocke, G. M. W.
Peel, rt. hon. General
Pennant, hon. Colonel
Phillips, G. L.
Powell, F. S.
Powys-Lybbe, P. L.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Rogers, J. J.
Rowley, hon. R. T.
Sclater-Booth, G.
Scott, Lord H.
Scourfield, J. H.
Selwyn, C. J.
Smith, A. (Herts)
Smith, S. G.
Smyth, Colonel
Smollett, P. B.
Somerset, Colonel
Somes, J.
Stanhope, J. B.
Stracey, Sir H.
Sturt, Lt.-Col. N.
Surtees, H. E.
Taylor, Colonel
Thynne, Lord E.
Thynne, Lord H.
Tottenham, Lt.-Col. C. G.
Trefusis, hon. C. H. R.
Treherne, M.
Trevor, Lord A. E. H.
Trollope, rt. hon. Sir J.
Turner, C.
Vance, J.
Vansittart, W.
Verner, E. W.
Vyse, Colonel H.
Walcott, Admiral
Walker, J. R.
Walpole, rt. hon. S. H.
Walsh, Sir J.
Walter, J.
Waterhouse, S.
Watlington, J. W. P.
Whitmore, H.
Wyndham, hon. P.
Yorke, J. R.

TELLERS.
Heathcote, Sir W.
Northcote, Sir S.

STREET MUSIC (METROPOLIS) BILL.

[BILL 90.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Repeal of recited Provisions, and Substitution of amended Provision).

MR. AYRTON, who had given notice to move at the end of the clause to add these words—

> "Provided he shall have been truly informed by such householder of the circumstances under which he is required to depart, and shall be given into custody by such householder,"

said, the object of the Amendment was to secure to the musician as a condition precedent to his arrest a knowledge of the circumstances under which he was given into custody. The hon. Member was proceeding when he was interrupted by cries for a division; whereon the hon. Gentleman said, he would move that the Chairman report Progress.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 52; Noes 138: Majority 86.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Clause, to add the words "provided he shall have been informed by the person making such charge of the circumstances under which he is required to depart."—*(Mr. Ayrton.)*

Mr. ADDERLEY said, a lady might be engaged in her domestic duties, and a German brass band with twenty performers might come to the window and blow a terrific blast. By the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman she would have to state to each performer why she wished them all to go away. They perhaps would be unable to understand English, and she might not be able to speak German. Well, then, the Amendment provided that the notice should be given to the musician by the householder. Why the householder might not be at home, and in that case the musician might play as long as he liked.

Sir GEORGE GREY said, the Amendment was altogether unnecessary, because the present law provided that a person playing an instrument in the street, to the annoyance of an inhabitant, could be ordered to remove, and if he refused he could be summoned.

Mr. LOCKE said, it was quite obvious that the right hon. Gentleman had misunderstood the Amendment. As the clause now stood it was altogether unnecessary that any communication should be made to the musician. If the Amendment were not adopted it would be left to the caprice of any one to direct a policeman to take a street musician into custody.

Mr. CLAY said, he could see no objection to an Amendment requiring that the musician should be informed by some person in the house of the reason why he was told to withdraw. But it was utterly unreasonable to provide that the householder should perform that duty, for the householder might be absent, or might be laid up by illness.

Mr. AYRTON said, he was ready to alter the Amendment by providing that the person who told the musician to retire should state the reason for his so doing.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 67; Noes 98: Majority 31.

Mr. AYRTON moved, at the end of the clause to add—"Provided he shall be given into custody by the person making the charge." His object was to provide that the charge should be made on the responsibility of the inhabitant of the house, and not merely on that of the policeman.

Sir GEORGE GREY thought that the Amendment was a reasonable one.

Mr. LONGFIELD also supported the Amendment.

Mr. WHALLEY complained of the arbitrary conduct of the metropolitan police, and said the Bill would largely increase their power.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Sir GEORGE GREY then moved at the end of the clause to add—

"Provided that the person making a charge for an offence against this Act, shall accompany the constable who shall take into custody any person offending as aforesaid, to the nearest police station-house, and there sign the charge-sheet kept for such purposes."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Sir GEORGE GREY moved to insert new clause—

"Whenever any person charged with an offence under this Act, shall be brought to any station-house during the time when the police court shall be shut, it shall be lawful for the constable in charge of the station-house to require the person making the charge to enter into a recognizance conditional as is provided by the Act passed in the 2 & 3 *Vict.* c. 47, s. 72; and, upon the refusal of such person to do so, it shall be lawful for such constable to discharge from custody the person so charged."

Clause *added* to the Bill.

Mr. AYRTON moved to add at end of the clause—

"And upon such recognizance being entered into, it shall be lawful for the said constable to discharge from custody the person so charged, on his entering into a recognizance to appear to answer the same."

Sir GEORGE GREY said, that the proviso was already contained in the existing law.

Amendment *withdrawn.*

Mr. AYRTON moved to insert clause—

"Any person who shall sound or play any musical instrument, or shall sing in any thoroughfare near any premises licensed for the sale of beer, wine, or spirits, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding 40*s.*, and it shall be lawful for any constable belonging to the metropolitan police force, to apprehend any such person if he shall continue so playing or singing, after being warned to desist therefrom, in view of such constable."

Mr. WALTER thought there was an ambiguity in the clause which required explanation. At present the words seemed somewhat invidious. He had no objection to bands being required to remove upon being warned; but from whom was the warning to come? If from the householder he should not object, but if it was intended that any person passing along the street should have the power to order the removal of a band, he should certainly object to such a power. He had noticed that bands near public houses were generally tolerably good bands, and not mere barrel organs. He could not but suspect that the words were intentionally ambiguous, and certainly they would enable a person passing along the road to order the removal of a band.

Clause *negatived.*

Mr. THOMSON HANKEY moved to insert proviso—

> "That nothing in this Act contained shall extend or apply to a dramatic representation usually performed in the streets of the metropolis, and generally known as the show of *Punch and Judy*, nor to any person representing any of the characters in such show, nor to any music performed or payed in connection with such show, in the same manner as has been usual before the passing of this Act; but such dramatic representation, show, and music may continue to be played as heretofore, before the passing of this Act."

Mr. PEACOCKE said, that the only effect of the insertion of such a clause in the Bill would be to render their legislation ridiculous.

Mr. CLAY said, he hoped the Committee would assent to the clause, and afford the necessary protection to an innocent amusement.

Mr. HUNT said, he believed the Bill would not in any way interfere with *Punch and Judy.*

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that if *Punch* were to sound any musical instrument, and was ordered to withdraw, he would run a great risk of being taken to the station-house if he resisted that order.

Mr. BASS said, he had no wish to oppose the clause.

Sir GEORGE GREY did not think the representation of *Punch and Judy* would come under the Bill unless accompanied by music. He agreed that the clause would make the Bill absurd.

Mr. Ayrton

Clause (This Act not to extend to *Punch and Judy*)—(*Mr. Hankey*)—*brought up,* and read 1°.

Question put, "That the Clause be now read a second time."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 34; Noes 65: Majority 31.

Bill *reported*; as amended, to be considered on *Tuesday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 186.]

House adjourned at half after Two o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, July 4, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Factory Acts Extension * (No. 176); Inclosure (No. 2)* (No. 177); Railways (Ireland) Acts Amendment * (No. 178).

Second Reading—London (City) Tithes Greek Loan * (No. 171).

Committee—Government Annuities, &c.* (No. 145); Clerks of the Peace Removal * (No. 126); Superannuation (Union Officers)* (No. 154); Pilotage Order Confirmation * (No. 150).

Report—Government Annuities, &c.* (No. 145); Superannuation (Union Officers)* (No. 154).

Third Reading—Valuation of Rateable Property (Ireland) * (No. 147); Cathedral Minor Corporations * (No. 166), and *passed.*

ALLEGED REVIVAL OF THE HOLY ALLIANCE.

The Marquess of CLANRICARDE, referring to the extraordinary despatches which had recently been published in *The Morning Post*, and to the denial given by the Prussian Government of their genuineness, said he hoped he should clearly understand from the noble Earl the Secretary for Foreign Affairs that the disavowal extended not merely to the text of those despatches, but to the transactions themselves, to which those papers professed to relate, in whatever words they might be clothed.

Earl RUSSELL was understood to say, that the denial of the Prussian Government extended to the transactions themselves. He could only repeat that the despatches were not genuine.

Viscount STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE said, the communication made by the noble Earl the Secretary for Foreign Affairs respecting the Correspondence alleged to have passed between Prussia and other Foreign Powers left some doubt, not as to the contradiction of the Correspondence itself, but regarding the circumstances to which it referred. He therefore wished to state that it was his intention before public business was proceeded with to-morrow to draw attention to the prevailing rumours concerning a revival of the so-called Holy Alliance, and to inquire whether the Government have any information on the subject that they can lay before Parliament?

EARL RUSSELL hoped his noble Friend correctly apprehended the statement he had made. The denial was put forward on the part of Prussia, and not of any other Power.

NAVY—ARMOUR-PLATED VESSELS—THE "KEARSARGE" AND THE "ALABAMA."—OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF HARDWICKE rose to call the attention of the noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Somerset) to the recent engagement between the *Kearsarge* and the *Alabama*, and asked if the attention of the Government had been called to the defence of the *Kearsarge* by means of chain-armour, and its power of resisting shot; and, further, if the Government had in the numerous experiments it had made, tested the value as a means of defence of ships of war of chain-armour? This was not the first time they had heard of chain armour being used in this way, for in 1862, Mr. Rowan, of Belfast, addressed a long letter to Lord Palmerston on the subject, which he would not read to the House, but would hand to the noble Duke.

THE DUKE OF SOMERSET said, the defence afforded by the chain-plating to the *Kearsarge* must have been very small, for it only extended over a space about thirty-six feet in length, and the chain was of the kind known as 1¾ inch. In order to judge of the strength of any armour it was necessary that the shots should strike it. Now the firing from the *Alabama* could not have been good, for this strip of armouring was only struck twice during the engagement; one of the shots glanced off, and the other, which was the only one that hit the armour fairly, pierced it and lodged in the side of the vessel. At the same time, it was known that the *Alabama* entered upon the contest under great disadvantages, her powder being either damp or very bad, and the vessel herself in a very unfit state. Two or three years ago the Admiralty made some experiments with chain-armour, and the result was that with a common 68-pounder and cast-iron shot it was knocked all to pieces —so that against steel projectiles it would afford no defence whatever. It did not at all follow that, as a make-shift, it would not be better than nothing, and at long distances, as in this case, it had some advantages. But what the Admiralty had to decide was—Given a certain weight, how to apply it most effectively for the defence of a ship? Some time ago the noble Earl opposite expressed a doubt whether guns weighing 6½ tons each would not be found too heavy for broadside purposes. He had since been informed that the two 11-inch guns on board the *Kearsarge*, one before and the other abaft the mainmast, weighed each 7¾ tons. The real conclusions to be drawn from the conflict between the *Kearsarge* and *Alabama* were that very powerful guns and very speedy vessels were required. The speed of the *Kearsarge* gave her great superiority over the *Alabama*, which, moreover, was not built for fighting purposes, but mainly with a view to cruising. Experiments had shown conclusively that the continuous surface of armour-plate yielded great advantages over interrupted surfaces like bar-iron or chain covering; no new information has been derived from the action between these two vessels.

LONDON (CITY) TITHES BILL.

SECOND READING.

Debate on Motion for Second Reading *resumed.*

After further short Debate, which was almost totally inaudible,

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed.*

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND).

THE EARL OF CLANCARTY said, in calling the attention of the House to the petitions that have been presented against certain alterations lately made in the rules of the Board of National Education in Ireland in favour of convent schools, as tending to substitute a sectarian for an united system of education, it is right that I should state that, however desirable it undoubtedly is that the poorer classes of different Christian denominations should be unitedly educated, to the extent that such education, based upon Scriptural instruction, may be freely accepted, I have ever considered the principle upon which united education was provided for under the rules of the National Board as most objectionable, and the means vainly resorted to for enforcing its acceptance upon the clergy and Protestants of Ireland to have been utterly unjustifiable. But, while my own opinions are thus opposed to the National system, I am sensible that among those who differ from me, there are many who have given it their support from the belief of its having been devised with much wisdom, and calculated, if faithfully carried out, to confer the greatest benefit upon the country. It is, indeed, pretty generally admitted to have failed of accomplishing what was expected from it; but it has sincere and ardent patrons, who cling to the belief that its admirable staff of Inspectors, its many trained teachers, and its model schools, above all, which are very ably conducted, exhibiting a fair sample of what the National system was designed to be, and where, under the rules of the Commissioners, young persons are trained for the office of teacher, may yet be the means of rendering the system popular and effective over the country. Hence they view with great jealousy any interference with the model schools, or the establishment of rival institutions of an opposite character. Such are the persons that have petitioned the House against the alterations I have referred to in the rules of the National Board, as a departure from the principle upon which the National system was established. They have undoubtedly a right to claim redress at the hands of the Government of whose educational policy they have been the steady supporters; and it is no less clearly the duty of Parliament to require that the large annual grant of more than £300,000 for the education of the poorer classes in Ireland should be faithfully administered, in strict conformity with its fundamental regulations. It is true that since I gave notice of bringing this subject before your Lordships, a Resolution, to the effect

> "That the new rules of the National Board, with regard to the aid to be afforded to convent and monastic schools, are at variance with the principle of the National System of Education,"

has been negatived by the House of Commons. If, however, report says truth, the subject was discussed in so thin a House as to have been at one time nearly counted out; and the Resolution may, therefore, have been decided upon by persons little acquainted with the subject; but, whatever may have been the cause of the Resolution having been negatived, such a verdict cannot, in the face of the facts of the case, be satisfactory to the public. It is tantamount to a declaration that the National system is properly sectarian, and its design to abet the pretensions of the Church of Rome to the absolute control of the education of the Irish population. But, on the other hand, it may be said that the petitions against the new rules have been but few, and do not indicate any widespread dissatisfaction. They certainly do not, for obvious reasons, come from the great body of the Roman Catholics. The interests of these, or rather of the Roman Catholic Church, in the matter are managed — and they could not be in more able hands—by the Roman Catholic hierarchy. The petitions are, in fact, all from the Presbyterian body, except one from the Ulster National Education Society, which includes, along with the name of the Lord Bishop of a great northern diocese, many members of the Established Church; but, though numerically they are few, their importance consists in this, that they represent the views of every intelligent Protestant that takes any real interest in the scheme, so called, of united education. Now, what are the complaints that they have put forward? The Presbyterian petitions, I find, do not materially differ from one another, nor from that of the Ulster Association, which only enters more fully into the particulars of the alterations last year made in the rules of 1855. All express approval of the National system, and of the model schools of the Board, and agree in representing the convent schools as denominational and sectarian, and therefore at variance with the main object of the institution, namely, united education. They point to the rules recently introduced as manifestly designed to render convent schools and monks' schools training institutions for National School teachers, and to supersede the use of the model schools for that purpose; as a consequence of which teachers will be sent forth imbued with sectarian prejudices, instead of being fitly trained, as in the model schools, to carry out a strictly non-sectarian principle of education. The Ulster petition complains of a further distinct preference shown to one religious denomination, in that while clergymen generally are absolutely excluded from discharging the duties of teachers in National Schools, the members of the religious orders of the Church of Rome, whether monks or nuns, are at once recognized as duly qualified for the office, without undergoing any kind of examination. These are grounds I should conceive quite sufficient to call for a complete review of the system, to ascertain whether it is in fact what it originally purposed to be—a system of united education, strictly non-sectarian, and administered with faithful impartiality. I do not wish to prefer a Bill of indictment against the Commissioners, but four members of their own body have found reason to protest against their proceedings with respect to convent schools; and a circumstance came subsequently to light—their suppression of an important public paper bearing directly upon the merits of convent and monastic schools—that appears to me to stamp their conduct with unfaithfulness in the administration of a most important trust. It is necessary to observe that there had been from the beginning a general acquiescence in the very questionable decision the Board early came to of taking convent schools into connection with the National system in the face of the Report of the Committee of the House of Commons of 1825, which distinctly stated that they were unsuited for the purposes of united education; nor were the Commissioners ever reproached for the favour and consideration they showed to the communities of nuns, in admitting their qualifications as teachers without examination. The merits and zealous devotion of the nuns to the charitable duties they undertook, as educators of Roman Catholic poor, no one was disposed to call in question; but when it became plainly the intention of the Commissioners that monks and nuns, without having received any training under the National Board, and holding themselves responsible to none but their ecclesiastical superiors, should be invested with the very important functions of training those who are to teach in the National Schools with which the country is overspread, it was time for the friends of the National system to object. They have accordingly appealed to both Houses of Parliament. The paper I have alluded to as having been suppressed by the Commissioners is the Report of one of their Head Inspectors, Mr. Sheridan, a Roman Catholic, much impressed with the merits of the religious houses within his district, and anxious, in the discharge of the duties of his office, to improve the efficiency of the schools under their superintendence. It is remarkable that this gentleman's Report, written in ignorance of the Commissioners' views, was sent in about the time that they were preparing their new rules for giving increased endowments, extension, and importance, to the convent and monastery schools; but, being clearly condemnatory of the step they were taking, it was withheld from publication in the appendix to their Annual Report, in which it was customary it should have appeared, and it is probable it never would have been produced had it not been called for by an order of the House of Commons. I will, with your Lordships' permission, read what bears immediately on the question of the fitness or unfitness of these schools for what the Commissioners intend to make them—

"Teachers who are members of religious communities are monks and nuns, and are the teachers of the class of schools called Convent National Schools. The importance of these schools may be measured by the fact that thirty-five of them (from one, having been recently established, no Return was obtained) commanded, in 1860, a gross average daily attendance of 9,105 pupils, or about one-fifth of the gross average daily attendance of all the other 854 National Schools taken together.

"These teachers are not classified by the Board, nor are they required to submit to an examination, as the Commissioners take for granted that they are sufficiently well educated to discharge the duties of National teachers efficiently; and, in point of fact, it is undeniable that the majority of them—of the nuns especially—are infinitely better educated than the teachers of ordinary National Schools, while it is equally true that they bring to the discharge of their duties a disinterestedness and devotedness to which even the most zealous of the lay teachers can have no claim. It is also undeniable that their schools do an incalculable amount of good. Their pupils receive a moral and religious training of the highest order; they are educated to habits of truth-telling, modesty, order, and cleanliness; and such of them as attend with fair regularity, and continue at school till they reach the upper classes, are sure to receive an excellent literary education.

"(*a.*) These teachers very seldom have any opportunity of receiving a technical training as teachers, either before or after making their religious profession; and hence, although they are undoubtedly well-educated in a general sense, I apprehend that many of them have a very limited acquaintance with those improved methods of teaching and school organization which have received the sanction of experience. The want of such technical knowledge is most apparent in their management of the junior classes.

"(*b.*) It is a characteristic of these teachers that they are impatient of competition. A rival school, if it can possibly be extinguished, is not allowed to exist. In crowded cities this is, of course, impossible; but in Tralee, Killarney, Newcastle, Kinsale, Queenstown, Middleton, Skibbereen, Bandon, Dingle, and a host of smaller towns, no female schools, except those connected with convents, are to be found; none are permitted to be established. In some of them, indeed, such as Tralee, Killarney, Newcastle, and Dingle, in which there are monks' schools as well as nuns' schools, even the ordinary male National Schools have been proscribed.

> "Now, I am perfectly convinced that in pursuing this policy these worthy teachers are actuated by good motives. They have faith in themselves, as all earnest devoted teachers have, or ought to have; and, believing conscientiously that their own schools are best adapted for the proper training of youth, they consider themselves justified in using all their influence to remove other schools out of the way. But to me such a policy appears most objectionable. It savours of intolerance. In fact—there is no use in mincing words—it is intolerance; and like every other intolerant policy, the evils it gives rise to are more than sufficient to counterbalance the good it is expected to effect.
>
> "In the first place, in every mass of population, while there is, undoubtedly, a large proportion of children that will attend the schools of religious communities in preference to any other, there is always, on the other hand, a not inconsiderable number of children who would readily attend lay schools, but cannot be induced to frequent those conducted by religious teachers. Let it be understood that I am not alluding to children of different denominations, but only to Catholic children. What is the result? When the lay schools are extinguished, a considerable portion of the children of the poor of the locality receive no education whatever. In the town of Killarney there are two convent schools and one monks' school for the education of the children of a population amounting to nearly 6,000 persons. No day school conducted by lay teachers would be tolerated there. Well, I have it on the best authority that the number of children attending schools in Killarney is considerably less than that of those who never enter a school.
>
> "In the next place, this impatience of competition not only extinguishes the principle of emulation, which exercises a healthy stimulating influence upon schools as upon individuals, but also leads the conductors of convent schools to admit pupils without limit — without any reference to the available teaching power. The expediency—the necessity — of restricting the attendance to that number which the schools are capable of accommodating conveniently, or the teachers of instructing efficiently, is practically ignored. The school-rooms in most cases are crowded to excess, the attendance out of all proportion to the teaching power. The inevitable result is that in such schools the rate of progress is extremely slow; it takes a very long time for a child to work her way from the lowest to the highest class, and, in point of fact, comparatively few ever reach that goal. The great majority leave the school, and give up schooling, before they have completed half the school course."

Now, my Lords, it was certainly an inexcusable act of the Commissioners of National Education to attempt to suppress a public document of this kind, which the Government and the public should have had full opportunity of considering in connection with their new rules. Their disingenuous conduct in this and other matters connected with the alteration of their rules naturally aroused the indignation of the friends of the National system, and at a large and influential meeting held at Belfast, at which the right rev. Prelate opposite was present, it was animadverted upon in very strong terms by the right rev. Prelate himself, as well as by others who addressed the meeting. The changes of the rules were regarded as

> "A violation of a solemn compact entered into with the friends of the National system, a treacherous departure from what they were led to believe would be its rules. They had met together to defend the system, not against the attacks of honourable and open adversaries who conscientiously oppose it, but to guard it against the insidious changes of professing friends.'

Such was the tone of indignant rebuke with which the Commissioners' conduct was noticed by their friends in the North. I confess that I did not view their proceedings, except in respect of the disingenuousness by which they were characterized, with any surprise. It must be in the recollection of many of your Lordships that about four years ago there was a kind of crisis in the existence of the National system, in consequence of the declared hostility of the Roman Catholic hierarchy to the principle of the system, and their special denunciation of the model schools, from which they caused a general, and in some instances a total withdrawal of the Roman Catholic pupils. A correspondence thence ensued between them and the Irish Government, in which they so ably pressed their views of the importance of interweaving religious with secular instruction, and of the responsibilities of ministers of the Church when called upon to take part in the education of youth, that Mr. Secretary Cardwell, who conducted the correspondence on the part of the Government, being utterly incapable of answering them, and unwilling to make an open surrender of the principles of the National system, compromised the matter by adding to the number of Roman Catholic members on the Board, so as to give them a predominating influence in its proceedings. Was it to be supposed that a concession so made was to be of no further avail? Certainly not. It was legitimately to be regarded by the Roman Catholic prelates as a means to the attainment of what was not openly granted. The dominant party on the Board immediately proceeded to compass the object of their Church by extending the system of convent education, and investing the religious communities with the duties, hitherto confined to the model schools, of training teachers who would go forth from the convent walls trained in subjection to no other authority than that of the hierarchy. And what is the defence that the Commissioners have made since their proceedings have been called in question? They do not attempt to show that they are warranted by any reference to the principles of the National system. In what is termed their explanatory paper they divert attention from the question at issue by giving a history of the convent schools, showing at once how great have been their services, and how much underpaid, about which no question had arisen; but the Attorney General for Ireland himself, one of the Commissioners, is reported to have defended their course of action on the occasion of the late debate in another place, on the ground of precedent, remarking—

> "That the Presbyterian schools of Ulster, under the amended rules of the Board, which were amended in favour of the Presbyterians of Ulster, in his judgment, against the interest of the Board, were to a large extent quite as exclusive as the convent schools. They had all other clergymen excluded from them."

Now, if the National system is to be upheld with any pretence of carrying out its original and declared object, it appears to me that it is indispensably necessary, not only that its rules should be carefully reviewed and corrected, but that the Board should be reconstructed, and made a paid, responsible Board; and that all exceptional and exclusive privileges—whether to monks, nuns, or Presbyterians—should be done away with. There can be no doubt that, as at present constituted, there is a preponderant power given to one denomination, that practically invests the Roman Catholic hierachy with a controlling power over the education of the poorer classes over the whole of Ireland. The growth of the power of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland has been very apparent ever since, and through means of the institution of the National System of Education. The first and great step towards its present development was when it was announced in the charter letter of its institution, dated October, 1831, and signed "E. G. Stanley," that the reading of the Bible in the National Schools was a vital defect, inasmuch as it was contrary to the principle of the Roman Catholic Church to allow it; that, therefore, the reading of the Sacred Volume was to be excluded from the proposed plan of united education. In lieu of the Bible, however, some Scripture extracts, admirably adapted to assist the moral training of the school children, were ordered to be made use of. But not many years elapsed before the extracts were objected to by the Roman Catholic priests, as the Bible before had been, and in 1839 those extracts of Scripture were, like the Bible, eliminated from the course of instruction provided for general use in the schoolroom. There remained, however, a tablet suspended on the walls of every schoolroom, exhibiting to the view of the assembled children the Ten Commandments. This remnant of the authority of God's Word in the work of united education could not long be tolerated, and therefore, in a subsequent amendment of the rules, it is announced that "the use of the tablet containing the Ten Commandments is not compulsory." How completely Scripture authority was thenceforward excluded from the National system was two years ago plainly acknowledged by the Commissioners. A well-meant effort was made in the beginning of 1862, by the right rev. Prelate opposite and other devoted friends of the National system, to have the rule regarding the use of the Sacred Volume so far relaxed as to enable the managers and teachers of National Schools to make such slight and casual reference to the Word of God, at the time of secular instruction, as occasion should absolutely call for. After considerable endeavours on the part of the Commissioners of Education to evade giving a direct answer to so inconvenient an application, an answer was at length plainly given, and the humiliating duty devolved upon the Lord Lieutenant, the representative of our Protestant Sovereign in Ireland, of conveying to the right rev. Prelate the declaration that to permit any reference whatever to the Word of God, during the hours of combined instruction, would be subversive of the fundamental principle of the National System of Education. Thus, so far as morality is to be inculcated in National Schools, it is to be wholly independent of the moral teaching of the Bible. But, it may be asked, is there not a lesson of morality required to be hung up in every school? Undoubtedly there is, but though it aims at the commendable object of promoting harmony and good-will, how does it go about it? A copy of it that I hold in my hand is given in the Appendix to the last public Report of the Commissioners. It sets out with saying, "Christians should endeavour, as the Apostle Paul commands them, to 'live peaceably with all men;'" then follows the Scripture reference, "Romans, c. 12, v. 17." The same Scripture reference appears also in all the previously published copies of the lesson, but it was a blunder, no doubt accidental, and by persons more conversant with Scripture than the Commissioners appear to have been would have been earlier corrected. The words of the text referred to are, "Recompense to no man evil for evil; provide things honest in the sight of all men." The proper reference for the words quoted would be Romans, c. 12, v. 18, which says "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you live peaceably with all men;" to which words the Commissioners have most improperly added, "even with those of a different religious persuasion;" thereby suggesting to the minds of the children, what it was the proposed purpose of united education to guard against, that the very last persons with whom they were to live peaceably were those of a different religious persuasion. In the next paragraph the lesson says that "Our Saviour Christ taught His disciples to love *even* their enemies." But if the Bible were not a closed book, the children would see that the word *even* was an interpolation of the Commissioners not warranted by any part of our Lord's teaching. In the next paragraph it is written—

> "Many men hold erroneous doctrines, but we ought not to hate or persecute them. We ought to seek for the truth, and to hold fast what we are convinced is the truth, but not to treat harshly those who are in error."

"Holding erroneous doctrines," "being in error," "seeking for the truth," and "holding it fast," are phrases I should say hardly intelligible to young children who are not informed of what is the standard of sound doctrine—where or what the truth is. It therefore appears to have been alike needless and mischievous, however well intended, to suggest to the children's minds the notions of hatred, persecution, or harsh treatment of those who are in error. There is, however, one circumstance in this part of the general lesson illustrative of the progress of Roman Catholic authority in the National System of Education. It appears, as now drawn up in the new rules, that the Commissioners have struck out the words "We ought to seek for the truth." This was, no doubt, done in compliance with the representations that had been made to the Board that such a precept was inconsistent with the principle of the Roman Catholic Church. So that, because Roman Catholics are not allowed to seek for the truth, Protestants, under the Board's teaching, are to be contented likewise to remain in ignorance. Now, my Lords, let me ask what are the benefits the country has reaped from the National System of Education in Ireland —not, I am bound to say, as originally introduced by the noble Earl, the respected leader of the party on this side of the House, who, I am sorry, is not able to be in his place to-day — but from the system as it has since been growing up, with its accumulation of compromises, concessions, and exceptional arrangements? Has it been instrumental in producing greater harmony between persons of different creeds and parties? I believe that, so far from that being the case, more Acts of Parliament have been passed since than were ever deemed necessary before the institution of the National System of Education, to prevent the occurrence of collisions between Protestants and Roman Catholics, especially in the North of Ireland; and I am justified by the example England presents of the friendly harmony that subsists among persons of different creeds, as well as by my own observation of the beneficial influence of schools that may be called denominational in Ireland, where children are religiously educated in the tenets of the communion to which their parents wish them to belong, in saying that better feelings are thus produced among the rising generation than by forcing a system of united education upon the country. Then, what has been the result of the system in the matter of elementary instruction? The best and most impartial testimony upon the subject will be that of the Census of 1861. What does it show? There were, at the time it was taken, in the whole of Ireland no less than 39 per cent of the population above five years of age unable to read or write. It might, however, be said that those who had emigrated were, for the most part, well educated. Let us see, then, what is the actual effect of the schools upon the youth of Ireland between the ages of five and sixteen, the period of life at which the schools are resorted to. The Return made by the Commissioners shows no less a number than 45 per cent of those unable to read or write. A more striking evidence of the effect of the National School system may be seen from the following Return of the proportion of persons, five years old and upwards, of different religious persuasions, unable to read or write. It is as follows:—Established Church, 16·0; Roman Catholics, 45·8; Presbyterians, 11·1; Methodists, 9·0; Independents, 6·8; Baptists, 9·2; Society of Friends, 4·1; all other persuasions, 11·8; Protestants generally, 13·7; Jews, 11·9. Hence it appears that while the Presbyterian body, supported by an exceptional arrangement with the National Board, have turned their schools to good account in showing so small a proportion as 11 per cent uninstructed in reading and writing, the Established Church, thrown upon its own resources, but with a poor population often scattered through Roman Catholic districts, where they have access to any but a priests' school, has not generally neglected the interests of the Church children when there are but 16 per cent of them illiterate. In the Roman Catholic body may be seen the result of the work done in four-fifths of the National Schools, including the schools in monasteries and convents—the value of which is so much vaunted in the explanatory paper of the Commissioners of National Education. And what is that result? 45·8 of the Roman Catholic population over five years of age that can neither read nor write. I need not comment upon this, but, with your Lordships' permission, will read a few words from an address on social economy by Sir James Emerson Tennant, delivered at the meeting of the Social Science Association at Glasgow, in 1860, his testimony to the character, with regard to intellectual development of the Irish immigrants to large towns in England. He writes—

> "The Scotch or Welsh peasant who finds his way to the manufacturing towns of England, from a labourer, becomes in his turn an employer, a tradesman, a shopkeeper, a merchant; but, strange to say, as a general rule, in that humblest of all capacities in which the Irish immigrant lands on the quay of Liverpool or Glasgow—in that capacity, for the most part, he is contented to continue for the remainder of his life. . . . Whence comes it that whilst the labourer of Scotland and of England has the prospect of affluence in the future, the eye to discern and the ambition to attain it, the patient but unaspiring peasant of Ireland, unconscious of his own powers and blind to his opportunities, finds his energies arrested in the earliest stage of a career which he is competent, but never destined to run, and in a land overflowing with riches he is contented to remain 'a servant of servants unto his brethren.' It would be equally an insult to Ireland and to our own understanding were we to snatch a conclusion, and cut short inquiry, by imputing to the Irish some imaginary inequality of race. We have the evidence of the very different career of the Irish in the United States and Canada, and their success there to prove that what might be mistaken for incapacity amongst the Irish in Scotland and in England, is in reality the dormancy, not the deficiency, of ability. It seems to me that much that is anomalous in the character and career of some of the labouring classes in Ireland is to be traced to a grave defect in their early training. An Irishman of the labouring class is seldom taught, nor even permitted, to think for himself."

Must we not admit, my Lords, that education has been at fault in this matter? And who is there among your Lordships that is connected with, or has visited Ireland, that has not seen and deplored the very backward and manifestly uneducated condition of the lower orders, the absence from their dwellings of that cleanliness, neatness, and economy, as well as of the enjoyment of the comforts of civilized life, which to the English peasant have become indispensable? Why is it that, compared with the sister country, Ireland exhibits over the greater part of her surface so much poverty, helplessness and squalid wretchedness as to have made her condition a very by-word of reproach? What is it that makes the wealth and prosperity of a nation? Not the fertility of its soil; if that were so, the soil of Ireland being naturally more fertile than that of England, the former would be the wealthier and more flourishing of the two. Not the number of its inhabitants; if that were so, Ireland would, eighteen years ago, have presented an example of prosperity far in advance of any other part of the United Kingdom. But we know how much the case was the reverse; that, ere the advent of the great famine in 1846, the overwhelming numbers of her population were the worst fed, the worst clothed, and in a greater proportion houseless and begging their bread, than the population of any other country. Nor does it depend upon the existence of free institutions; if that were so, Ireland, being under the same form of government as England, and enjoying the same political rights, would have reaped the like benefit from them. No, my Lords, the improvement of the condition of Ireland—any hope we may entertain of her prosperity, must depend, under Divine Providence, upon the awakened intelligence and rightly-directed energies of her population, and it is for lack of these conditions having been fulfilled that she is fully twenty-five years behind any civilized country in Europe. The obvious remedy for this is to provide education, not by the intolerant application of any theory of united education that has totally failed, but such education as will meet the ascertained requirements of the country; not the mere elementary teaching of literature, but the education of the character, and, above all, of the Christian character, which alone can impart a right sense of responsibility and of moral rectitude. I will not trouble your Lordships by further observation of my own upon this subject, but will close what I have to say by quoting from a speech not long since delivered by the noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, on the subject of education, when it was proposed to introduce into England a system of education, somewhat of the same kind as that which unfortunately exists in Ireland—

> "I own that to me, looking to this as a practical question, innumerable difficulties rise up against the adoption of such a proposition. In the first place, I could not but be struck with the answer of one of the boys at the examination today, when he was asked for what purpose the Holy Scriptures were given to mankind? and he answered, 'To be the guide of our conduct in life.' Well, now, what an imperfect, lame system must that be which proposes, either by State assistance or voluntary effort, to educate the great body of the people of this country, and yet leave out the knowledge of that which is to guide our conduct through life? Can any omission be more unwise, or more fatal to the object we have in view. . . The children who receive only secular instruction will conclude most naturally that they have the sum and substance of that which is most necessary for them. That they might attend religious instruction elsewhere is, no doubt, possible; but when you consider the time that is taken up at school, and the occupations of the various ministers of religion, you will see that it is hardly possible in practice that in one place children should receive an adequate secular instruction, and that in another place they should find a minister of religion capable of giving them the whole of the instruction which is required for their religious education. If that is the case, and if it is so important that their conduct in life should be so regulated, will you give them moral instruction apart from the Bible, apart from any religious sanction? That again appears to me to be an equally unwise and fatal course, because if these precepts of morality—these rules for the guidance of their conduct—have a Divine sanction, it ought to be revealed to them, and the counsel of God should not be withheld. . . . I have always contended that this matter of religion is secular as well as religious, that it belongs to us all, that it pervades the whole business of life, and is, in fact, one of those things which ought to be reckoned among the common things of which every household ought to partake. I have ventured to say this much because the question at the present time is not whether education ought to be given so much as of what kind it ought to be."

I have taken the liberty, my Lords, after placing before your Lordships the nature of the objections to the alterations of the rules of the National Board, to notice at some length the working of the education system, and what appears to me to be the just claims of Ireland upon the consideration of the Government. I have done so—I will not say in the hope, for that hope has been too often disappointed, but with the earnest desire, that should the noble Earl the President of the Council answer my question, whether the sanction of the Government will be given to the new rules of the National Board, by telling me that the subject will be considered—that it will be considered irrespective of party interests, and solely with a view to the best interests of the Irish population, as in that case the great question of the Irish difficulty will at length be solved.

THE BISHOP OF DOWN AND CONNOR could not concur with the noble Lord in his condemnation of the National System of Education in Ireland. He could not look with indifference upon a system which embraced 6,000 schools, and educated more than half a million of children of every sect in Ireland. It afforded them not only secular but religious instruction, and, by bringing the children of every sect together, it tended to check the growth of prejudice and bigotry in their minds. He must say, however, that he regarded with no small misgiving and alarm the alterations which had lately been made in the fundamental rules of the Board, the effect of which was to transfer the training of future teachers of the National Schools in Ireland from the model schools, which exemplified the system in its highest and best form, to schools which must from their very character and position be regarded as denominational schools. The question was simply whether the change which had been made was a fundamental one. That had been denied, but in his opinion the change was of that character. The right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary of Ireland, in writing to the Chief Commissioner, on the 30th of January, said—

> "The attention of the Irish Government had been drawn to certain contemplated changes in the fundamental rules of the National System of Education."

Although the right hon. Baronet had thought fit to alter his opinion since that time, he himself concurred entirely in the right hon. Baronet's impressions as expressed in the letter from which he had quoted. He could also refer to the opinions of his right rev. Brother the Bishop of Derry, and of Dr. Henry and others, in confirmation of his view. It would be seen, therefore, that those whose long experience in connection with the subject well qualified them to express an accurate opinion took the same view of the question. The papers presented to their Lordships' House contained protests from some of the earliest members of the Board, who stated that in their opinion the alterations which had been made were fundamental; and in this opinion a majority of the Board concurred. Having many schools in which he took an interest, he could not consent to accept any scheme which he believed to be opposed to the system of National Education. He did not wish that the schools in which he was interested should possess any peculiar privileges, but that they should enjoy all the benefits which were common to every religious body in Ireland. It had been said that the schools of the Presbyterians in Ireland enjoyed at a former date some exceptional privileges; but when that statement was inquired into by a Committee it was found that the Presbyterians possessed no peculiar privileges. The convent schools alone were exceptionally favoured, and he could not but object to the variation of the rules in favour of these schools. They received grants of public money not calculated upon the efficiency of the pupils, but according to the number of children in attendance. Thus the convent schools had a direct interest in enlarging the numbers of children whom they taught, and Mr. Sheridan had stated that in these schools children were admitted without limitations. Of his own knowledge he knew nothing of the efficiency of these schools, but from some remarks of Mr. Sheridan he was led to believe that they were not very efficient. He found that in the model schools 90 per cent of the pupils passed from the lower classes to the upper classes, and in the district schools 52 per cent; but in the convent schools only 23 per cent of the pupils were so advanced. He, therefore, could not think that these schools could be regarded as institutions best fitted to provide future masters and mistresses for the schools in Ireland. Indeed, in his opinion, they must necessarily be inefficient for that purpose, because the ladies who taught in these schools were themselves imperfectly educated. The efficiency of a master depended not so much upon the education he had received as upon his ability to impart that education to others, and it could not be expected that masters trained in schools where the teachers themselves were untrained would be the persons best qualified to conduct the education of the people of Ireland. He denied that any crusade had been set on foot in Belfast against these schools. He gave to the ladies who conducted them the highest credit for performing what was no doubt to them a labour of love, and they were, he fully believed, actuated by the purest and highest motives; but he still could not think that schools based upon so narrow and sectarian a foundation were proper institutions for training the youth of Ireland. Those who had petitioned against the changes in the rules did so because they deprecated any departure from the great principle of non-sectarian education in Ireland. At present children of all religions might be found sitting side by side in the schools. But if the rules as recently altered should be enforced, the whole country would be covered with hostile schools, in which children would be imbued with antagonistic feelings, and all the old intolerance and bigotry which he hoped had almost disappeared from Ireland would be revived. He would suggest that the best mode of dealing with this subject would be by the appointment of a Royal Commission, composed of persons unconnected with the system; and, although he would not pledge himself to agree with any conclusions they might arrive at, he would undertake to bow with respect to their determination, and would, as far as possible, urge upon those who agreed with him to do the same.

THE EARL OF BANDON said, the system of education as introduced by Lord Derby was on the principle of united education; and in very few of the non-vested schools could united education be said to exist. In his own county he had known instances where clergymen were anxious to put their schools under the National Board, and were prevented from doing so by their own Protestant parishioners. Having frequently assisted at collections made with charitable objects, he could testify to the zeal with which the very poorest classes subscribed to sustain the Church Education Society. The position in which the education of the children of the lower classes in Ireland was placed was, that while Roman Catholics in each parish had schools supported by the State, no Protestant child attended these schools. The Roman Catholic schools received support from the State, while assistance was refused to Protestant schools. He would ask their Lordships how long that anomaly was to continue? The religious scruples even of Jews were respected, but those of Irish Protestants were wholly disregarded. The National Board professed to carry out a mixed system of education, but in reality it was undermining that system. Nominated to please the Ultramontane party, and viewing the convent schools with the utmost favour, how was it likely that the Commissioners would do justice to the model schools of which the others were their rivals? If they made the convent schools model schools, the days of the National system were numbered. The National system was really carried out in the workhouses, where a lay Board mediated and did justice between the parties respectively; whereas in other schools, when complaints were made, the Commissioners too often sent back the matter for investigation by the priest, who was the patron of the school; in the same way the Lord Lieutenant, when appealed to as a Minister of the Crown, instead of deciding for himself, referred to the Commissioners for their view of what ought to be done. If they wished to maintain the National system they must totally abolish the Board, and appoint paid Commissioners and make them responsible to Parliament.

EARL GRANVILLE said, that great weight was to be attached to the views of the right rev. Prelate who had spoken on the subject (the Bishop of Down and Connor), although he had certainly failed to convince him that the course which he advocated was one which it would be desirable to adopt. In reference to the arguments of the two noble Lords opposite, he felt bound to remark that they had all along been the consistent, but uncompromising, opponents of the system of National Education in Ireland. It was but natural, therefore, that they should continue to object to it; but he, for one, must contend that one of the greatest benefits which could be conferred on Ireland was the promotion of education, and the National system had, he believed, answered the purpose. There was something besides, however, which would tend greatly to the advantage of the country—and that was the encouraging a spirit of harmony and conciliation on religious subjects; and the observations in which the noble Lords opposite had indulged were, he thought, scarcely calculated to forward that end. With respect to the composition of the National Board, the average attendance was about four Protestant to three Roman Catholic Members; and on the day when the rules in question were decided on the members of both persuasions were, so far as he was aware, equal in their numbers. In respect to the change of the rules, the speeches that had been made conveyed to their Lordships a very exaggerated view of them. He might observe that Lord Derby had—very properly he thought — given his sanction to the admission of convent schools to the benefits of the National system. They first received the capitation grant; but when afterwards the system of classification was introduced it was not found applicable to the convent schools, and they had hitherto received from the Government only about half what was given to other schools. That being so, the question lately brought before the Board was, that the age at which monitors were allowed to remain at the training schools being restricted to eighteen, and managers refusing to receive them at that age because of their youth, the result being that their services were lost to the country, and they adopted frequently other pursuits, it was desirable that those boys should be allowed to remain at the schools till they reached the age of twenty; the expense of which change would be about £2,000 a year, of which sum it was estimated only £500 would go to the convent schools. There was in that change, he thought, nothing to which objection could possibly be taken, while the interests of education were advanced by the step.

THE EARL OF LONGFORD said, that the members of the Established Church in Ireland will hear with great regret that Her Majesty's Ministers sanction the change proposed in the Rules of the Commissioners of National Education. The speech of the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Down and Connor) ought to have convinced them that a grave error had been committed, which it was their duty to rectify rather than to support. He (the Earl of Longford) and other persons had placed schools in connection with the National Board, on the faith of its published principles and published regulations. Its published principles were to the effect that no suspicion of proselytism should attach to the system, so that parents of all religious persuasions might send their children with confidence to the schools. Its published regulations were literally and verbally non-sectarian; but its practice had gradually become, and has now avowedly become, bitterly sectarian. He (the Earl of Longford) would not follow previous speakers through the series of changes, all in a direction hostile to the Established Church, which have been successively introduced into the system; but he added his protest to theirs against the unfortunate measure now under discussion, and regretted that the Ministry should approve an arrangement which he believed to be prejudicial to the cause of good government in Ireland.

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, July 4, 1864.

MINUTES.]—New Writ Issued—For Gloucester County (Eastern Division) *in the room of* Sir Christopher William Codrington, baronet, deceased.

Select Committee — *Report* — Expiring Laws (No. 459).

Supply—*considered in Committee* — *Resolutions* [July 1] *reported* *.

Public Bills—*Resolutions in Committee*—Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans)*; Turnpike Acts Continuance*.

Second Reading — Public Schools* [Bill 23] (*Lords*); Transfer Act Amendment* [Bill 183].

Select Committee — On Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* [Bill 152].

Committee — Cranbourne Street * [Bill 154], *re-committed*—r.p.; India Office* [Bill 166]; Indemnity* [Bill 97]; Judgments, &c., Law Amendment *re-committed** [Bill 160]; Local Government Act (1858) Amendment* [Bill 155].

Report — India Office* [Bill 166]; Indemnity* [Bill 97]; Judgments, &c., Law Amendment *re-committed** [Bill 160]; Local Government Act (1853) Amendment* [Bill 155].

Considered as amended—Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties)* [Bill 159]; Administration of Trusts (Scotland)* [Bill 179]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland)* [Bill 100].

INDIA—LUCKNOW BOOTY.

QUESTION.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whether the booty taken at the Begum's Coote (Lucknow) in December, 1858, has been, or is to be, distributed among the troops by whom it was captured; and if the whole, or any portion of it, is to be so distributed, when the distribution is likely to take place?

Sir CHARLES WOOD replied that the operations of the prize agents having been brought to a close, this property was held to belong to the Crown; and a proposal made by the Chief Commissioner of Oude, that a certain portion should be granted to the finders, was considered and approved by the Government of India in December, 1859. The distribution of this sum was left to Major General Sir Hope Grant.

INDIA—DELHI PRIZE MONEY.

QUESTION.

Captain CLIVE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whether any steps are being taken to accelerate the distribution of the second instalment of Delhi Prize Money to claimants in England, payment of such second instalment having been made in India in November, 1863?

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, in reply, that it was found that in the first distribution of this money several mistakes had been made in India, and instructions were sent out in order that those mistakes might be corrected. The amount of the second portion to be distributed could not be determined until that of the first had been ascertained. However, he had written out to India early in March with a view to accelerate the second distribution, but he had not yet received an answer to his despatch.

RELATIONS WITH BRAZIL.

QUESTION.

Sir MINTO FARQUHAR said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, what likelihood there is of a resumption of Diplomatic Relations between England and Brazil.

Mr. LAYARD replied, that negotiations were still going on, but he was unable to say when they would be completed.

INDIA—THE GAOL OF CALCUTTA.

QUESTION.

Mr. LESLIE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whether there is any foundation for the statements contained in the Letter of the Indian Correspondent of *The Times* which appeared in that paper on Friday last, regarding the condition of the great Gaol at Calcutta—

> "That it is a den of iniquity, a sink of filth; that no one could inform the President of the Sanitary Commission how many prisoners died in the gaol; that the medical attendant could not say for certain what the mortality was; and that some prisoners have been murdered by the native gaolers in the attempt to extort bribes from them and their friends."

And whether Her Majesty's Government will consent to lay upon the table of the House the Report of Mr. Strachey, the President of the Sanitary Commission, on the subject of Calcutta and other Indian Prisons?

Sir CHARLES WOOD, in reply, said, he had seen the statement to which the hon. Gentleman had called attention, and he could only say that it was very shocking, if true. He had received no information himself upon the subject, and therefore he was unable either to confirm or contradict the statement. It seemed, however, very improbable, for this reason, that under the existing Act Visiting Justices had been appointed, and it was the duty of one or more of those gentlemen, who were independent gentlemen of Calcutta, to visit the gaols three times in each quarter, and to make a Report as to their condition. In the last Report which he had received the Commissioners, after going into considerable detail as to the number of prisoners and other matters, said, "We beg to state that the management of the gaol appears to be satisfactory." Now, it was hardly likely, if such a state of things existed as the hon. Gentleman had referred to, that such a Report would have been made so recently as last winter, not by Government officials, but by independent gentlemen.

Mr. LESLIE said, he wished to know whether the right hon. Gentleman will make further inquiry?

Sir CHARLES WOOD: Certainly. I apprehend if the statement in the letter quoted by the hon. Member be true, the Sanitary Commission which has been recently appointed for Bengal has already inquired into the state of the case. I am not in possession of the Report, but no doubt it will be sent.

DENMARK AND GERMANY — THE CONFERENCE.—QUESTION.

Sir LAWRENCE PALK said, in the absence of the First Lord of the Treasury, he would beg to ask the Government, Whether any Circular Note or Despatch has been received by Her Majesty's Government from the Allied Powers, declaring they no longer consider themselves bound by the concessions made by them at the Conference; and whether any statement has been made by Austria, that the assertion made by Earl Russell that Austria will confine herself to the occupation of Schleswig and Holstein is erroneous?

Sir GEORGE GREY, in reply, said, no circular note to that effect had been received.

Mr. LAYARD said, in the latter part of the Question the word "occupation" was incorrect. The statement was that there was no "conquest" of Jutland.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON said, he wished to know whether Her Majesty's Government are in possession of any information that the German Powers are about to attack Copenhagen and the Islands?

Mr. LAYARD: Not that I am aware.

THAMES EMBANKMENT AND METROPOLIS IMPROVEMENT (LOANS).

Resolutions [July 1] *reported.*

1. "That it is expedient to authorize the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to guarantee the repayment of any money that may be borrowed under the Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement Acts, together with the interest thereon; and to cause advances to be made out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, of such sums as may be necessary for the repayment of such principal and interest, in aid of any other moneys applicable for that purpose under the said Act."

2. "That the Commissioners for the reduction of the National Debt be authorized to advance the money which by the Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement Acts the Metropolitan Board of Works is authorised to raise."

Resolutions *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer and Mr. Peel.

TURNPIKE ACTS CONTINUANCE.

On Motion of Mr. Baring, Bill to continue certain Turnpike Acts in Great Britain, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Baring and Sir George Grey.

THE ALLEGED HOLY ALLIANCE.

OBSERVATIONS.

Viscount PALMERSTON having moved that the Orders of the Day be postponed till after the notice of Motion relative to Denmark and Germany, said: I am bound to state to the House that we have received to-day a communication from the Prussian Ambassador with reference to the correspondence which has been published in one of the morning newspapers. I will not read the whole of the communication, but in it he says that since that newspaper has, notwithstanding the official denial which has been given, published despatches which are fabrications from beginning to end, and thinking that some question might be asked me in this House concerning them, he deems it his duty to tell me, "with all the authority of my official character, that, as far as my Government is concerned, all this pretended correspondence is a complete invention."

Motion *agreed to.*

Ordered, That the Orders of the Day be postponed till after the Notice of Motion relative to Denmark and Germany.—(*Viscount Palmerston.*)

DENMARK AND GERMANY—VOTE OF CENSURE—

RESOLUTION (MR. DISRAELI).

ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY.

MR. DISRAELI: Mr. Speaker—Some of the longest and most disastrous wars of modern Europe have been wars of succession. The Thirty Years War was a war of succession. It arose from a dispute respecting the inheritance of a duchy in the north of Europe, not very distant from that Duchy of Holstein which now engages general attention. Sir, there are two causes why wars originating in disputed succession become usually of a prolonged and obstinate character. The first is internal discord, and the second foreign ambition. Sometimes a domestic party, under such circumstances, has an understanding with a foreign Potentate; and, again, the ambition of that foreign Potentate excites the distrust, perhaps the envy, of other Powers; and the consequence is, generally speaking, that the dissensions thus created lead to prolonged and complicated struggles. Sir, I apprehend—indeed, I entertain no doubt—that it was the contemplation of such circumstances possibly occurring in our time that the statesmen of Europe, some thirteen years ago, knowing that it was probable that the Royal line of Denmark would cease, and that upon the death of the then King his dominions would be divided, and in all probability disputed, gave their best consideration to obviate the recurrence of such calamities to Europe. Sir, in these days fortunately it is not possible for the Powers of Europe to act under such circumstances as they would have done a hundred years ago. Then they would probably have met in secret conclave and have decided the arrangement for the internal government of an independent kingdom. In our time they said to the King of Denmark, "If you and your people among yourselves can make an arrangement in the case of the contingency of your death without issue, which may put an end to all internal discord, we at least will do this for you and Denmark—we will in your lifetime recognize the settlement thus made, and, so far as the influence of the great Powers can be exercised, we will at least relieve you from the other great cause which, in the case of disputed successions, leads to prolonged wars. We will save you from foreign interference, foreign ambition, and foreign aggression." That, Sir, I believe, is an accurate account and true description of that celebrated Treaty of May, 1852, of which we have heard so much, and of which some characters are given which in my opinion are unauthorized and unfounded.

There can be no doubt that the purpose of that treaty was one which entitled it to the respect of the communities of Europe. Its language is simple and expresses its purpose. The Powers who concluded that treaty announced that they concluded it, not from their own will or arbitrary impulse, but at the invitation of the Danish Government, in order to give to the arrangements relative to the succession an additional pledge of stability by an act of European recognition. If hon. Gentlemen look to that treaty—and I doubt not they are familiar with it—they will find the first Article entirely occupied with the recitals of the efforts of the King of Denmark—and, in his mind, successful efforts — to make the necessary arrangements with the principal Estates and personages of his kingdom, in order to effect the requisite alterations in the *lex regia* regulating the order of succession; and the Article concludes by an invitation and appeal to the Powers of Europe, by a recognition of that settlement, to preserve his kingdom from the risk of external danger.

Sir, under that treaty England incurred no legal responsibility which was not equally entered into by France and by Russia. If, indeed, I were to dwell on moral obligations—which I think constitute too dangerous a theme to introduce into a debate of this kind — but if I were to dwell upon that topic, I might say that the moral obligations which France, for example, had incurred to Denmark were of no ordinary character. Denmark had been the ally of France in that severe struggle which forms the most considerable portion of modern history, and had proved a most faithful ally. Even at St. Helena, when contemplating his marvellous career and moralizing over the past, the first Emperor of the dynasty which now governs France rendered justice to the complete devotion of the Kings of Denmark and Saxony—the only Sovereigns, he said, who were faithful under all proof and the extreme of adversity. On the other hand, if we look to our relations with Denmark, in her we found a persevering, though a gallant foe. Therefore, so far as moral obligations are concerned, while there are none which should influence England, there is a great sense of gratitude which might have influenced the counsels of France. But, looking to the treaty, there is no legal obligation incurred by England towards Denmark which is not equally shared by Russia and by France.

Now, the question which I would first ask the House is this—How is it that, under these circumstances, the position of France relative to Denmark is one so free from embarrassment—I might say so dignified—that she recently received a tribute to her demeanour and unimpeachable conduct in this respect from Her Majesty's Secretary of State; while the position of England under the same obligation, contained in the same treaty, with relation to Denmark is one, all will admit, of infinite perplexity and, I am afraid I must add, terrible mortification? That, Sir, is the first question which I will put to the House, and which, I think, ought to receive a satisfactory answer, among other questions, to-night. And I think that the answer that must first occur to everyone — the logical inference—is that the affairs of this country with respect to our obligations under the Treaty of 1852 must have been very much mismanaged to have produced consequences so contrary to the position occupied by another Power equally bound with ourselves by that treaty.

Sir, this is not the first time, as the House is aware, that the dominions of the King of Denmark have been occupied by Austrian and Prussian armies. In the year 1848, when a great European insurrection occurred—I call it insurrection to distinguish it from revolution, for, though its action was very violent, its ultimate effect was almost nothing—but when the great European insurrection took place, there was no portion of Europe more influenced by it than Germany. There is scarcely a political constitution in Germany that was not changed at that period, and scarcely a throne that was not subverted. The King of Denmark, in his character of a Sovereign Prince of Germany, was affected by that great movement. The population of Germany, under the influence of peculiar excitement at that time, were impelled to redress the grievances, as they alleged them to be, of their fellow-countrymen in the dominions of the King of Denmark, who were his subjects. The Duchy of Holstein and the Duchy of Schleswig were invaded, a civil war was excited by ambitious Princes, and that territory was ultimately subjected to a decree of that Diet with which now we have become familiar. The office was delegated to the Austrian and Prussian armies to execute that decree, and they occupied, I believe, at one time the whole continental possessions of the King of Denmark. In 1851 tranquillity had been restored to Europe, and especially to Germany, and the troops of Austria and Prussia ultimately quitted the dominions of the King of Denmark. That they quitted them in consequence of the military prowess of the Danes—though that was far from inconsiderable—I do not pretend to say. They quitted the territory, I believe the truth to be, in consequence of the influence of Russia, at that time irresistible in Germany, and deservedly so, because she had interfered and established tranquillity; and Russia had expressed her opinion that the German forces should quit the dominions of the King of Denmark. They quitted the country, however, under certain conditions. A diplomatic correspondence had taken place between the King of Denmark and the Courts of Berlin and Vienna, and the King of Denmark in that correspondence entered into certain engagements, and those engagements undoubtedly were recommended to a certain degree by the wish, if possible, to remedy the abuses complained of, and also by the desire to find an honourable excuse for the relinquishment of his provinces by the German forces. The King of Denmark never fulfilled the engagements into which he then entered. Partly, I have no doubt, from negligence. We know that it is not the habit of mankind to perform disagreeable duties when pressure is withdrawn. But I have no doubt, and I believe the candid statement to be, that it arose in a great degree from the impracticable character of the engagements into which he had entered. That was in the year 1851.

In 1852, tranquillity then being entirely restored, the treaty of May, which regulated the succession, was negotiated. And I may remind hon. Members that in that treaty there is not the slightest reference to these engagements which the King of Denmark had entered into with the Diet of Germany, or with German Powers who were members of the Diet. Nevertheless, the consequence of that state of affairs was this—that though there was no international question respecting Denmark, and although the possible difficulties which might occur of an international character had been anticipated by the Treaty of 1852, still in respect to the King of Denmark's capacity as Duke of Holstein and a Sovereign German prince, a controversy arose between him and the Diet of Germany in consequence of those engagements, expressed in hitherto private and secret diplomatic correspondence carried on between him and certain German Courts. The House will understand that this was not an international question—it did not affect the public law of Europe; but it was a municipal, local, or, as we now call it, a Federal question. Notwithstanding that in reality it related only to the King of Denmark and the Diet of Germany, in time it attracted the attention of the Government of England and of the Ministers of the great Powers, signataries of the Treaty of 1852. For some period after the Treaty of 1852, very little was heard of this Federal question and the controversy between the Diet and the King of Denmark. After the exertions and exhaustion of the revolutionary years the question slept; but it did not die. Occasionally it gave signs of vitality; and as time proceeded, shortly—at least not very long after—the accession of the present Government to office, the controversy between the Diet and the King of Denmark assumed an appearance of very great life and acrimony.

Now, Her Majesty's Ministers thought it their duty to interfere in that controversy between the German Diet and the King of Denmark — a controversy strictly Federal and not international. Whether they were wise in taking that course appears very doubtful. My own impression is, and always has been, that it would have been much better to have left the Federal question between the Diet and the King to work itself out. Her Majesty's Ministers, however, were of opinion—and no doubt there is something to be said in favour of that opinion —that as the question, although Federal, was one which would probably lead to events which would make it international, it was wiser and better to interfere by anticipation, and prevent, if possible, the Federal execution ever taking place. The consequence of that extreme activity on the part of Her Majesty's Ministers is a mass of correspondence which has been placed on the table, and with which, I doubt not, many Gentlemen have some acquaintance, though they may have been more attracted and absorbed by the interest of the more modern correspondence which has, within the year, been presented to the House. Sir, I should not be doing justice to the Secretary of State if I did not bear testimony to the perseverance and extreme ingenuity with which he conducted that correspondence. The noble Lord the Secretary of State found in that business, no doubt, a subject genial to his nature — namely, drawing up Constitutions for the government of communities. The noble Lord, we know, is almost as celebrated as a statesman who flourished at the end of the last century for this peculiar talent. I will not criticize any of the lucubrations of the noble Lord at that time. I think his labours are well described in a passage in one of the despatches of a distinguished Swedish statesman — the present Prime Minister, if I am not mistaken — who, when he was called upon to consider a scheme of the English Government for the administration of Schleswig, which entered into minute details with a power and prolixity which could have been acquired only by a constitutional Minister, who had long served an apprenticeship in the House of Commons, said—

> "Generally speaking, the monarchs of Europe have found it difficult to manage one Parliament, but I observe, to my surprise, that Lord Russell is of opinion that the King of Denmark will be able to manage four."

The only remark I shall make on this folio volume of between 300 and 400 pages relating to the affairs of Schleswig and Holstein is this—I observe that the other Powers of Europe, who were equally interested in the matter, and equally bound to interfere — if being signataries to the Treaty of 1852 justified interference — did not interpose as the English Government did. That they disapproved the course taken by us I by no means assert. When we make a suggestion on the subject, they receive it with cold politeness; they have no objection to the course we announce we are going to follow, but confine themselves, with scarcely an exception, to this conduct on their part. The noble Lord acted differently. But it is really unnecessary for me to dwell on this part of the question — we may dismiss it from our minds, and I have touched on it only to complete the picture which I am bound to place before the House—in consequence of events which very speedily occurred.

All this elaborate and, I may venture to say, not using the word offensively but accurately, pragmatical correspondence of the noble Lord on the affairs of Schleswig and Holstein was carried on in perfect ignorance on the part of the people of this country, who found very little interest in the subject; and even in Europe where affairs of diplomacy always attract more attention, little notice was taken of it. This correspondence, however, culminated in a celebrated despatch which appeared in the autumn of 1862, and then, for the first time, a very great effect was produced in Europe generally — certainly in Germany and France — and some interest began to be excited in England. Sir, the effect of the Secretary of State's management of these transactions had been this, that he had encouraged — I will not now stop to inquire whether intentionally or not, but it is a fact that he had encouraged—the views of what is called the German party in this controversy. That had been the effect of the noble Lord's general interference, but especially it was the result of the despatch which appeared in the autumn of 1862. But, Sir, something shortly and in consequence occurred which removed that impression. Germany being agitated on the subject, England at last, in 1863, having had her attention called to the case, which began to produce some disquietude, and Gentlemen in this House beginning to direct their attention to it, shortly before the prorogation of Parliament the state of affairs caused such a degree of public anxiety, that it was deemed necessary that an inquiry should be addressed to Her Majesty's Government on the subject, and that some means should be taken to settle the uneasiness which prevailed by obtaining from the Ministers a declaration of their policy generally with regard to Denmark. Sir, that appeal was not made, as I need hardly assure or even remind the House—for many were witnesses to it —in any party spirit, or in any way animated, I will say, by that disciplined arrangement with which public questions are by both sides of the House in general very properly brought before us. It was at the end of the Session, when few were left, and when the answer of Her Majesty's Ministers could not at all affect the position of parties, though it might be of inestimable interest and importance in its effect on the opinion of Europe, and on the course of events. That question was brought forward by an hon. Friend of mine (Mr. Seymour FitzGerald), who always speaks on these subjects with the authority of one who knows what he is talking about. Well, Sir, a communication was made to the noble Lord the First Minister on the subject, and it was understood on this side of the House, from the previous declarations of the noble Lord, and our experience of his career generally, that it was not an appeal which would be disagreeable to him, or one which he would have any desire to avoid. The noble Lord was not taken by surprise. He was communicated with privately, and he himself fixed the day—it was a morning sitting—when he would come down and explain the views of the Government in regard to our relations with Denmark. I am bound to say that the noble Lord spoke with all that perspicuity and complete detail with which he always treats diplomatic subjects, and in which we acknowledge him to be a master. The noble Lord entered into particulars, and gave to the House—who, with few exceptions, knew little about the matter—not only a popular, but generally an accurate account of the whole question. He described the constitution of the Diet itself. He explained, for the first time, in Parliament, what Federal Execution meant. The noble Lord was a little unhappy in his prophecy as to what was going to happen with regard to Federal Execution; but we are all liable to error when we prophesy, and it was the only mistake he made. The noble Lord said he did not think there would be a Federal Execution, and that if there were we might be perfectly easy in our minds, for it would not lead to any disturbance in Europe. The noble Lord also described the position of Holstein as a German Duchy, in which the King of Denmark was a Sovereign German Prince, and in that capacity a member of the Diet, and subject to the laws of the Diet. The Duchy of Schleswig, the noble Lord said, was not a German Duchy, and the moment it was interfered with, international considerations would arise. But the noble Lord informed us in the most re-assuring spirit that his views on our relations with Denmark were such as they had always been. I will quote the exact passage from the noble Lord's speech, not because it will not be familiar to the majority of those whom I am addressing, but because on an occasion like the present, one should refer to documents so that it may not be said afterwards that statements have been garbled or misrepresented. The noble Lord concluded his general observations in this manner—

> "We are asked what is the policy and the course of Her Majesty's Government respecting that dispute. We concur entirely with the hon. Gentleman (the Member for Horsham), and I am satisfied with all reasonable men in Europe, including those in France and Russia, in desiring that the independence, the integrity, and the rights of Denmark may be maintained. We are convinced—I am convinced at least—that if any violent attempt were made to overthrow those rights and interfere with that independence, those who made the attempt would find in the result that it would not be Denmark alone with which they would have to contend." — [3 *Hansard*, clxxii. 1252.]

I say that is a clear, statesmanlike, and manly declaration of policy. It was not a hurried or hasty expression of opinion, because on a subject of that importance and that character the noble Lord never makes a hasty expression of opinion. He was master of the subject and could not be taken by surprise. But on that occasion there was no chance of his being taken by surprise. The occasion was arranged. The noble Lord was perfectly informed of what our object on this side was. The noble Lord sympathized with it. He wanted the disquietude of the public mind in England, and on the Continent especially, to be soothed and satisfied, and he knew that he could not arrive at such a desirable result more happily and more completely than by a frank exposition of the policy of the Government.

Sir, it is my business to-night to vindicate the noble Lord from those who have treated this declaration of policy as one used only to amuse the House of Commons. I am here to prove the sincerity of that declaration. It is long since the speech of the noble Lord was delivered, and we have now upon our table the diplomatic correspondence which was then carrying on by Her Majesty's Government on the subject. It was then secret—it is now known to us all; and I will show you what at that very time was the tone of the Secretary of State in addressing the Courts of Germany mainly interested in the question. I will show how entirely and how heartily the secret efforts of the Government were exercised in order to carry into effect the policy which was publicly in the House of Commons announced by the noble Lord. I think it must have been very late in July that the noble Lord spoke—upon the 23rd, I believe—and I have here the despatches which, nearly at the same period, were sending by the Secretary of State to the German Courts. For example, hear how, on the 31st of July, the Secretary of State writes to Lord Bloomfield at Vienna—

> "You will tell Count Rechberg that if Germany persists in confounding Schleswig with Holstein, other Powers of Europe may confound Holstein with Schleswig, and deny the right of Germany to interfere with the one any more than she has with the other, except as a European Power. Such a pretension might be as dangerous to the independence and integrity of Germany as the invasion of Schleswig might be to the independence and integrity of Denmark."—*Denmark and Germany*, No. 2, 115.

And what is the answer of Lord Bloomfield? On the 6th of August, after having communicated with Count Rechberg, he writes—

> "Before leaving his Excellency I informed him that the Swedish Government would not remain indifferent to a Federal Execution in Holstein, and that this measure of the Diet, if persisted in, might have serious consequences in Europe."—p. 117.

I am showing how sincere the policy of the noble Lord was, and that the speech which we have been told was mainly for the House of Commons was really the policy of Her Majesty's Government. Well, that was to Austria. Let us now see what was the despatch to Prussia. In the next month Earl Russell writes to our Minister at the Prussian Court:—

> "I have caused the Prussian *Chargé d'Affaires* to be informed that if Austria and Prussia persist in advising the Confederation to make a Federal Execution now, they will do so against the advice already given by Her Majesty's Government, and must be responsible for the consequences, whatever they may be. The Diet should bear in mind that there is a material difference between the political bearing of a military occupation of a territory which is purely and solely a portion of the Confederation, and the invasion of a territory which, although part of the German Confederation, is also portion of the territory of an independent Sovereign, whose dominions are counted as an element in the balance of power in Europe."

I have now shown the House what was the real policy of the Government with respect to our relations with Denmark when Parliament was prorogued, and I have also shown that the speech of the noble Lord the First Minister of the Crown was echoed by the Secretary of State to Austria and Prussia. I have shown, therefore, that it was a sincere policy, as announced by the noble Lord. I will now show that it was a wise and a judicious policy.

Sir, the noble Lord having made this statement to the House of Commons, the House was disbanded, the Members went into the country with perfect tranquillity of mind respecting these affairs of Denmark and Germany. The speech of the noble Lord re-assured the country, and gave them confidence that the noble Lord knew what he was about. And the noble Lord knew that we had a right to be confident in the policy he had announced, because at that period the noble Lord was aware that France was perfectly ready to co-operate with Her Majesty's Government in any measure which they thought proper to adopt with respect to the vexed transactions between Denmark and Germany. Nay, France was not only ready to co-operate, but she spontaneously offered to act with us in any way we desired. The noble Lord made his speech at the end of July—I think the 23rd of July—and it is very important to know what at that moment were our relations with France in reference to this subject. I find in the Correspondence on the table a despatch from Lord Cowley, dated July the 31st. The speech of the noble Lord having been made on the 23rd, this is a despatch written upon the same subject on the 31st. Speaking of the affairs of Germany and Denmark, Lord Cowley writes—

> "M. Drouyn de Lhuys expressed himself as desirous of acting in concert with Her Majesty's Government in this matter."

I have now placed before the House the real policy of the Government at the time Parliament was prorogued last year. I have shown you that it was a sincere policy when expressed by the noble Lord. I have shown that it was a sound and judicious policy, because Her Majesty's Government was then conscious that France was ready to co-operate with this country, France having expressed its desire to aid us in the settlement of this question. Well, Sir, at the end of the summer of last year, and at the commencement of the autumn, after the speeches and despatches of the First Minister and the Secretary of State, and after, at the end of July, that re-assuring announcement from the French Government, there was great excitement in Germany. The German people have been for some time painfully conscious that they do not exercise that influence in Europe which they believe is due to the merits, moral, intellectual and physical, of forty millions of population, homogeneous and speaking the same language. During the summer of last year this feeling was displayed in a remarkable manner, and it led to the meeting at Frankfort, which has not been hitherto mentioned in reference to these negotiations, but which was in reality a very significant affair. The German people at that moment found the old question of Denmark—the relations between Denmark and the Diet—to be the only practical question upon which they could exhibit their love of a United Fatherland and their sympathy with a kindred race who were subjects of a Foreign Prince. Therefore there was very great excitement in Germany on the subject; and to those who are not completely acquainted with the German character, and who take for granted that the theories they put forth are all to be carried into action, there were no doubt many symptoms which were calculated to alarm the Cabinet. Her Majesty's Government, firm in their policy, firm in their ally, knowing that the moderate counsels, urged by France and England in a spirit which was sincere and which could not be mistaken, must ultimately lead to some conciliatory arrangements between the King of Denmark and the Diet, I suppose did not much disquiet themselves respecting the agitation in Germany. But towards the end of the summer and the commencement of the autumn—in the month of September—after the meeting at Frankfort and after other circumstances, the noble Lord the Secretary of State, as a prudent man—a wise, cautious, and prudent Minister—thought it would be just as well to take time by the forelock, to prepare for emergencies, and to remind his allies at Paris of the kind and spontaneous expression on their part of their desire to co-operate with him in arranging this business—I think it was on the 16th of September that Lord Russell, the Secretary of State, applied in this language to our Minister at Paris—our Ambassador (Lord Cowley) being at that time absent—

> "As it might produce some danger to the balance of power especially if the integrity and independence of Denmark were in any way impaired by the demands of Germany and the measures consequent thereupon if the Government of the Emperor of the French are of opinion that any benefit would be likely to follow from an offer of good services on the part of Great Britain and France, Her Majesty's Government would be ready to take that course. If, however, the Government of France would consider such a step as likely to be unavailing, the two Powers might

remind Austria, Prussia, and the Diet that any act on their part tending to weaken the integrity and independence of Denmark would be at variance with the Treaty of the 8th of May, 1852."—No. 2, 130.

Sir, I think that was a very prudent step on the part of the Secretary of State. It was virtually a reminder of the offer which France had made some months before. Yet, to the surprise, and entirely to the discomfiture of Her Majesty's Government, this application was received at first with coldness, and afterwards with absolute refusal.

Well, Sir, I pause now to inquire what had occasioned this change in the relations between the two Courts. Why was France, which at the end of the Session of Parliament was so heartily with England and so approving the policy of the noble Lord with respect to Denmark and Germany that she voluntarily offered to act with us in endeavouring to settle the question—why was France two or three months afterwards so entirely changed? Why was she so cold, and ultimately in the painful position of declining to act with us? I stop for a moment my examination of this Correspondence to look for the causes of this change of feeling, and I believe they may be easily discerned.

Sir, at the commencement of last year an insurrection broke out in Poland. Unhappily, insurrection in Poland is not an unprecedented event. This insurrection was extensive and menacing; but there had been insurrections in Poland before quite as extensive and far more menacing —the insurrection of 1831, for example, for at that time Poland possessed a national army second to none for valour and discipline. Well, Sir, the Question of the Polish Insurrection in 1831 was a subject of deep consideration with the English Government of that day. They went thoroughly into the matter; they took the soundings of that question; it was investigated maturely, and the Government of King William the Fourth arrived at these two conclusions — first, that it was not expedient for England to go to war for the restoration of Poland; and second, that if England was not prepared to go to war, any interference of another kind on her part would only aggravate the calamities of that fated people. These were the conclusions at which the Government of Lord Grey arrived, and they were announced to Parliament. This is a question which the English Government has had more than one opportunity of considering—and in every instance they considered it fully and completely. It recurred again in the year 1855, when a Conference was sitting at Vienna in the midst of the Russian war, and again the English Government — the Government of the Queen — had to deal with the subject of Poland. It was considered by them under the most favourable circumstances for Poland, for we were at war then, and at war with Russia. But after performing all the duties of a responsible Ministry on that occasion, Her Majesty's Government arrived at these conclusions — first, that it was not only not expedient for England to go to war to restore Poland, but that it was not expedient even to prolong a war for that object; and, in the next place, that any interference with a view to provoke a war in Poland without action on our part, was not just to the Poles, and must only tend to bring upon them increased disasters. I say, therefore, that this question of Poland in the present century, and within the last thirty-four years, has been twice considered by different Governments; and when I remind the House that on its consideration by the Cabinet of Lord Grey in 1831 the individual who filled the office of Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and who, of course, greatly guided the opinion of his Colleagues on such a question, was the noble Lord the present First Minister of the Crown, and when I also remind the House that the British Plenipotentiary at the Conference of Vienna in 1855, on whose responsibility in a great degree the decision then come to was arrived at, is the present Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, I think that England, when the great difficulties of last year with respect to Poland occurred, had a right to congratulate herself that, in a situation of such gravity, and at an emergency when a mistake might produce incalculable evils, her fortunes were regulated not only by two statesmen of such great ability and experience, but by statesmen who, on this subject, possessed peculiar advantages, who had thoroughly entered into the question, who knew all its issues, all the contingencies that might possibly arise in its management, and who on the two previous occasions on which it had been submitted to the consideration of England, had been the guiding Ministers to determine her to a wise course of action.

Now, I must observe that what is called the Polish question occupies a different position in France from that which it occupies in England. I will not admit that, in deep sympathy with the Poles, the French are superior to the English people. I believe I am only stating accurately the feelings of this country when I say that among men of all classes there is no modern event which is looked back to with more regret than the partition of Poland. It is universally acknowledged by them to be one of the darkest pages of the history of the Eighteenth century. But in France the Polish question is not a question which merely interests the sentiments of the millions. It is a political question, and a political question of the very highest importance — a question which interests Ministers, and Cabinets, and Princes. There is a belief in France which has made the restoration of Poland a traditionary policy of that country—a belief that its restoration would add to the power and glory of France. In France it is also a practical question, because there are men even now alive in France who remember that the French eagles have floated over the ancient capitals of Poland; if they remember it with some degree of pride I should think they must likewise remember it with some degree of remorse, when they recollect the opportunity they let pass. The House must therefore bear in mind that when an insurrection occurs in Poland it is a very different affair in France from what it is in England. It is not an affair which merely interests the frequenters of cafés and casinos—it at once comes home to Ministers, Cabinets, and Princes. Well, the ruler of France, a sagacious Prince and a lover of peace, as the Secretary of State has just informed us, was of course perfectly alive to the grave issues involved in what is called the Polish question. But the Emperor knew perfectly well that England had already had opportunities of considering it in the completest manner, and had arrived at a settled conclusion with regard to it. Therefore, with characteristic caution, he exercised great reserve, and held out little encouragement to the representatives of the Polish people. He knew well that in 1855 he himself, our ally—and with us a conquering ally—had urged this question on the English Government, and that, under the most favourable circumstances for the restoration of Poland, we had adhered to our traditionary policy, neither to go to war nor to interfere. Therefore, the French Government exhibited a wise reserve on the subject. But after a short time, what must have been the astonishment of the Emperor of the French when he found the English Government embracing the cause of Poland with extraordinary ardour! The noble Lord the Secretary of State and the noble Lord the First Minister, but especially the former, announced this policy as if it were a policy new to the consideration of statesmen and likely to lead to immense results. He absolutely served a notice to quit on the Emperor of Russia. He sent a copy of this despatch to all the Courts of Europe which were signataries of the Treaty of Vienna and invited them to follow his example. From the King of Portugal down to the King of Sweden, there was not a signatary of that treaty who was not, as it were, clattering at the palace gates of St. Petersburg, and calling the Czar to account respecting the affairs of Poland. For three months Europe generally believed that there was to be a war on a great scale, of which the restoration of Poland was to be one of the main objects. Is it at all remarkable that the French Government and the French people, cautious as they were before, should have responded to such invitations and such stimulating proposals? We know how the noble Lord fooled them to the top of their bent. The House recollects the six propositions to which the attention of the Emperor of Russia was called in the most peremptory manner. The House recollects the closing scene, when it was arranged that the Ambassadors of France, Austria, and England, should on the very same day appear at the hotel of the Minister of Russia and present Notes ending with three identical paragraphs to show the agreement of the Powers. An impression pervaded Europe that there was to be a general war, and that England, France, and Austria were united to restore Poland. The House remembers the end of all this —it remembers the reply of the Russian Minister, couched in a tone of haughty sarcasm and of indignation that deigned to be ironical. There was then but one step to take according to the views of the French Government, and that was action. They appealed to that England which had itself thus set the example of agitation on the subject; and England, wisely as I think, recurred to her traditionary policy, the Government confessing that it was a momentary indiscretion which had animated her councils for three or four months; that they never meant anything more than words; and a month afterwards, I believe, they sent to St. Petersburg an obscure despatch, which may be described as an apology. But this did not alter the position of the French Government and the French Emperor. The Emperor had been induced by us to hold out promises which he could not fulfil. He was placed in a false position towards both the people of Poland and the people of France; and, therefore, Sir, I am not surprised that when the noble Lord the Secretary of State, a little alarmed by the progress of affairs in Germany, thought it discreet to reconnoitre his position on the 17th of September, he should have been received at Paris with coldness, and, ultimately, that his despatch should have been answered in this manner.

I fear that I may weary the House with my narrative, but I will not abuse the privilege of reading extracts, which is generally very foreign to my desire. Yet, on a question of this kind it is better to have the documents, and not lay oneself open to the charge of garbling. Mr. Grey, writing to Lord Russell on the 18th of September, 1863, says—

> "The second mode of proceeding suggested by your Lordship — namely, 'To remind Austria, Prussia, and the German Diet that any acts on their part tending to weaken the integrity and independence of Denmark, would be at variance with the Treaty of the 8th of May, 1852,' would be in a great measure analogous to the course pursued by Great Britain and France in the Polish question. He had no inclination (and he frankly avowed that he should so speak to the Emperor) to place France in the same position with reference to Germany as she had been placed with regard to Russia. The formal notes addressed by the three Powers to Russia had received an answer which literally meant nothing, and the position in which those three great Powers were now placed was anything but dignified; and if England and France were to address such a reminder as that proposed to Austria, Prussia, and the German Confederation, they must be prepared to go further, and to adopt a course of action more in accordance with the dignity of two great Powers than they were now doing in the Polish question. . . . . Unless Her Majesty's Government was prepared to go further, if necessary, than the mere presentation of a note, and the receipt of an evasive reply, he was sure the Emperor would not consent to adopt your Lordship's suggestion."—No. 2, 131.

Well, Sir, that was an intimation to the noble Lord with respect to the change in the relations between England and France that was significant—I think it was one that the noble Lord should have duly weighed — and when he remembered the position which this country occupied with regard to Denmark—that it was a position under the treaty which did not bind us to interfere more than France itself — conscious, at the same time, that any co-operation from Russia in the same cause could hardly be counted upon—I should have said that a prudent Government would have well considered that position, and that they would not have taken any course which committed them too strongly to any decided line of action. But so far as I can judge from the Correspondence before us, that was not the tone taken by Her Majesty's Government — because here we have extracts from the Correspondence of the Secretary of State to the Swedish Minister, to the Diet at Frankfort, and a most important despatch to Lord Bloomfield, all in the fortnight that elapsed after the receipt of the despatch of Mr. Grey that notified the change in the feeling of the French Government. It is highly instructive that we should know what effect that produced in the system and policy of Her Majesty's Government. Immediately — almost the day after the receipt of that despatch—the Secretary of State wrote to the Swedish Minister—

> "Her Majesty's Government set the highest value on the independence and integrity of Denmark. . . . . Her Majesty's Government will be ready to remind Austria and Prussia of their treaty obligations to respect the integrity and independence of Denmark."—No. 2, 137-8.

Then on the 29th of September—that is, only nine or ten days after the receipt of the French despatch—we have this most important despatch, which I shall read at some little length. It is at page 136, and is really addressed to the Diet. The Secretary of State says—

> "Her Majesty's Government by the Treaty of London, of May 8, 1852, is bound to respect the integrity and independence of Denmark. The Emperor of Austria and the King of Prussia have taken the same engagement. Her Majesty could not see with indifference a military occupation of Holstein, which is only to cease on terms injuriously affecting the constitution of the whole Danish Monarchy. Her Majesty's Government could not recognize this military occupation as a legitimate exercise of the powers of the Confederation, or admit that it could properly be called a Federal Execution. Her Majesty's Government could not be indifferent to the bearing of such an act upon Denmark and upon European interests. Her Majesty's Government therefore earnestly entreat the German Diet to pause and to submit the questions in dispute between Germany and Denmark to the mediation of other Powers unconcerned in the controversy, but deeply concerned

in the maintenance of the peace of Europe and the independence of Denmark."—No. 2, 145.

My object in reading this despatch is to show that, after the indication of the change of feeling on the part of France, the policy—the sincere policy—of the Government was not modified. The Secretary of State writes thus on the 30th of September to Lord Bloomfield at Vienna—

> "Her Majesty's Government trust that no act of Federal Execution to which Austria may be a party, and no act of war against Denmark on the ground of the affairs of Schleswig, will be allowed to clash with this primary and essential treaty obligation. Her Majesty's Government indeed entertain a full confidence that the Government of Austria is as deeply impressed as Her Majesty's Government with the conviction that the independence and integrity of Denmark form an essential element in the balance of power in Europe."—No. 3, 147.

Now, this takes us to the end of September; and I think the House up to this time tolerably clearly understands the course of the Correspondence. Nothing of any importance happened in October that requires me to pause and consider it. We arrive, then, at the month of November, and now approach very important and critical affairs. The month of November was remarkable for the occurrence of two great events which completely changed the character and immensely affected the aspect of the whole relations between Denmark and Germany, and which produced consequences which none of us may see the end of. Early in November the Emperor of the French proposed a European Congress. His position was such—as he himself has described it there can be no indelicacy in saying so—his position had become painful from various causes, but mainly from the manner in which he had misapprehended the conduct of the English Government with regard to Poland. He saw great troubles about to occur in Europe; he wished to anticipate their settlement; he felt himself in a false position with respect to his own subjects, because he had experienced a great diplomatic discomfiture; but he was desirous—and there is no doubt of the sincerity of the declaration—he was desirous of still taking a course which should restore and retain the cordial understanding with this country. He proposed then a general Congress. Well—when Parliament met on the 4th of February I had to make certain observations on the general condition of affairs, and I gave my opinion as to the propriety of Her Majesty's Government refusing to be a party to that Congress. Generally speaking, I think that a Congress should not precede action. If you wish any happy and permanent results from a Congress, it should rather follow the great efforts of nations; and, when they are somewhat exhausted, give them the opportunity of an honourable settlement. Sir, I did not think it my duty to conceal my opinion, Her Majesty's Government having admitted that they had felt it their duty to refuse a proposition of that character. I should have felt that I was wanting in that ingenuousness and fair play in politics which I hope, whoever sits on that bench or this, we shall always pursue; if, when the true interests of the country are concerned, agreeing as I did with the Government, I did not express frankly that opinion. But, Sir, I am bound to say that had I been aware of what has been communicated to us by the papers on the table—had I been aware, when I spoke on the 4th of February, that only a week before Parliament met—that only a week before we were assured by a Speech from the Throne that Her Majesty was continuing to carry on negotiations in the interest of peace—that Her Majesty's Government had made a proposition to France which must inevitably have produced, if accepted, a great European war, I should have given my approbation in terms much more qualified.

But, Sir, whatever difference of opinion there might be as to the propriety or impropriety of Her Majesty's Government acceding to the Congress, I think there were not then — I am sure there are not now — two opinions as to the mode and manner in which that refusal was conveyed. Sir, when the noble Lord vindicated that curt and, as I conceive, most offensive reply, he dilated the other night on the straightforwardness of British Ministers, and said, that by whatever else their language might be characterized, it was distinguished by candour and clearness, and that even where it might be charged with being coarse it at least conveyed a determinate meaning. Well, Sir, I wish that if our diplomatic language is characterized by clearness and straightforwardness, some of that spirit had distinguished the despatches and declarations addressed by the noble Lord to the Court of Denmark. It is a great pity that we did not have a little of that rude frankness when the fortunes of that ancient kingdom were at stake.

But, Sir, another event of which I must now remind the House happened about that time. In November the King of Denmark died. The death of the King of Denmark entirely changed the character of the question between Germany and Denmark. The question was a Federal question before, as the noble Lord, from the despatches I have read, was perfectly aware; but by the death of the King of Denmark it became an international question, because the controversy of the King of Denmark was with the Diet of Germany, which had not recognized the change in the *Lex Regia*, or the changes in the succession to the various dominions of the King. It was, therefore, an international question of magnitude and of a menacing character. Under these circumstances, when the question became European, when the difficulties were immensely magnified and multiplied—the offer of a Congress having been made on the 5th of November, and not refused until the 27th—the King of Denmark having died on the 16th—it was, I say, with a complete knowledge of the increased risk and of the increased dimensions of the interests at stake, that the noble Lord sent that answer to the invitation of the Emperor of the French —I say, Sir, that at this moment it became the Government of England seriously to consider their position. With the offer of the Congress, and with the death of the King of Denmark—with these two remarkable events before the noble Lord's eyes, it is my duty to remind the House of the manner in which the noble Lord the Secretary of State addressed the European Powers. Neither of these great events seems to have induced the noble Lord to modify his tone. On the 19th of November, the King having just died, the Secretary of State writes to Sir Alexander Malet, our Minister to the Diet, to remind him that all the Powers of Europe had agreed to the Treaty of 1852. On the 20th, he writes a letter of menace to the German Powers saying that Her Majesty's Government expect, as a matter of course, that all the Powers will recognize the succession of the King of Denmark as heir of all the States which, according to the Treaty of London, were united under the sceptre of the late King. And on the 23rd, four days before he refused the invitation to the Congress, he writes to Lord Bloomfield—

> "Her Majesty's Government would have no right to interfere on behalf of Denmark if the troops of the Confederation should enter Holstein on Federal grounds. But if Execution were enforced on international grounds, the Powers who signed the Treaty of 1852 would have a right to interfere."—No. 3, 230.

To Sir Augustus Paget, our Minister at Copenhagen, on November 30—the House will recollect that this was after he had refused the Congress, after the King had died, and after the question had become an international one—he writes announcing his refusal of the Congress, and proposes the sole mediation of England. Then he writes to Sir Alexander Malet in the same month, that Her Majesty's Government can only leave to Germany the sole responsibility of raising a war in Europe, which the Diet seemed bent on making. That is the tone which the Government adopted, after the consideration, as we are bound to believe, which the question demanded — after having incurred the responsibility of refusing the Congress offered by the Emperor of the French, after the death of the King of Denmark, after the question had been changed from a Federal into an international one, such, I repeat, is the tone they took up, and in which they sent their menacing messages to every Court in Germany—I say that at the death of the King of Denmark it behoved Her Majesty's Ministers, instead of adopting such a course, maturely to consider their position in relation to the events which had occurred. There were two courses open to Her Majesty's Government—both intelligible, both honourable. It was open to them, after the death of the King of Denmark to have acted, as France had resolved under the same circumstances to act —France, who occupies, we are told, a position in reference to these matters so dignified and satisfactory that it has received the compliments even of a baffled Minister. That course was frankly announced shortly afterwards to the English Minister by the Minister of France in Denmark. On the 19th November, General Fleury said to Lord Wodehouse at Copenhagen—

> "That his own instructions from the Emperor were not to take part in any negotiations here, but to tell the Danish Government explicitly that, if Denmark became involved in a war with Germany, France would not come to her assistance."

If England had adopted that course, it would have been intelligible and honourable. We were not bound by the Treaty of 1852, to go to the assistance of Denmark if she became involved in a war with Germany. No one pretends that we were. As a matter of high policy—much as we may regret any disturbance in the territorial limits of Europe—being a country the policy of which is a policy of tranquillity and peace—there were no adequate considerations which could have justified England in entering into an extensive European war, without allies to prevent a war between Denmark and Germany. That was, I say, an honourable and intelligible course.

There was another course equally intelligible and equally honourable. Though I am bound to say that the course which I should have recommended the country to take would have been to adopt the same position as that of France, yet, if the Government really entertained the views with respect to the balance of power which have been expressed occasionally in this House by the noble Lord, and in a literary form by the Secretary of State—from which I may say I disagree, because they appear to me to be founded on the obsolete tradition of an antiquated system, and because I think that the elements from which we ought to form an opinion as to the distribution of the power of the world must be collected from a much more extensive area, and must be formed of larger and more varied elements—but let that pass—yet I say, if Her Majesty's Government were of opinion that the balance of power was endangered by a quarrel between Germany and Denmark, they were justified in giving their advice to Denmark, in threatening Germany, and in taking the general management of the affairs of Denmark; but they were bound, if a war did take place between Germany and Denmark, to support Denmark. Instead of that, they invented a process of conduct which I hope is not easily exampled in the history of this country, and which I can only describe in one sentence—it consisted of menaces never accomplished and promises never fulfilled. With all these difficulties they never hesitate in their tone. At least, let us do them this justice—there never were, in semblance, more determined Ministers. They seemed at least to rejoice in the phantom of a proud courage. But what do they do? They send a special envoy to Denmark who was to enforce their policy and arrange everything. Formally the special Envoy was sent to congratulate the King on his accession to the Throne of Denmark — and all the other Powers did the same—but in reality the mission of Lord Wodehouse was for greater objects than that, and his instructions are before us in full. Without wearying the House by reading the whole of those instructions, I will read one paragraph, which is the last, and which is as it were a summary of the whole. They were written at the end of December. Recollect, this is the policy of the Government after refusing the Congress, and after the death of the King of Denmark—which had, therefore, incurred a still deeper responsibility, and which one must suppose had deeply considered all the issues involved. This is the cream of the instructions given by the Government to Lord Wodehouse—

> "The result to be arrived at is the fulfilment of the Treaty of May 8, 1852, and of the engagements entered into by Prussia and Austria and Denmark in 1851-2."—No. 3, 353.

Lord Wodehouse could not possibly be at fault as to what he was to do when he arrived at his destination. His was, no doubt, a significant appointment. He was a statesman of some experience; he had held a subordinate but important position in the administration of our foreign affairs; he had been a Minister at a Northern Court; he had recently distinguished himself in Parliament by a speech on the question of Germany and Denmark, in which he took a decidedly Danish view. Lord Wodehouse received clear instructions as to what he was to do. But, at the same time, what was the conduct of the Secretary of State? While Lord Wodehouse was repairing to his post did the Secretary of State in the least falter in his tone? It was about this time that the great diplomatic reprimand was sent to Sir Alexander Malet for having talked of the "Protocol" of 1852 instead of the "Treaty." This was the time that instructions were sent out that if anybody had the hardihood to mention the "Protocol" of '52 they were immediately to be stopped. However elevated their position might be, even if it were M. Bismark himself, they were to be pulled up directly, in the full flow of their eloquence; note was to be taken of this great diplomatic *lapsus,* and the Minister was to telegraph instantly home to his Government how he had carried out his instructions in this respect. On the 17th of December the noble Lord thus wrote to Sir Andrew Buchanan, our Ambassador at Berlin—

> "Let it suffice at present for Her Majesty's Government to declare that they would consider any departure from the Treaty of Succession of 1852, by Powers who signed or acceded to that treaty, as entirely inconsistent with good faith."—No. 3, 383.

Similar despatches were sent to Wurtemberg, Hanover, and Saxony. On the 23rd of December the noble Earl wrote to Sir Andrew Buchanan—

> "If the overthrow of the dynasty now reigning in Denmark is sought by Germany the most serious consequences may ensue."—No. 3, 411.

[*Cheers.*] I want to know what hon. Members mean by cheering the words I have just quoted. If you wish to convey even to a little Power that if it does a certain thing you will go to war with it, you take care not to announce your intention in an offensive manner; because, were you to do so, probably, even the smallest Power in Europe would not yield. And certainly if you wish to tell a great Power in Europe what may be eventually the consequences if it should adopt a different line from that which you desire, you would not abruptly declare that if it declined to accede to your wish you would declare war. Why, there are no despatches on record in the world—there is no record in any Foreign Office of language of this kind. The question is, what interpretation can be put on these threats. The Secretary of State writes again on the 25th of December to Sir Andrew Buchanan, stating that—

> "Any precipitate action on the part of the German Confederation may lead to consequences fatal to the peace of Europe, and may involve Germany, in particular, in difficulties of a most serious nature."—No. 4, 414.

On the 26th of December the Secretary of State writes to Sir Alexander Malet and sends him a copy of the Treaty of 1852, in order that he may communicate it to the Diet. Now, that is the state of affairs after the King of Denmark's death—after he had been perfectly acquainted with the policy of France; after he had been frankly told that the French Emperor had explicitly informed Denmark that if she got involved in war with Germany France would not come to her assistance. Now, the words "if she went to war" might have been interpreted in two ways; because she might get into war without any fault of her own, and Germany might be the aggressor; but there could be no mistake in regard to the words "if she became involved in war." Neither Denmark nor England could make any mistake in regard to the policy of France, which the Secretary of State now says was a magnanimous policy.

Notwithstanding these threats, notwithstanding these repeated menaces, and notwithstanding every effort made by Her Majesty's Government to prevent it, Federal Execution took place, as it was intended to take place. One day after the most menacing epistle which I have ever read—the day after the copy of the Treaty of 1852 had been solemnly placed before the Diet by Sir Alexander Malet—on the 27th of December, Federal Execution took place. At any rate, I do not think that is evidence of the just influence of England in the counsels of Germany.

What was the course of Her Majesty's Government at this critical conjuncture? Why, Sir, they went again to France. After all that had happened their only expedient was to go and supplicate France. I will read the letter. [Mr. Layard: Hear, hear!] The hon. Gentleman seems to triumph in the recollection of mistakes and disappointments. I will give him the date, but I should think it must really be seared upon his conscience. The 27th of December is the date of the Federal execution; and Her Majesty's Government must have been in a state of complete panic, because on the 28th they make application to France, which is answered in a few hours by Lord Cowley:—"I said Her Majesty's Government were most sincerely anxious to—" [*Laughter*] I wish really to be candid, not to misrepresent anything, and to put the case before the House without garbling any of the despatches—"I said that Her Majesty's Government were most sincerely anxious to act with the Imperial Government in this question." No doubt they were. I am vindicating your conduct. I believe in your sincerity throughout. It is only your intense incapacity that I denounce. The passage in the Despatch is Shaksperean; it is one of those dramatic descriptions which only a masterly pen could accomplish. Lord Cowley went on—

> "Her Majesty's Government felt that if the two Powers could agree war might be avoided, otherwise the danger of war was imminent. M. Drouyn de Lhuys said he partook this opinion; but as his Excellency made no further observation I remarked it would be a grievous thing if the difference of opinion which had arisen upon the merits of a general Congress were to produce an estrangement which would leave each Government to pursue its own course. I hoped that this would not be the case. Her Majesty's Government would do all in their power to avoid it.

I presumed I might give them the assurance that the Imperial Government were not decided to reject the notion of a Conference?"—No. 4, 444.

Well, Sir, this received a curt and unsatisfactory reply. Nothing could be obtained from that plaintive appeal of Lord Cowley. Well, what did Her Majesty's Government do? Having received information that the threat of Federal execution had been fulfilled, having appealed to France, and been treated in the manner I have described, what did the Government do? Why, the Secretary of State within twenty-four hours afterwards, penned the fiercest despatch he had ever yet written. It is dated December 31, 1863, and it is addressed to Sir Andrew Buchanan—

"Her Majesty's Government do not hold that war would relieve Prussia from the obligations of the Treaty of 1852. The King of Denmark would by that treaty be entitled still to be acknowledged as the Sovereign of all the dominions of the late King of Denmark. He has been so entitled from the time of the death of the late King. A war of conquest undertaken by Germany avowedly for the purpose of adding some parts of the Danish dominions to the territory of the German Confederation might, if successful, alter the state of possession contemplated by the Treaty of London, and give to Germany a title by conquest to parts of the dominions of the King of Denmark. The prospect of such an accession may no doubt be a temptation to those who think it can be accomplished; but Her Majesty's Government cannot believe that Prussia will depart from the straight line of good faith in order to assist in carrying such a project into effect."—No. 4, 445.

[*Ministerial cheers.*] You cheer as if it were a surprising thing that the Secretary of State should have written a single sentence of common sense. These are important State documents, and I hope Her Majesty's Government are not so fallen that there is not a Minister among them who is able to write a despatch—I do not say a bad despatch, but a very important one. I wish to call attention to its importance —

"If German nationality in Holstein, and partially in Schleswig, were made the ground of the dismemberment of Denmark, Polish nationality in the Duchy of Posen would be a ground equally strong for the dismemberment of Prussia. It appears to Her Majesty's Government that the safest course for Prussia to pursue is to act with good faith and honour, and to stand by and fulfil her treaty engagements. By such a course she will command the sympathy and approval of Europe; by a contrary course she will draw down upon herself the universal condemnation of all disinterested men. By this course alone war in Europe can be with certainty prevented."—No. 4, 445.

Well, Sir, that, I think, was a bold despatch to write after the rejection, for the second or third time, of our overtures to France. That brings us up to the last day of the year.

But before I proceed to more recent transactions it is necessary to call the attention of the House to the remarkable contrast between the menaces lavished on Germany and the expectations—to use the mildest term—that were held out to Denmark. The first great object of Her Majesty's Government when the difficulties began to be very serious was to induce Denmark to revoke the Patent of Holstein —that is, to terminate its constitution. The constitution of Holstein had been granted very recently before the death of the King, with a violent desire on the part of the monarch to fulfil his promises. It was a wise and excellent constitution, by which Holstein became virtually independent. It enjoyed the fulness of self-government, and was held only by a sovereign tie to Denmark, as Norway is held to Sweden. The Danish Government were not at all willing to revoke the constitution in Holstein. It was one that did them credit, and was naturally popular in Holstein. Still, the Diet was very anxious that the Patent should be revoked, because if Holstein continued satisfied it was impossible to trade on the intimate connection between Schleswig and Holstein, the lever by which the Kingdom of Denmark was to be destroyed. The Diet, therefore, insisted that the Patent should be revoked. Her Majesty's Government, I believe, approved the Patent of Holstein, as the Danish Government had done, but as a means of obtaining peace and saving Denmark, they made use of all the means in their power to induce Denmark to revoke that constitution. Sir Augustus Paget, writing to the Foreign Secretary on the 14th of October, and describing an interview with M. Hall, the Prime Minister of Denmark, says —

"After much further conversation, in which I made use of every argument to induce his Excellency to adopt a conciliatory course, and in which I warned him of the danger of rejecting the friendly counsels now offered by Her Majesty's Government,—"—No. 3, 162.

M. Hall promises to withdraw the Patent. What interpretation could M. Hall place on that interview? He was called upon to do what he knew to be distasteful, and believed to be impolitic. He is warned of the danger of rejecting those friendly counsels, and in consequence of that warning he gives way and surrenders his opinion. I would candidly ask what is the interpretation which in private life would be put on such language as I have quoted, and which had been acted upon by those to whom it was addressed?

Well, we come now to the Federal Execution in Holstein. Speaking literally, the Federal Execution was a legal act, and Denmark could not resist it. But from the manner in which it was about to be carried into effect, and in consequence of the pretensions connected with it, the Danes were of opinion that it would have been better at once to resist the execution which aimed a fatal blow at the independence of Schleswig, and upon this point they felt strongly. Well, Her Majesty's Government—and I give them full credit for being actuated by the best motives—thought otherwise and wished the Danish Government to submit to this execution. And what was the sort of language used by them in order to bring about that result? Sir Augustus Paget replied in this way to the objections of the Danish Minister—

> "I replied that Denmark would at all events have a better chance of securing the assistance of the Powers if the execution were not resisted."

I ask any candid man to put his own interpretation upon this language. And on the 12th of the same month Lord Russell himself tells M. Bille, the Danish Minister in London, that there is no connection between the engagements of Denmark to Germany and the engagement of the German Powers under the Treaty of 1852. After such a declaration from the English Minister in the metropolis—a declaration which must have had the greatest effect upon the policy of the Danish Government—of course they submitted to the execution. But, having revoked the Patent and submitted to the execution, as neither the one nor the other was the real object of the German Powers, a new demand was made which was of the greatest consequence. Now, listen to this. The new demand was to repeal the whole Constitution. I want to put clearly before the House the position of the Danish Government with respect to this much talked of Constitution. There had been in the preceding year a Parliamentary Reform Bill carried in Denmark. The King died before having given his assent to it, though he was most willing to have done so. The instant the new King succeeded, the new Parliamentary Reform Bill was brought to him. Of course great excitement prevailed in Denmark, just as it did in England at the time of the Reform Bill under similar circumstances, and the King was placed in a most difficult position. Now, observe this; England, who was so obtrusive and pragmatical in the counsels which she gave, who was always offering advice and suggestions, hung back when the question arose whether the new King should give his assent to the Reform Bill or not. England was selfishly silent, and would incur no responsibility. The excitement in Copenhagen was great, and the King gave his assent to the Bill. But mark! At that moment it is not at all impossible that if Her Majesty's Government had written a despatch to Copenhagen asking the King not to give his assent to the Bill for the space of six weeks, in order to assist England in the negotiations she was carrying on in behalf of Denmark; and if the King had convened his Council and laid before them the expressed wish of an ally who was then looked upon by Denmark with confidence and hope, especially from the time that France had declared she would not assist her, I cannot doubt that the King would have complied with a request that was so important to his fortunes. But the instant the King had sanctioned the new Constitution, the English Government began writing despatches calling upon him to revoke it. [*Cheers from the Ministerial Benches.*] Ay, but what was his position then? How could he revoke it? The King was a constitutional King; he could have put an end to this Constitution only by a *coup d'état;* and he was not in a position, nor I believe if he were had he the inclination, to do such an act. The only constitutional course open to him was to call the new Parliament together, with the view of their revoking the Constitution. But see what would have been the position of affairs then. In England the Reform Act was passed in 1832, new elections took place under it, and the House assembled under Lord Althorp, as the leader of the Government. Now, suppose Lord Althorp had come down to that House with a King's speech recommending them to revoke the Reform Act, and have asked leave to introduce another Bill for the purpose of reforming the Constitution, would it not have been asking an utter impossibility? But how did Her Majesty's Government act towards Denmark in similar circumstances? First of all, the noble Lord at the head of the Foreign Office wrote to Lord Wodehouse on the 20th of December giving formal advice to the Danish Government to repeal the Constitution, and Lord Wodehouse, who had been sent upon this painful and, I must say, impossible office to the Danish Minister, thus speaks of the way in which he had performed his task—

> "I pointed out to M. Hall also that if, on the one hand, Her Majesty's Government would never counsel the Danish Government to yield anything inconsistent with the honour and independence of the Danish Crown, and the integrity of the King's dominions; so, on the other hand, we had a right to expect that the Danish Government would not, by putting forward extreme pretensions, drive matters to extremities."

And Sir Augustus Paget, who appears to have performed his duty with great temper and talent, writing on the 22nd of December, says—

> "I asked M. Hall to reflect what would be the position of Denmark if the advice of the Powers were refused, and what it would be if accepted, and to draw his own conclusions."—No. 4, 420.

Now, I ask, what are the conclusions which any Gentleman—I do not care on what side of the House he may sit—would have drawn from such language as that? But before that a special interview took place between Lord Wodehouse and the Danish Minister, of which Lord Wodehouse writes—

> "It was my duty to declare to M. Hall that if the Danish Government rejected our advice, Her Majesty's Government must leave Denmark to encounter Germany on her own responsibility."

Well, Sir, I ask again whether there are two interpretations to be put upon such observations as these? And what happened? It was impossible for M. Hall, who was the author of the Constitution, to put an end to it; so he resigned—a new Government is formed, and under the new Constitution Parliament is absolutely called together to pass an Act to terminate its own existence. And in January, Sir Augustus Paget tells the Danish Government with some *naïveté*

> "If they would summon the Rigsraad, and propose the repeal of the Constitution, they would act wisely, in accordance with the advice of their friends, and the responsibility of the war would not be laid at their door."

Well, then, these were three great subjects on which the representation of England induced Denmark to adopt a course against her will, and, as the Danes believed, against their policy. The plot begins to thicken. Notwithstanding the revocation of the Patent, the Federal execution, and the repeal of the Constitution, one thing more is wanted, and Schleswig is about to be invaded. Affairs now become most critical. No sooner is this known than a very haughty menace is sent to Austria. From a despatch of Lord Bloomfield, dated December 31, it will be seen that Austria was threatened, if Schleswig was invaded, that—

> "The consequences would be serious. The question would cease to be a purely German one, and would become one of European importance."

On the 4th of January, Earl Russell writes to Mr. Murray, at the Court of Saxony—

> "The most serious consequences are to be apprehended if the Germans invade Schleswig."—No. 4, 481.

On the 9th again he writes to Dresden—

> "The line taken by Saxony destroys confidence in diplomatic relations with that state."—No. 4, 502.

On the 18th of January, he writes to Lord Bloomfield—

> "You are instructed to represent in the strongest terms to Count Rechberg, and, if you shall have an opportunity of doing so, to the Emperor, the extreme injustice and danger of the principle and practice of taking possession of the territory of a State as what is called a material guarantee for the obtainment of certain international demands, instead of pressing those demands by the usual method of negotiation. Such a practice is fatal to peace, and destructive of the independence of States. It is destructive of peace because it is an act of war, and if resistance takes place it is the beginning of war. But war so begun may not be confined within the narrow limits of its early commencement, as was proved in 1853, when the occupation of the Danubian Principalities by Russia as a material guarantee proved the direct cause of the Crimean war."—No. 4, 564.

It is only because I do not wish to weary the House that I do not read it all, but it is extremely well written. ["Read."] Well, then, the despatch goes on to say—

> "Such a practice is most injurious to the independence and integrity of the States to which it is applied, because a territory so occupied can scarcely be left by the occupying force in the same state in which it was when the occupation took place. But, moreover, such a practice may recoil upon those who adopt it, and, in the ever-varying course of events, it may be most inconveniently applied to those who, having set the example, had flattered themselves it never could be applied to them."—No. 4, 564.

Well, the invasion of Schleswig is impending and then an identic note is sent to Vienna and Berlin in these terms—

> "Her Majesty's Government having been informed that the Governments of Austria and Prussia have addressed a threatening summons to Denmark, the undersigned has been instructed to ask for a formal declaration on the part of

those Governments that they adhere to the principle of the integrity of the Danish monarchy."—No. 4, 565.

And again, writing to Lord Bloomfield, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs speaks of the invasion as "a breach of faith which may entail upon Europe widespread calamities." But all these remonstrances were in vain. Notwithstanding these solemn warnings, notwithstanding this evidence that in the German Courts the just influence of England was lowered, the invasion of Schleswig takes place—And what is the conduct of the Government? They hurry again to Paris. They propose a joint declaration of the non-German Powers. Earl Russell writes to Lord Cowley in the middle of January. An answer was sent, I believe, the next day, the 14th; and this is Lord Cowley's statement in reference to the opinion of the French Government—

> "As to the four Powers impressing upon the Diet the heavy responsibility that it would incur if, by any precipitate measures, it were to break the peace of Europe before the Conference which had been proposed by the British Government for considering the means of settling the question between Germany and Denmark, and thereby maintaining that peace, can be assembled, M. Drouyn de Lhuys observed that he had not forgotten that when Russia had been warned by France, Great Britain, and Austria of the responsibility which she was incurring by her conduct towards Poland, Prince Gortschakoff had replied, 'that Russia was ready to assume that responsibility before God and man.' He, for one, did not wish to provoke another answer of the same sort to be received with the same indifference."—No. 4, 536.

The drama now becomes deeply interesting. The events are quick. That is the answer of the French Government; and on the next day Lord Russell writes to Lord Cowley to propose concert and co-operation with France to maintain the treaty—that is, to prevent the occupation of Schleswig. Lord Cowley writes the next day to Lord Russell that the French Government want to know what "concert and co-operation" mean. Lord Russell at last, on January 24, writes to say that concert and co-operation mean, "if necessary, material assistance to Denmark." That must have been about the same time when the Cabinet was sitting to draw up Her Majesty's Speech, assuring Parliament that negotiations continued to be carried on in the interest of peace. Now, Sir, what was the answer of the French Government; when, at last, England invited her to go to war to settle the questions between Germany and Denmark? I will read the reply—

> "M. Drouyn de Lhuys, after recapitulating the substance of my despatch of the 24th of January to your Excellency, explains very clearly the views of the French Government upon the subject. The Emperor recognizes the value of the London Treaty as tending to preserve the balance of power and maintain the peace of Europe. But the Government of France, while paying a just tribute to the purport and objects of the Treaty of 1852, is ready to admit that circumstances may require its modification. The Emperor has always been disposed to pay great regard to the feelings and aspirations of nationalities. It is not to be denied that the national feelings and aspirations of Germany tend to a closer connection with the Germans of Holstein and Schleswig. The Emperor would feel repugnance to any course which should bind him to oppose in arms the wishes of Germany. It may be comparatively easy for England to carry on a war which can never go beyond maritime operations of blockade and capture of ships. Schleswig and England are far apart from each other. But the soil of Germany touches the soil of France, and a war between France and Germany would be one of the most burdensome and one of the most hazardous in which the French Empire could engage. Besides these considerations, the Emperor cannot fail to recollect that he has been made an object of mistrust and suspicion in Europe on account of his supposed projects of aggrandizement on the Rhine. A war commenced on the frontiers of Germany could not fail to give strength to these unfounded and unwarrantable imputations. For these reasons, the Government of the Emperor will not take at present any engagement on the subject of Denmark. If, hereafter, the balance of power should be seriously threatened, the Emperor may be inclined to take new measures in the interest of France and of Europe. But for the present the Emperor reserves to his Government entire liberty."—No. 4, 620.

Well, Sir, I should think that, after the reception of that despatch, though it might have been very hard to convince the Foreign Secretary of the fact, any other person might easily have suspected that the just influence of England was lowered in another quarter of Europe.

Sir, I have now brought events to the period when Parliament met, trespassing, I fear, too much on the indulgence of the House; but hon. Members will remember that, in order to give this narrative to-day, it was necessary for me to peruse 1,500 printed folio pages, and I trust I have done no more than advert to those passages to which it was requisite to direct attention in order that the House might form a complete and candid opinion of the case. I will not dwell, or only for the slightest possible time, on what occurred upon the meeting of Parliament. Sir, when we met there were no papers; and I remember that when I asked for papers there was not, I will frankly say, on both sides of the House, a sufficient sense of the very great importance of the occasion and of the singular circumstance that the papers were not presented to us. It turned out afterwards, from what fell from the Secretary of State in another place, that it was never intended that the papers should be presented at the meeting of Parliament. The noble Lord at the head of the Government treated the inquiry for papers in a jaunty way, and said, "Oh! you shall have papers, and I wish you joy of them." That was the tone of the First Minister in reference to the most important diplomatic correspondence ever laid before Parliament since the rupture of the Treaty of Amiens: but we are all now aware of the importance of these transactions. It was weeks—months almost—before we became masters of the case, but during the interval the most disastrous circumstances occurred, showing the increased peril and danger of Denmark and the successes of the invaders of her territory. We all remember their entrance into Jutland. We all remember the inquiries which were made on the subject and the assurances which were given. But it was impossible for the House to pronounce any opinion, because the papers were not before it, and the moment we had the papers the Conference was announced. One word with respect to the Conference. I never was of opinion that the Conference would arrive at any advantageous result, I could not persuade myself, after reading the papers, that, whatever might be the cause, any one seriously wished for a settlement, except, of course, Her Majesty's Ministers, and they had a reason for it. The Conference lasted six weeks. It wasted six weeks. It lasted as long as a Carnival, and, like a Carnival, it was an affair of masks and mystification. Our Ministers went to it as men in distressed circumstances go to a place of amusement—to while away the time, with a consciousness of impending failure. However, the summary of the Conference is this — that Her Majesty's Government made two considerable proposals. They proposed, first, the dismemberment of Denmark. So much for its integrity. They proposed, in the second place, that the remainder of Denmark should be placed under the joint guarantee of the great Powers. They would have created another Turkey in Europe, in the same geographical relation, the scene of the same rival intrigues, and the same fertile source of constant misconceptions and wars. So much for the independence of Denmark. These two propositions having been made—the one disastrous to the integrity, and the other to the independence of Denmark—the Conference, nevertheless, even with these sacrifices offered, was a barren failure.

And I now wish to ask—after having, I hope, with some clearness and in a manner tolerably comprehensive, placed the case before hon. Members—what is their opinion of the management of these affairs by Her Majesty's Government? I showed you that the beginning of this interference was a treaty, by which England entered into obligations as regards Denmark not different from those of France. I have shown you, on the evidence of the Secretary of State, that the present position of France with respect to Denmark is one quite magnanimous, free from all difficulties and disgrace. I have shown you, I think, what every man indeed feels, that the position of England under this treaty, on the contrary, is most embarrassing, surrounded with difficulties, and full of humiliation. I have stated my opinion that the difference between the position of England and that of France arose from the mismanagement of our affairs. That appeared to me to be the natural inference and logical deduction. I have given you a narrative of the manner in which our affairs have been conducted, and now I ask you what is your opinion? Do you see in the management of those affairs that capacity, and especially that kind of capacity that is adequate to the occasion? Do you find in it that sagacity, that prudence, that dexterity, that quickness of perception, and those conciliatory moods which we are always taught to believe necessary in the transaction of our foreign affairs? Is there to be seen that knowledge of human nature, and especially that peculiar kind of science most necessary in these affairs—an acquaintance with the character of foreign countries and of the chief actors in the scene? Sir, for my part, I find all these qualities wanting; and, in consequence of the want of these qualities, I see that three results have accrued. The first is that the avowed policy of Her Majesty's Government has failed. The second is, that our just influence in the councils of Europe has been lowered. Thirdly, in consequence of our just influence in the councils of Europe being lowered, the securities for peace are diminished. These are three results which have followed in consequence of the want of the qualities to which I have alluded, and in consequence of the management of these affairs by the Government. Sir, I need not, I think, trouble the House with demonstrating that the Government have failed in their avowed policy of upholding the independence and integrity of Denmark. The first result may be thrown aside. I come, therefore, to the second. By the just influence of England in the councils of Europe I mean an influence contradistinguished from that which is obtained by intrigue and secret understanding—I mean an influence that results from the conviction of foreign Powers that our resources are great and that our policy is moderate and steadfast. Since the settlement that followed the great revolutionary war England, who obtained at that time — as she deserved to do, for she bore the brunt of the struggle—who obtained at that time all the fair objects of her ambition, has on the whole followed a Conservative foreign policy. I do not mean by a Conservative foreign policy a foreign policy that would disapprove, still less oppose, the natural development of nations. I mean a foreign policy interested in the tranquillity and prosperity of the world, the normal condition of which is peace, and which does not ally itself with the revolutionary party of Europe. Other countries have their political systems and public objects, as England had, though they may not have attained them. She is not to look upon them with unreasonable jealousy. The position of England in the councils of Europe is essentially that of a moderating and mediatorial Power. Her interest and her policy are, when changes are inevitable and necessary, to assist so that these changes, if possible, may be accomplished without war; or, if war occurs, that its duration and its asperity may be lessened. That is what I mean by the just influence of England in the councils of Europe. It appears to me that just influence of England in the councils of Europe has been lowered. Within twelve months we have been twice repulsed at St. Petersburg. Twice have we supplicated in vain at Paris. We have menaced Austria, and Austria has allowed our menaces to pass her like the idle wind. We have threatened Prussia, and Prussia has defied us. Our objurgations have rattled over the head of the German Diet, and the German Diet has treated them with contempt. Again, Sir, during the last few months there is scarcely a form of diplomatic interference which has not been suggested or adopted by the English Government — except a Congress. Conferences at Vienna, at Paris, at London—all have been proposed; protocols, joint declarations, sole mediation, joint mediation, identic notes, sole notes, united notes—everything has been tried. Couriers from the Queen have been scouring Europe with the exuberant fertility of abortive projects. After the termination of a most important Conference, held in the capital of the Queen, over which the Chief Minister of Her Majesty's foreign relations presided, and which was attended with all the pomp and ceremony requisite for so great an occasion, we find that its sittings have been perfectly barren; and the Chief Ministers of the Cabinet closed the proceedings by quitting the scene of their exertions, and appearing in the two Houses of Parliament to tell the country that they have no allies, and that as they have no allies they can do nothing. Pardon me, I must not omit to do justice to the exulting boast of the Secretary of State, who, in the midst of discomfiture, finds solace in the sympathy and politeness of the neutral Powers. I do not grudge Lord Russell the sighs of Russia or the smiles of France; but I regret that, with characteristic discretion, he should have quitted the battle of the Conference only to take his seat in the House of Lords, to denounce the perfidy of Prussia, and to mourn over Austrian fickleness. There wanted but one touch to complete the picture, and it was supplied by the noble Lord the First Minister. Sir, I listened with astonishment [*Cheers*] — I listened with astonishment as the noble Lord condemned the vices of his victim, and inveighed at the last moment against the obstinacy of unhappy Denmark. Denmark would not submit to arbitration. But on what conditions did the German Powers accept it? And what security had Denmark that if in the Conference she could not obtain an assurance that the neutral Powers would support her by force on the line of the Schlei — what security, I say, had she that any other line would be maintained — an unknown line by an unknown arbiter? Sir, it does appear to me impossible to deny, under these circumstances, that the just influence of England in the councils of

Europe is lowered. And now, I ask, what are the consequences of the just influence of England in the councils of Europe being lowered? The consequences are—to use a familiar phrase in the despatches—"most serious," because in exact proportion as that influence is lowered the securities for peace are diminished. I lay this down as a great principle which cannot be controverted in the management of our foreign affairs. If England is resolved upon a particular policy, war is not probable. If there is, under these circumstances, a cordial alliance between England and France, war is most difficult; but if there is a thorough understanding between England, France, and Russia, war is impossible. These were the happy conditions under which Her Majesty's Ministers entered office, and which they enjoyed when they began to move in the question of Denmark. Two years ago, and even less, there was a cordial understanding between England, France, and Russia upon this question or any question which might arise between Germany and Denmark. What cards to play! What advantages in the management of affairs! It seemed, indeed, that they might reasonably look forward to a future which would justify the confidence of Parliament; when they might point with pride to what they had accomplished, and appeal to public opinion to support them. But what has happened? They have alienated Russia — they have estranged France—and then they call Parliament together to declare war against Germany. Why, such a thing never happened before in the history of this country. Nay, more, I do not think it can ever happen again. It is one of those portentous results which occur now and then to humiliate and depress the pride of nations, and to lower our confidence in human intellect. Well, Sir, as the difficulties increase, as the obstacles are multiplied, as the consequences of their perpetual errors and constant mistakes are gradually becoming more apparent, you always find Her Majesty's Government nearer war. As in private life, we know it is the weak who are always violent, so it is with Her Majesty's Ministers. As long as they are confident in their allies, as long as they possess the cordial sympathy of the great Powers, they speak with moderation, they counsel with dignity; but, like all incompetent men, when they are in extreme difficulty they can see but one resource, and that is force. When affairs cannot be arranged in peace you see them turning first to St. Petersburg—that was a bold despatch which was sent to St. Petersburg in January last to ask Russia to declare war against Germany—and twice to Paris, entreating that violence may be used to extricate them from the consequences of their own mistakes. It is only by giving Government credit, as I have been doing throughout, for the complete sincerity of their expressions and conduct that their behaviour is explicable. Assume that their policy was a war policy and it is quite intelligible. Whenever difficulties arise their resolution is instantly to have recourse to violence. Every word they utter, every despatch they write, seems always to look to a scene of collision. What is the state of Europe at this moment? What is the state of Europe produced by this management of our affairs? I know not what other hon. Gentlemen may think, but it appears to me most serious. I find the great German Powers openly avowing that it is not in their capacity to fulfil their engagements. I find Europe impotent to vindicate public law because all the great alliances are broken down; and I find a proud and generous nation like England shrinking with the reserve of magnanimity from the responsibility of commencing war, yet sensitively smarting under the impression that her honour is stained — stained by pledges which ought not to have been given, and expectations which I maintain ought never to have been held out by wise and competent statesmen. Sir, this is anarchy. It therefore appears to me obvious that Her Majesty's Government have failed in their avowed policy of maintaining the independence and integrity of Denmark. It appears to me undeniable that the just influence of England is lowered in the councils of Europe. It appears to me too painfully clear that to lower our influence is to diminish the securities of peace. And what defence have we? If ever a criticism is made on his ambiguous conduct the noble Lord asks me, "What is your policy?" My answer might be my policy is the honour of England and the peace of Europe, and the noble Lord has betrayed both. I can understand a Minister coming to Parliament when there is a question of domestic interest of the highest character for consideration—such as the emancipation of the Catholics, the principles on which our commercial code is to be established or our representative system founded; I can quite understand — although I should deem it a very weak step — a Minister saying, "Such questions are open questions, and we leave it to Parliament to decide what is to be our policy." Parliament is in the possession of all the information on such subjects that is necessary or can be obtained. Parliament is as competent to come to a judgment upon the emancipation of any part of our subjects who are not in possession of the privileges to which they are entitled—the principles on which a commercial code is to be established or a representative system founded are as well known to them as to any body of men in the world; but it is quite a new doctrine to appeal to Parliament to initiate a foreign policy. To initiate a foreign policy is the prerogative of the Crown, exercised under the responsibility of constitutional Ministers. It is devised, initiated, and carried out in secrecy, and justly and wisely so. What do we know as to what may be going on in Downing Street at this moment? We know not what despatches may have been written, or what proposals may have been made to any foreign Power. For aught I know, the noble Lord this morning may have made another proposition, which may light up a general European war. It is for Parliament to inquire, to criticise, to support, or to condemn in questions of foreign policy, but it is not for Parliament to initiate a foreign policy in absolute ignorance of the state of affairs. That would be to ask a man to set his house on fire. I will go further. He is not a wise—I am sure he is not a patriotic man—who at a crisis like the present would accept office on conditions. What conditions could be made when we are in ignorance of our real state? Any conditions we could offer in a vote of the House of Commons carried upon a particular point might be found extremely unwise when we were placed in possession of the real position of the country. No, Sir, we must not allow Her Majesty's Government to escape from their responsibility. That is at the bottom of all their demands when they ask "What is your policy?" The very first night we met—on the 4th of February — we had the same question. Parliament was called together by a Ministry in distress to give them a policy. But Parliament maintained a dignified and discrete reserve, and you now find in what a position the Ministry are placed to-night. Sir, it is not for any man in this House, on whatever side he sits, to indicate the policy of this country in our foreign relations—it is the duty of no one but the responsible Ministers of the Crown. The most we can do is to tell the noble Lord what is not our policy. We will not threaten and then refuse to act. We will not lure on our allies with expectations we do not fulfil. And, Sir, if it ever be the lot of myself or any public men with whom I have the honour to act to carry on important negotiations on behalf of this country, as the noble Lord and his Colleagues have done, I trust that we at least shall not carry them on in such a manner that it will be our duty to come to Parliament to announce to the country that we have no allies, and then declare that England can never act alone. Sir, those are words which ought never to have escaped the lips of a British Minister. They are sentiments which ought never to have occurred even to his heart. I repudiate —I reject them. I remember there was a time when England with not a tithe of her present resources, inspired by a patriotic cause, triumphantly encountered a world in arms. And, Sir, I believe now, if the occasion were fitting, if her independence or her honour were assailed, or her Empire endangered, I believe that England would rise in the magnificence of her might and struggle triumphantly for those objects for which men live and nations flourish. But I, for one, will never consent to go to war to extricate Ministers from the consequences of their own mistakes. It is in this spirit that I have drawn up this Address to the Crown. I have drawn it up in the spirit in which the Royal Speech was delivered at the commencement of the Session. I am ready to vindicate the honour of the country whenever it is necessary, but I have drawn up this Address in the interest of Peace. Sir, I beg leave to move the Resolution of which I have given notice.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to thank Her Majesty for directing the Correspondence on Denmark and Germany, and the protocols of the Conference recently held in London, to be laid before Parliament.

"To assure Her Majesty that we have heard with deep concern that the sittings of that Conference have been brought to a close without accomplishing the important purposes for which it was convened.

"To express to Her Majesty our great regret that, while the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government has failed to maintain their avowed policy of upholding the integrity and independence of Denmark, it has lowered the just influence of this country in the counsels of Europe, and thereby diminished the securities for peace."—(*Mr. Disraeli.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, I will venture to assure the right hon. Gentleman that he shall have no ground to complain of any attempt on the part of Her Majesty's Government to disguise or to escape from their responsibility. Whether, indeed, he has rightly measured the duties of an Opposition—whether he has successfully vindicated the terms of the Motion he submits to the House, is a matter fairly open, I think, to inquiry by the House; but I admit fully and freely that his charges against the Government are bold and palpable, and that the first demand to satisfy is that we should offer our defence. Therefore, I make no apology to hon. Gentlemen who have placed Amendments on the paper. I can well understand why the hon. Gentleman the Member for Bridgwater (Mr. Kinglake) or the hon. Gentleman opposite the Member for Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), should have thought it right in the interests of England to substitute Motions which really do involve a policy for a Motion which involves none. At the same time it is our duty, while wholly refraining from any attempt to question the exercise of their discretion, to step in by the kind indulgence of the House, upon the delivery of the charge by the right hon. Gentleman, and to meet the accusations which he has lavished upon the conduct of the Secretary of State and of the Government.

Now, Sir, it is well to have something to agree in, and I am glad to think that this is a starting point, if I may so describe it, which the right hon. Gentleman and the Government may consider that they possess in common — I mean the starting point defined by the period of the last summer and early autumn, and by the declarations of that winter. The right hon. Gentleman has referred to the declaration which my noble Friend at the head of the Government made in the month of July, and he has construed that declaration, if I understood him rightly—I do not attempt to repeat his words — as an authoritative announcement by my noble Friend of his own opinion that the Treaty of 1852, entered into for the purpose of maintaining the independence and integrity of Denmark, would receive that support of united Europe under which it had originally been framed; and I think, likewise, that he has fairly judged that my noble Friend in giving that opinion with respect to the anticipated conduct of the other Powers who were parties to that treaty also implied the readiness of the Administration of which he was the head to take their part in the matter. The right hon. Gentleman has stated, and stated truly—for the evidence in the papers is clear and conclusive — that at that period France and Russia were of the same mind. It is not necessary to trouble the House by referring to their language. I think, perhaps, as it is desirable not to lengthen statements necessarily long upon a complicated subject of this kind, I may stand for the present on what I take to be the frank avowal of the right hon. Gentleman that at that period France and Russia were prepared to act in support of the declaration of the noble Lord.

Well, then, Sir, from that one single point of agreement I now set out into the long and dreary journey of difference and contrast. The right hon. Gentleman says that in the month of September there was a total change in the policy of France; and having assumed that to be the case, he gives as a reason the dissatisfaction of France with the policy of England in regard to the Polish question. I do not know that it is necessary—I do not know that it is expedient—that we should enter at this period upon a discussion of the course taken by Her Majesty's Government in regard to the Polish question. So far as I know, the Parliament of this country did not in either House act with respect to Poland on those principles of extreme reserve which have been professed by the right hon. Gentleman. On the contrary, both in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords, Her Majesty's Government were urged again and again to lift up their voice on behalf of suffering Poland.

MR. DISRAELI: I never said that Parliament had shown extreme reserve.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I was not using the right hon. Gentleman's words, but my own, and I take the liberty of making this further observation on the same point, that the only charge, or at any rate the prominent objection, which was made to the conduct or supposed conduct of Her Majesty's Government with regard to Poland was that the declaration of my noble Friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs during the discussions on the subject—that he would not take up arms for Poland—had entirely dashed and destroyed the hopes of the Poles.

But, says the right hon. Gentleman, there was a total change in the policy and position of France in respect to Denmark in the month of September; and no doubt if there was such a change of policy the right hon. Gentleman would be justified in drawing a fair inference from it. But was there really such a change? The right hon. Gentleman, indeed, quoted the despatch of Mr. Grey, which he thinks supports the statement he has made; and the right hon. Gentleman gracefully apologizes to the House for troubling it with reference to documents. Sir, I, for my part, am much more disposed to complain in this respect of his sins of omission than of his sins of commission. For the right hon. Gentleman, professing to pass over the immaterial and irrelevant portions of this despatch, referred to the mortification which France had felt on account of the refusal of the joint application of the three Powers by Russia; and he fairly quoted the resolution of France—a resolution at which none can wonder and none can complain—to avoid repeating any diplomatic measure the same in form as that which had exposed her to that refusal. But the right hon. Gentleman gave the House to understand that at this period—in September—France had clearly signified to us that we were not to look for any more co-operation from her on behalf of Denmark. I put it to the House whether the right hon. Gentleman did not lead it to infer that the Emperor of the French had in substance intimated this to us:—"My policy is changed. If you had stood by me in the case of Poland, I would now have stood by you in the case of Denmark. You abandoned me in the case of Poland, and I will leave you to conduct the case of Denmark by yourselves." But was this the fact? Was this the conduct of France at that very period? Was this the language or the sense of the very despatch which the right hon. Gentleman quoted? Sir, I will read the words of Mr. Grey, not taken from a remote part of the despatch, but from the very gap and interval between the two parts of the right hon. Gentleman's quotation. At the very time when the right hon. Gentleman says that France was adopting a policy of her own on the affairs of Denmark, what was it that M. Drouyn de Lhuys stated to Mr. Grey? Here is the passage—

> "France was not, his Excellency said, by any means indifferent to the maintenance of the integrity and independence of Denmark, and it was not from any indifference that he disapproved of your Lordship's suggestion. He had already represented to the German Powers that if they invaded Holstein for the purpose of effecting a revolt in Schleswig, or if they went further and invaded Schleswig itself, they would be infringing on the rights of an independent Sovereign, and entering upon a grave question affecting the balance of power in Europe, to which France could not remain indifferent."—No. 2, 131.

The very strongest of all those expressions which, when they come from the pen of my noble Friend the Secretary of State, are treated as menaces which bound us to go to war, proceeded from the mouth of the French Minister for Foreign Affairs at the very moment when the right hon. Gentleman would have us believe that France was renouncing all co-operation with us in regard to the Danish question.

But the right hon. Gentleman went on from the September stage to the November stage of this complicated history, and he referred to the "discourteous terms" in which he says the noble Lord the Secretary of State had treated the proposal of the Emperor of the French for assembling a European Congress. Well, Sir, my noble Friend the Secretary of State is a man of truth and honour, apt and given to speak out his mind with as little of circumlocution as circumstances will allow. But if Her Majesty's Government—for this is a question of the Government, and not of the Secretary of State—if Her Majesty's Government are to blame for having, as the right hon. Gentleman says, curtly and succinctly declined the proposition of the Congress, did the right hon. Gentleman himself pursue a course that was calculated to mend our bad manners? How did he describe the proposal made by the Emperor of the French? On the 4th of February, 1864, this master of diplomatic courtesy, this statesman so careful of the fine feelings of our neighbours, so sensible of the value of the alliance between the two countries, somewhat "curtly" and somewhat "succinctly" disposed of the subject with the words, "I look upon the proposition for the Congress to have been an adroit manœuvre." I refer to that matter that I may go on to meet the inferences which the right hon. Gentleman sought to found on the refusal of the Congress, just as he had previously founded totally baseless inferences on the proceedings in regard to Poland.

Having stated that we had refused the Congress in a manner which he could not but exceedingly disapprove, he said that France, on the death of the late King of Denmark, resolved to take no part in the dispute; and he quoted a despatch of the 19th of December, from, I think, Lord Wodehouse, in which that noble Lord says that General Fleury, the Envoy of the French Government at Copenhagen, had received instructions from the Emperor

> "Not to take part in any negotiations here, but to tell the Danish Government explicitly that, if Denmark became involved in a war with Germany, France would not come to her assistance, and to advise in general terms moderation and concessions to Germany."

Again, Sir, I am sorry that the right hon. Gentleman, bewildered and overpowered with the study of these 1,500 pages, most anxious — because his candour is known to the world—most anxious if he can to convey the fairest and fullest representation of the papers—yet by some unlucky fate, some illnatured star that crossed his good intentions, hardly in any instance —and I will make good what I am stating—has represented the real effect and bearing even of the very passages which he quotes — why, Sir, ist hat the whole of what Lord Wodehouse wrote in respect to General Fleury? It is quite true that we received this statement from Copenhagen, and that on receiving it my noble Friend sought to have it verified by a reference to Paris. He referred the matter to Lord Cowley, who returned an answer from M. Drouyn de Lhuys with an important addition, because, it should be remembered, the right hon. Gentleman's doctrine is that France had now definitively renounced all intention of taking part in the Danish question. Well, but the right hon. Gentleman omitted to quote this passage:—

> "He (M. Drouyn de Lhuys) was positive that no declaration had been made by the General (Fleury) which did not leave the Emperor free to take any course which events might render expedient."

Do hon. Gentlemen opposite really think that is not a material part of the statement? Is that a policy of absolute renunciation? I think it was a very wise course for the Emperor of the French, with the sentiments he entertained, to give Denmark frank intimation that it must not look for material support from him; but, at the same time, Lord Cowley had it distinctly from the French Minister for Foreign Affairs himself that in this declaration the Emperor expressly reserved to himself the right to interfere in the Danish question as far as, how, and when he might think fit.

Well, we now come a step farther in the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, which I will endeavour to follow point by point. The right hon. Gentleman will have it that in all cases when the Government found themselves strong they were moderate in their language, and that when they found themselves weak they became violent; and on that principle he accounts for a letter written, as he says, on the 25th of December, to menace the Diet in case they proceeded to Federal Execution. Here, again, I am sorry to say the right hon. Gentleman has not quoted the document fairly or truthfully. I am in the recollection of the House, and I speak in the presence of the right hon. Gentleman. He stated that in this letter of the 25th of December, which he described, I think, as one of great violence—but he was so lavish of these descriptions that I may perhaps make some mistake as to how they were applied in a particular case—he said that in this letter my noble Friend menaced the Diet in the event of their proceeding to Federal Execution, and he read words of a general nature to bear out the comment he made. Those words are—

> "Any precipitate action on the part of the German Confederation at the present moment may lead to consequences fatal to the peace of Europe, and may involve Germany in particular in difficulties of a most serious nature."—No. 4, 414.

But, what is the preamble of that letter? It is very short. It does not mention Federal Execution—Federal Execution is not mentioned in it—it has no reference whatever to Federal Execution. The opening words are—

> "The Diet sitting at Frankfort appears to claim a right to decide on questions of succession in the several States composing the Confederation, and to be bent on asserting such right in the present case of the succession in the Duchy of Holstein."

Therefore the charge of the right hon. Gentleman, I do not hesitate to state, had not one jot or tittle of foundation. The question of Federal Execution had no reference to the subject of succession. The claim to determine succession has more or less been made at different periods by the German Diet, but it is not acknowledged to be part of its regular attributes and jurisdiction. With regard to that claim, who supposes that the Diet would be allowed to determine the succession to Austria or the succession to Prussia? But the rights of all the States, great and small, are alike. It was in relation to this extravagant and exorbitant claim of the German Diet to determine the succession, and not to Federal Execution, that the letter was written which the right hon. Gentleman has quoted in a manner entirely to falsify its purport and effect. It is granted, I think, that he quoted it for the purpose of illustrating his assertions relative to "menaces against Federal Execution." But that letter never mentions Federal Execution—the matter it does mention is a claim, or supposed claim, of the Diet to determine the question of succession.

Well, I come to another despatch, and I am sorry I can speak of the right hon. Gentleman's quotation of it in no other terms than those I have used in speaking of his former quotations. It is the despatch of the 29th of December, I may call it the lugubrious despatch; because the House will remember very well how the right hon. Gentleman resorted to the fullest use of his comic powers in describing by voice and manner the plaintive tones in which Her Majesty's Government addressed itself to the Government of France. The right hon. Gentleman quoted this passage from Earl Cowley's despatch, dated December 29—

> "I said, [to M. Drouyn de Lhuys,] that Her Majesty's Government were most seriously desirous to act with the Imperial Government on this question."

That refers to the proposal made by the British Government for a Conference on the affairs of Denmark. But the right hon. Gentleman read on and said—

> "They felt that if the two could agree war might be avoided; otherwise the danger of war was imminent. M. Drouyn de Lhuys said that he partook this opinion; but as his Excellency made no further observation I remarked that it would be a grievous thing if the difference of opinion which had arisen upon the merits of a General Congress were to produce an estrangement which would leave each Government to pursue its own course."—No. 4, 444.

The right hon. Gentleman observed that no reply was made; that we made an application to France to join with us in a European Conference on the affairs of Denmark; that Lord Cowley could get no answer from M. Drouyn de Lhuys, and failing to get any reply he was obliged to wind up the conversation with the expression of a hope that the difference of opinion which had arisen upon the merits of a General Congress would not prevent co-operation upon the affairs of Denmark. There the right hon. Gentleman stopped, and every one who heard him took it as a distinct allegation that M. Drouyn de Lhuys had refused to give any reply to Lord Cowley. If that was not the object of his statement, it could have no other. It was the whole strain and drift of his argument to show that long after France had resolved, we went to France dunning and pestering her with proposal after proposal which she rejected. If the citation had been a fair one the inference would have been just. Again, I say, the right hon. Gentleman misled the House. Here are the next words following those quoted by the right hon. Gentleman. Lord Cowley said—

> "I presume that I might give them [Her Majesty's Government] the assurance that the Imperial Government were not decided to reject the notion of a Conference. M. Drouyn de Lhuys replied that the Imperial Government were anxious to prevent a war, and if they saw their way to its prevention through a Conference they would not refuse to take part in one."

Did then the Emperor of the French discourage action? Did he profess the policy of renunciation? Lord Cowley added—

> "I have detailed, as far as time will admit of, the general tenour of my conversation with M. Drouyn de Lhuys. I should add that His Excellency expressed the opinion that if your Lordship would also insist on knowing the intentions of the two great German Powers, it would aid in bringing this question to an earlier solution."—No. 4, 445.

That is what the right hon. Gentleman thought fit to describe as the policy of abstinence, refusal, and renunciation.

We come next to the revocation of the constitution of Denmark. The right hon. Gentleman said the Danes revoked the Patent—the Danes withdrew the new constitution, and abandoned resistance in Holstein on our recommendation. Now, I am not here to bring an indictment against the Danes. When we recollect that the throne of Denmark is occupied by a Sovereign who acceded to it under circumstances of difficulty unparalleled, and who is the inheritor of embarrassments caused by the conduct of his predecessor and the policy of the Minister he found in power, I am not able to say with confidence that it was within the strength and means of the King of Denmark to unravel the difficulties with which he was surrounded.

But, at the same time, I beg to say that this, like other allegations of the right hon. Gentleman, is void of foundation. He says the Danes did these things upon our instance. My answer is that they did them on the joint instance of the Powers. He said they did these things when we requested them; my answer is that, unhappily, they were not done until the concession was so late it was valueless for the purpose.

Now, let us see how the truth stands upon these matters. First, says the right hon. Gentleman—because his object is, for the sake of wounding the Government, to saddle on his country responsibilities which she does not bear ["Oh!"]; yes, if the proceedings quoted by the right hon. Gentleman were engagements in the sense in which he would have us to believe they were, they are not to be settled between party and party in the House of Commons—the bond of England is good by whomsoever given. The engagements continue, and he on his accession to power would be bound to fulfil them in the sense he would attach to them. First, says the right hon. Gentleman, Denmark revoked the Patent on our recommendation, and revoking it on our recommendation that constituted a *quasi* engagement on our part. Now, I think it will be found that on the 8th of October the British Government remonstrated against the Patent, and advised its revocation. When was the Patent revoked? On the 7th of December, two months after the advice was given that it should be revoked. And was this period of two months a period to be measured merely by time? No, it was a period filled with events of the greatest and gravest consequence. Because in the meantime the New Constitution had been passed, and the revocation of the Patent, as M. Hall said to Lord Wodehouse, was a thing of the smallest possible importance. So much for the revocation of the Patent. I think, by the bye, I heard the right hon. Gentleman say, that M. Hall offered to recall the Patent in the month of October. All I can say is, that as far as I am aware that was a conditional offer, "that England and France would give to the Danish Government a formal promise to support them against any further demands of Germany;" to which Sir Augustus Paget replied, "I did not think much would be obtained by my forwarding this message." The revocation of the Patent was withheld during the time it would have been of use; it was yielded when it was a question of the smallest possible importance.

But what is the next allegation of the right hon. Gentleman? He quoted the responsibility of our advice with reference to the question of resistance to the Federal Execution. He said that Denmark upon three great subjects, in deference to our advice, acted contrary to her will and contrary to her policy. But does he mean to say Denmark acted on our advice alone? If he means to say that, I will show there is not the slightest foundation for the statement. But if he means to say she acted on our advice in common with that of the other Powers, then there is not the slightest force or value in his statement, because the coercion of Denmark by the recommendation of all can entail only a joint responsibility, and cannot possibly fasten a separate exclusive responsibility on each. What is the case of resistance to the Federal Execution? On the 27th of October, long after France had entirely renounced meddling with the Danish Question, Lord Cowley writes to Earl Russell—

> "M. Drouyn de Lhuys assures me that his advice to the Danish Cabinet has been of a most pacific nature, and that he has recommended acquiescence in the Federal Execution, should the Diet persist in ordering it, rather than risk hostilities."—No. 3, 179.

So much for that. Sweden was by far the most nearly associated with Denmark in the whole of its policy. And what did Sweden say?

> "Upon M. Hall pressing Count Manderstrom on this point, his Excellency distinctly told M. Hall that, although the Swedish Government might agree with that of Denmark in the view they took of the possible entry of Federal troops into Holstein, they could not commit themselves to a commencement of hostilities with the Confederation on Federal territory, and he strongly advised the Danish Government to avoid doing so."

And Mr. Ward informed the Syndic of Hamburg of the objection entertained by Her Majesty's Government to the Federal Execution being carried out in Holstein. The Syndic said that, as he had been informed, Russia and France had already advised Denmark not to offer any resistance to the Federal decree. Lord Wodehouse also wrote on December 21—

> "Sir Augustus Paget having communicated to me a letter addressed to him on the 19th instant by M. Hall, announcing the decision of the Danish Government not to offer resistance in Holstein to the forces of the Confederation, and stating that this decision has been taken especially in conse-

quence of the representations of Her Majesty's Government, I think it right to observe that, while I pointed out to M. Hall, at my first interview with him, the danger of opposing the Federal troops, and expressed my opinion that it would be most imprudent for Denmark to precipitate a war by resistance to the Execution, I was careful to explain that Her Majesty's Government could not take upon themselves the responsibility of the determination which might be arrived at by the Danish Cabinet."—No. 4, 416.

So, Sir, I think it is pretty clear that, in the first place, the advice upon which the Danish Government acted was common advice— advice in which England was involved only in common with France and Russia; and, in the second place, that it was advice with regard to which they were distinctly informed that Her Majesty's Government could not be responsible for the consequences of the decision that the Danish Government might take in respect of the Federal Execution. It is just the same also with regard to the new Constitution. The right hon. Gentleman says that England was selfishly silent with regard to the new Constitution. He gave the House to understand that when good might have been done by remonstrance, England left Denmark to take her own course; but that subsequently, when it had become difficult for Denmark to recede, then England came with her inopportune and inauspicious advice, and desired that the new Constitution might be revoked—remaining selfishly silent, however, at the critical moment. That critical moment was the moment when the new King had just come into his too burdensome heritage, and found this unhappy Bill awaiting his decision. I think it was on the 15th or 16th of November that he came to the throne; and on the 17th of November—such is the correctness and accuracy with which the right hon. Gentleman cites the vital documents of this case — Earl Russell wrote to Sir Augustus Paget, fearing to force advice upon the King at that critical moment, but indicating that his advice would be that the Royal assent to the new Constitution should be suspended. The words are these—

> "Her Majesty's Government are very reluctant to interfere with regard to the Danish Constitution, and therefore I cannot instruct you to urge the King to take a course which may be very unpalatable to his subjects. At the same time, if you are questioned, you may say that, as his Majesty desires, doubtless, that the proposed mediation should lead to a good result, the probability of its doing so might be greatly increased if his assent to the Constitution were to be suspended, until a settlement of the international question was effected, or, at least, had made some progress."—No. 3, 206.

Unhappily, that advice was not acted upon. Unhappily, the position of the King in the face of the populace of Copenhagen appears to have been such as to make it impossible for him to take a course which, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, and in the opinion, I think, of the other neutral Governments, international obligations strictly interpreted required. Consequently the complications that existed underwent great further aggravation; and, unhappily, the revocation of this Constitution, like the other concessions, although made, was made too late. On the 17th of November my noble Friend had suggested a suspension of the Royal assent. Shortly after that time it became clear to Her Majesty's Government that the Constitution ought to be revoked. The Danish Parliament was still sitting, and would have had power to revoke it; but, unhappily, that Minister, who, I fear, has been in act though not in intention, one of the worst enemies of Denmark, permitted the Parliament to be dissolved without touching the constitution, and so left the King in a state of hopeless embarrassment. At last, on the 19th of January, when Federal Execution was far advanced in Holstein, and when the Prussian and Austrian forces were about to enter Schleswig, it was then for the first time that the offer was made by the Danish Minister Bishop Monrad to call together the Rigsraad, and propose to recall the new Constitution. Therefore, the statement of the right hon. Gentleman is wholly fallacious if it be not directly the reverse of true, because he knows perfectly well that time in political events is an essential condition, and that what to-day may be a highly satisfactory concession will not to-morrow be received as a concession at all. We see that, Sir, in domestic as well as in foreign politics. How often in domestic politics Gentlemen and parties have been found unwilling to concede anything so long as concession would be gracious, and only ready to give when the gift had lost all value. Such has unhappily been the case with regard to the course of these negotiations.

These are the specific charges made by the right hon. Gentleman upon the documents, and I will now endeavour, though with some diffidence and apprehension, to explain what I take to have been the principles of policy adopted by

Her Majesty's Government in this matter. The right hon. Gentleman stated—and although I think he overstated that portion of the case, I confess I think it was a point that ought to have attracted much more notice than it has done—he stated, and stated with truth, that a considerable change was effected in the position of this question at the death of the King of Denmark. The death of King Frederic VII. altered the position of the parties with respect to the Treaty of 1852. It immediately laid the whole strain upon that treaty and the construction of that treaty. As long as King Frederic VII. was living there was nothing but a question of internation engagement, and the matter in dispute was whether international covenants had been fulfilled or not. There was no question of disputed title then. But when Frederic VII. deceased and King Christian IX came to the throne, then the questions of succession connected with the various constructions of the treaty immensely aggravated the matters at issue. The policy of Her Majesty's Government under Frederic VII., as was stated over and over again in the despatches, was to endeavour to bring the Danish Government to fulfil the engagements of 1852, and to bring the German Governments to be moderate in their view of those engagements. But the right hon. Gentleman appears to think, and to make it a charge against the Government, that they have taken, as it were gratuitously and needlessly, a prominent part in the settlement of those matters. He says, with truth, that England has no special interest in these questions. Well, it has been stated by my noble Friend the Secretary of State more than once in these despatches that the interests of England in the Dano-German question are the interests of Europe. We can conceive that France, from tradition and association, and likewise from her peculiar relations with Germany, may have a special and direct interest in any question which may involve the disruption of Denmark and its partial absorption into the German Confederation. We can conceive that Russia, principally dependent upon the Baltic for her access to the broad ocean waters of the world, may feel a strong and peculiar interest in the question whether Denmark and Sweden are to be united in one great Scandinavian kingdom. But England has no special interests there. Why, then, did she take a part, which was certainly a prominent part, in these discussions? She took it for an object which I hope will ever be dearer to England than her interest — namely, what she conceives to be her honour and duty. Gentlemen must look back to the previous stages of this Question in order properly to appreciate the position of England during the recent complications. At the period of the war of 1849 the mediation of England was invoked by the contending parties. That was originally the suggestion of Prussia, adopted by Denmark, forwarded from Denmark to my noble Friend then Secretary of State (Viscount Palmerston) and by him undertaken. It was a grave responsibility. But was it a barren work? On the contrary, it ended in putting a stop to the shedding of human blood; it ended in terms of pacification and in a treaty which was deemed by both parties to be honourable and satisfactory. These are the words in which the Danish Minister of that day spoke of the part taken by England with regard to the peace of 1850—

> "I approve entirely the terms of the document, I find it in all points agreeable to our interests; and I invite you to make use of the first occasion which may present itself, to become the medium of conveying to Lord Palmerston our cordial gratitude for this new proof of the interest and friendship of that illustrious statesman for Denmark, and of his sincere desire to procure for us the necessary guarantees."

After a proceeding of that kind so beneficial to the parties, so honourable to this country, it was not possible for the representative of England to recede from the prominent post in which he had been placed by no act of his own, but by the obligations resulting from former transactions of the most satisfactory and beneficial kind. And there, I think, is a full and ample explanation of the conduct and general position assumed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in regard to the Danish negotiations. By the way, I really wish that the right hon. Gentleman in attacking his opponents, would remember his country. My hon. Friend (Mr. Layard) reminds me that the right hon. Gentleman said it was to Russia that the whole honour of that settlement and of that peace was due. Now, I have quoted the authentic words to show that my noble Friend was regarded by Denmark as the chief agent in that pacification.

Well, Sir, upon the accession of the new King the duty and endeavour of Her Majesty's Government were to maintain the Treaty of 1852. Was that right, or was it wrong? Is it honourable to Parliament that the right hon. Gentleman should come down here, and in mimic tones should hold up to ridicule the conduct of the Administration because they instruct their agents abroad to apply to France and to Russia, the co-signatary Powers, for assistance in endeavouring to give effect to the treaty? Did not the right hon. Gentleman in one of the declamatory bursts towards the close of his speech, totally forget the argumentative part of it? In the argumentative part he had exhibited it as preposterous meanness on the part of England to apply to Paris and St. Petersburg; but in the declamatory part of his speech he came round to a much better sense than he attained when he was merely logical and argumentative. "Get England and France to unite," he said, "and war is difficult; get England, France, and Russia to unite, and war is impossible." Now the steps taken by Her Majesty's Government — almost without exception — what were they but endeavours to bind together the Powers of Europe for the fulfilment and maintenance of an important European engagement?

The right hon. Gentleman then brings us on to another stage of these proceedings. For a short time—I think only for a few days—after the death of the late King of Denmark there was no great reason, that I am aware of, to suppose that the Treaty of 1852 was in serious danger. It was only in the end of November that a new doctrine was coined by Austria and Prussia—that the Treaty of 1852 was nothing more than a part of the same transactions and special covenants of 1851-2 between Germany and Denmark, and that unless those covenants were fulfilled the Treaty of 1852 was at an end. That was the formidable doctrine which at that time came into view. It was about the 28th of November—it may have been a little later—that language began to be held by the German Powers which materially altered the position of the case. So long as the German Powers frankly recognized their obligations under the Treaty of 1852 there was comparatively little danger, but when they held themselves free to make the Treaty of 1852 dependent on conditions, the fulfilment or non-fulfilment of which they were competent themselves to decide, because they were settled between themselves and Denmark, then it became obvious that the dangers were thickening around us. It became a question whether the treaty would bear out what was considered to be its loyal and undoubted meaning. There was undoubtedly a recognition on the part of the German Powers of the succession of King Christian; but it was a recognition *de bene esse*, which they gave themselves a title to revoke at any moment upon the allegation that the separate engagements of 1851-2 had not been fulfilled by Denmark, and that, therefore, the Treaty of 1852 was annulled. Undoubtedly it was at that period that the Government undertook the greatest responsibility which has laid upon them at any stage of this difficult question. Undoubtedly on the 5th, 10th, and 18th of January they did make applications to France and Russia which contemplated the formation of a combination for the purpose of upholding the Treaty of 1852—upholding it, as I apprehend, not against the will of the people of the Duchies, but against foreign force or intrigue. The right hon. Gentleman, who felt it necessary to censure everything done by the Government, felt it necessary to censure this. He said that on the 18th of January the Government wrote a letter which would have put all Europe in a blaze. What! a letter which would have brought France and Russia into a combination with England put all Europe in a blaze! and that from the right hon. Gentleman, too, who fifteen minutes later declared that France, England, and Russia being combined a war in Europe was altogether impossible! Considering the disproportionate weight laid by the right hon. Gentleman on points of minor importance, I was surprised that when he came to the great passages of European policy he should satisfy himself with flinging an isolated reproach against Her Majesty's Government. We wrote this letter contemplating concert and co-operation. We did believe that it was for the interest of Europe that the Treaty of 1852 should be supported with adequate means—with that adequacy of means which diminishes or annihilates risk—and we stand here responsible for having acted with that belief. Has the right hon. Gentleman an opinion on that point, or has he not? I wish I could dive into the recesses of his mind. I complain of the parsimonious reserve of the right hon. Gentleman; he is as bad as a miser with his money—one cannot get from him the smallest inkling, glance, or glimpse of the future policy of this country. He arraigns the conduct of the Government, and where the conduct of the Government touches policy he will not give an opinion. He brings forward a Motion which aims a deadly blow at the Government—he asks the House of Commons to condemn the Government—and yet over this by far the most important part of their proceedings—over this cardinal article of their conduct—the right hon. Gentleman, in asking the House of Commons to condemn the Government, passes in silence, because he could not have intimated an opinion without giving an opinion as to the policy of the Government. The Government did think it was their duty to make those efforts to effect a combination for the support of the Treaty of 1852, and for the purpose of preventing that treaty being set aside by foreign force. I am not here to blame the Governments which declined to concur in that overture. I think that in the case of an engagement like the Treaty of 1852 the persons really responsible for its failure, and for all the consequences of failure, are those who first recede from their plighted faith. When some of the Powers had shown an inclination to shelter themselves under reserves which would have enabled them at the first moment that suited their convenience to abandon the treaty and tear it to rags, it was not to be expected but that each of the other Powers should say, "We must re-consider our position; we must assume that this is a new starting point." The Emperor of the French was entitled to say, "I must look to the position and interests of France." He did look to those interests, and we do not blame him for the resolution at which he arrived. But though we do not presume to blame the conduct of France, or what some people might call the mysterious conduct of Russia—though we may have felt that the unhappy position of Russia with regard to Poland somewhat impairs the independence, dignity, and strength of her position on other European questions where the German Powers are principally concerned — although I frankly and freely admit that—yet I do not accept it as a ground for assuming that her efforts were not sincere and earnest in concert with the great Powers of Europe—nor do we accept it as a matter of blame imputable to us that we made an effort to rally the Powers of Europe in support of that treaty. It appears to me that the single-handed intervention of England in European questions is a course of proceeding which can rarely be justified—of course I am speaking of cases other than those in which our honour and interests are directly involved—a system has grown up of late—and the Treaty of 1852 is a notable example of it—under which the Powers of Europe have formed themselves into a sort of police for the purpose of maintaining general peace and off putting down the wrongdoer, whoever he may be, without reference to any selfish object. That is the sense of the Treaty of 1852. I think it is an honourable course, and I think that the community of interest in nations is beginning to be recognized. That the collective forces of the civilized world should be organized for such a purpose is one of the best guarantees of peace; and if the right hon. Gentleman means to challenge the conduct of the Government in their endeavours to enlist the active aid of France and Russia in the preservation of European peace, let him say so. We are ready to abide by the decision of the House and the country on that point.

Well, then, says the right hon. Gentleman, you got into the Conference, and, having got into Conference, you provided for the integrity of Denmark by cutting off Holstein and a part of Schleswig; and you provided for her independence by putting her under the tutelage of all the Powers of Europe. No doubt there is a good deal of wit in that description; but we have never disguised that, after the failure of our application to France and Russia, our tone was altered. If you find fault with the Secretary of State for having said that this course or the other "will lead to an intervention," or that "England cannot view with indifference" such and such a policy, you must recollect that that language was in conformity with the language of France and Russia at the same period; and it was held in contemplation of a contingency which afterwards was not realized, that the neutral Powers would find themselves in a position to co-operate for the maintenance of the treaty. Where does the right hon. Gentleman find language of menace used after the time when we became aware that menace could not practically be carried into effect? It is difficult to assert a negative in any case, and particularly so in the case of a correspondence extending over 1,500 pages—but I am not aware of a single word having been said by my noble Friend by way of menace to the German Powers after we had become aware that European combination in support of the treaty was no longer obtainable. I think the right hon. Gentleman said that we were right in not going to war single-handed on behalf of Denmark; but when we found that it was impossible to give full effect to the Treaty of 1852, we did the best we could for Denmark. [*Laughter.*] No doubt hon. Gentlemen opposite think they could have done better; but we did as well as we could, as well as France could, as well as Russia could, or as well as Sweden could. They had nothing better to suggest. The right hon. Gentleman describes us all as being smitten with hopeless incapacity; but as long as we can show that our proceedings were the proceedings of the neutral Powers representing Europe, and the impartial judgment of the world, I do not think the right hon. Gentleman will succeed in driving home the deadly weapon he is aiming at our breasts. This view of the subject appears not to have occurred to the right hon. Gentleman. The Treaty of 1852, though it did not effect, contemplated and aimed at securing a combination under the Crown of Denmark, on a new accession to the throne, of all the territories attached to the throne under Frederick VII. Now the Treaty of 1852 would have been perfectly satisfied by what has been called a "personal union." Suppose this proposal had been made to Germany—we will guarantee the Treaty of 1852, and all the possessions that were ruled by Frederick VII. shall pass to Christian IX.; but there shall be neither administrative nor legislative connection between Denmark Proper and the three Duchies. The Treaty would undoubtedly in the latter have been fulfilled, and it would have been impossible to bring a charge of bad faith against Germany, however much we might have complained, lamented, and deplored her conduct. It is quite plain that if we had advised Denmark to pursue the phantom of a material compliance with the Treaty of 1852, we should have very greatly erred; because we should have advised Denmark to do what she has evidently been determined to avoid — for if there is any one thing plainer than another, it is the resolution on her part not to submit to what has been called a "personal union." Therefore, if the right hon. Gentleman charges us with proposing the reduction of the Danish territory, I say that that proposal was agreeable both to the interests and the wishes of the people of Denmark. Denmark would have been much better pleased to have made a partial surrender of territory, if by that course she could virtually have secured to herself all real power over the remainder. I cannot help saying that I think the case of the right hon. Gentleman is, in this part, as well as in many others, if I may say so without offence, extremely weak, because this proposal—I mean the line of the Schlei—was first of all made by us in concert with, and under the full approbation and concurrence of the neutral Powers, and consequently was more agreeable to Denmark than the only other proposition made to her. I think the House and the country are aware that there were ample reasons why England should not have undertaken what might aptly be termed the Quixotic enterprise of waging single-handed a war which offered itself to us under such circumstances. The tax upon English energies would have been totally disproportioned to the objects for which they were called into action. The want of separate and special interests in the absence of positive engagements was a matter which it was the absolute duty of the Government to take into consideration. But, Sir, if England was to make that war, and to make it with effect, it was not a war which could be waged in Denmark only. Its limits must have been vastly extended. It must at once have gone to the Adriatic. A general European war would have been kindled; and though among the possible results of that war there might have been some, the attainment of which Her Majesty's Government might have regarded as exceedingly valuable, yet the considerations involved in such a war, the fearful uncertainty with which it was surrounded. attached to such a course a responsibility from which the boldest mind would shrink. Besides, England could not enter upon that war single-handed on account of the Treaty of 1852. She must have gone to war to seek some practical arrangement with regard to Denmark — that was an arrangement on which it was impossible that she could have that clear judgment which alone could justify such an issue. England might have found herself in what to her, above all others, would have been a most terrible position; she might have found that her judgment of the justice of the case might have ultimately proved different from that of the population of the Duchies themselves. I hardly know what British House of Commons would have sustained a Government in endeavouring to crush by force the liberties of a people. I think that these reasons have not been challenged by the right hon. Gentleman;—and, indeed, the right hon. Gentleman has, as I have said, with a marvellous adroitness, contrived to avoid in the course of his speech of two and a half or three hours—not at all too long for the interest of the subject—in every possible way expressing an opinion as to what ought or ought not to have been done.

And now, Sir, I think I have gone through the charges which have been made by the right hon. Gentleman, and I have shown how far he has been correct in his quotations. I also must apologize for not refraining from burdening the House with a multitude of references, without a full study of which it is impossible to arrive at a thorough comprehension of this involved and complicated question. But, having met these charges, I hold it to be my right to take my turn as critic and judge, and see what we can make of the Motion submitted to the House by the right hon. Gentleman. It is in many respects a remarkable Motion. Its birth, like that of Julius Cæsar and other great men of olden time, was heralded by omens and prophecies. At an early period of the Session the right hon. Gentleman came out as a prophet, and told us that our policy would be questioned, and another day the hon. Member for Huntingdon (General Peel) took up the parable and assured us that we should have a Motion on the foreign policy of the Government. Then the ball returned into the hand of the right hon. Gentleman, and for the third time the solemn announcement was made. This Motion, then, has been in course of incubation for about five months, and its terms have had the advantage of being revolved over and over again in all the brains of all the wisest Gentlemen in the country—namely, those whom we see sitting opposite. The right hon. Gentleman makes a Motion, of which we all understand the intention and purport, but which I will show by-and-by to be by no means so plain spoken as it pretends to be. It is intended to aim at the existence of the Government; and I must say that in one sense we ought to be greatly indebted to the right hon. Gentleman. I will explain my meaning by a short anecdote. There is in a beautiful churchyard in Kent an epitaph which commemorates the death of a lady and gentleman who were murdered by their domestic servant, and the writer of the epitaph, in his anxiety to give to the matter a pious and Christian turn, has endeavoured to point out to the reader that it was a very great advantage to this lady and gentleman to be rid by this summary method of the inconvenience and discomfort which so frequently attend dissolution in its natural course. It was only very recently that I saw this epitaph, and it now strongly occurs to me that the right hon. Gentleman was desirous of performing the same kind office for the Government which the domestic servant performed for the lady and gentleman; and that, as the dissolution of a Government in the natural course of events is often attended with inconvenience and discomfort, and must occur at some time or another, we ought to consider the right hon. Gentleman, in hastening our dissolution, is doing us a very kind office. The question which the right hon. Gentleman has raised is a purely personal one. We have heard the tone adopted by the right hon. Gentleman this evening. He looks across the table to a number of Gentlemen, of whom my noble Friend (Viscount Palmerston) is the one conspicuous figure, and says, "It is your miserable incapacity I complain of. I am astonished when you write a sentence of common sense." I quote the words of the right hon. Gentleman, and again I find that his memory is short. He afterwards proceeded to describe the foreign policy of this country since 1815, and that policy he characterized as being generally a wise and successful policy. Did he recollect when he so described it that the man whom he had just accused of "miserable incapacity" was the responsible and main agent in conducting our foreign affairs for more than half the time since the Peace of 1815. Now, Sir, what is the meaning of this Motion? It means, in reality, "Get out of your places and let us come into them." That is a perfectly fair issue to raise; but, if it is unaccompanied with any reference to policy, it is a very disagreeable Motion to discuss for those who have still hanging about them the faintest remains of the modesty of their youth. How are we to appreciate it? When the right hon. Gentleman accuses us of "miserable incapacity," he shows himself superior to considerations of this kind.

MR. DISRAELI: I did not use those words. [Several MEMBERS: "Utter incapacity," "Intense incapacity."]

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The right hon. Gentleman says that he did not use those words. I am willing to take it either way—"utter," "intense," or "miserable,"—he says, "utter incapacity," and I am quite willing to accept the correction. He says, "By your gross mismanagement you have offended all our allies. You have made yourselves contemptible to those who supported you." These are the charges which form the matter of the right hon. Gentleman's speech. He seems to think that he has proved his case because we have failed in averting war. My noble Friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs at any rate has contrived to stave off this war for the best part of five years after he came into office. But the right hon. Gentleman should have extended to us his compassionate recollection, for when he was a Minister of the Crown, and when Lord Malmesbury was Secretary of State, he did not succeed in staving off a war for five days. The right hon. Gentleman came down to the House of Commons on the 18th of April, 1859, and told us that he was well satisfied peace could be preserved; and yet on the 22nd of April an Austrian summons was sent to Piedmont to disarm, which was the commencement of the war in Italy. Surely some allowance should be made for human infirmity. Let us have some mercy shown towards us. I appeal to your humane, your generous feelings. If they give me no answer, I appeal to your own experience for our justification. The language of the Motion is this:—"Let the noble Lord go out; let the noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Afiairs go out; let all their Colleagues go out of the way, and let the figures of myself and Lord Malmesbury appear upon the stage, when everyone will be well behaved, and all misdoers, all public criminals, all public offenders against the peace of Europe will be affrighted," as were the Greeks of old by the appearance of Æneas in the shades below—

> "—————phalanges
> Ut vidêre virum fulgentiaque arma per umbras
> Ingenti trepidare metu."

It appears to me that that is an expectation barely justified by the experience we have had. I see none of these exemptions from the ordinary weaknesses of humanity, and I do not believe they will be avoided by a change of Government. The right hon. Gentleman then got on what I may call his "high horse," and he would not give us the slightest opinion upon any matter of substantive policy, because that, he said, would be accepting office upon conditions. He has contrived a Motion intended to animate an Opposition to put an end to the life of the Government, but which, looked at as a declaration bearing upon public interests, is pale and colourless as a ghost. The allegation is that "our just influence in Europe is lowered"—that is the single allegation it contains—and that thereby "the chances of peace are diminished." Let us deal with that. In the first place, I deny its justice. In the second place, I hold that if it were true it is not a seemly declaration to be recorded by a Motion in this House. Why is the just influence of the country lowered? Because we have failed in averting war. ["No!"] Then nothing can succeed but success, and there can be no fault but failure. There may have been a failure—failure for the moment, but if that failure has been a failure of honest, upright, generous efforts to prevent great masses of mankind from injuring and destroying one another, then the dispassionate Minister and Government which, being in office at the moment, endeavour to calm the troubled waters, may reap on one side — perhaps on both sides—nay even from a part, although, I believe, a very small part of their own countrymen, no other reward than disapproval and resentment; yet the recollection of these efforts in after years will present themselves, and it will be borne in mind that the voice of England had been raised, as it has been raised in other European crises, for moderation and for justice. The efforts of Her Majesty's Government have been to teach wisdom to one party and mercy and forbearance to those who are sometimes said to have been tyrannous as well as strong. But is this a case really without parallel? Let me go back to the great case of Mr. Canning. Never was there a more conspicuous instance of failure, if our judgment is to be founded on the visible results of the moment, than the failure of Mr. Canning in respect of the invasion of Spain by France, but, measured by the justice and wisdom of the course pursued by our Government, there is no more honourable chapter to be found in the whole history of our foreign policy. What said Mr. Canning when the charge was put to him? It would, he said, be disingenuous not to admit that the entry of the French armies was in a certain sense, a disparagement, an affront, and a blow to the sensibilities of England; but subsequent events afforded an ample justification of the wisdom and humanity of the remonstrances which we addressed to the invading Power. In reviewing the measures referred to by the right hon. Gentleman, the long list of proposals, almost of petitions, which we have made in the interest of peace, and the failure of these petitions, either by their being refused at a time when alone concessions would have been useful, or by being declined in a spirit of what some may call the insolence of power, let us go a little beyond the present moment. Let us discard if we can that Epicurean temper which is so sharp in its vision for things near at hand, but which is blind as a bat or a beetle for all that appertains to the future. I do not believe that the just influence of England is lowered. That is not the language which is held by allied and friendly Governments. By whom is it held? It may be held by a certain portion of the Parliament of England; but it seems to me that the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman has for its key nothing but the almost ribald language of a few obscure journals of the Continent. It is from them that this intending Minister derives his inspiration. It is from such sources that our lessons of English policy are to be learnt. For them that may be excusable enough. We know that in this country there are, unfortunately, still narrow sects of people who delight in and even revel in a depreciation of foreign countries. So, too, absurd as it is, there are still in France sects of people who retain what was once the national antipathy to us, but which, thank God, has of late been almost entirely removed. There are readers of such trash, and as long as there are readers there will be writers. The right hon. Gentleman has imported a little of that trash, and commends it in the shape of a Vote of Want of Confidence in the Government to the acceptance of the House of Commons. I have said that it is untrue. I have denied that the just influence of England has been lowered; and I deny also the consequence that the chances of peace have been diminished by the failure—even if it be a failure—of our honest efforts for the maintenance of peace, and for urging mercy, justice, and moderation upon disputing parties. I deny the proposition. But even were it true, I say that, as far as my knowledge extends, this is the very first occasion upon which the British House of Commons has been called upon to record, for the sake of displacing a Government, the degradation of the country. Why cannot the right hon. Gentleman speak plainly? Why cannot he adopt the language of our forefathers, who, when they objected to the conduct of the Government of the time, addressed the Crown, saying that the Government had lost their confidence, and praying that they might be removed from the councils of the Sovereign. Why cannot he say, "We think the conduct of the Government is open to these charges—we withdraw our confidence from them, and we pray the Crown to put others in their places." But he was afraid to raise that issue. The right hon. Gentleman did not dare to say that: he could screw up his courage to a certain point, but he could not venture to assert the old constitutional form of a Vote of Want of Confidence, and because he was not bold he thought he was wise. The right hon. Gentleman is an innovator in party warfare. He has adopted a form for which there is no precedent; for I believe at no time has party spirit led any combination of Englishmen to place upon the records of this House a Motion which can be regarded only as dishonourable to their country. Go back to the times of Sir Robert Walpole, of Lord North, and of Mr. Fox. Never will you find in them such a sterile, *jejeune* affair as this proposed to this House of Commons. You will find that what was then to be said by the Opposition was spoken out in the good old English manner. Their charges were written legibly in the face of the world, that all who ran might read. But now we have a Motion not referring in express terms to the conduct of the Government, but substituting for the ancient and regular method of proceeding loose language, which may indeed be sufficient for the purpose of making it impossible for the Government to retain office, but which at the same time cannot transfix them without piercing the honour of the country.

Under these circumstances, I look forward with cheerfulness and confidence to the issue of this debate. I have now detained the House a long time. I have endeavoured to avoid leading them into the many, almost the innumerable pages of this long Correspondence. I have followed the right hon. Gentleman into every point which he chose to suggest; and I am bound to say that I do not know any other points to which he might have condescended into which it would not have been practicable to follow and to confute him. I am convinced that, whatever his arguments may be, the House will not be led astray by the right hon. Gentleman. Let him, if he pleases, shelter himself under the irresponsibility of Opposition; but that is a doctrine which will not bear to be pushed to extremes, and never, I believe, has it been pushed to such an extreme as it has been to-night. In vain is it for the right hon. Gentleman to say, "Wait! Place me upon those benches, and then let me tell you what I mean to do." I do not think the country will consent to proposals based upon such conditions. Nay, more, I feel a most confident conviction that this House and the country will approve the course taken in these most difficult negotiations by Her Majesty's Government, and that they will reject a Motion which both prudence and patriotism must alike emphatically condemn.

MR. NEWDEGATE rose to move the insertion, in lieu of the second paragraph of Mr. Disraeli's Motion, of the following words:—

> "To submit to Her Majesty the opinion of this House, that the independence of Denmark and the possessions of that kingdom, on the terms proposed by the representatives of the neutral Powers in the recent Conference, ought to be guaranteed."

After listening to the two most able speeches with which this debate had been opened, he could not help thinking that there was great force in the observations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he said that the terms of the Motion of the right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire announced a degradation of this country in the eyes of the world, which he (Mr. Newdegate) did feel that it was almost indecent to admit. No doubt England at this moment stood in a position of isolation in one sense from her usual allies with reference to the case of Denmark and in the maintenance of the independence of that kingdom, which constituted an important element of the balance of power, needful to secure the peace of Europe. He could not admit the doctrine of the right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire that, when papers relating to the foreign policy of the country were submitted to that House by command of Her Majesty, the only question that any Member was entitled to entertain was, "Whether the Government, which had conducted the policy to which those papers referred, deserved the continuance of the confidence of the country, or whether they should be succeeded by the occupants of the front bench on that side of the House?" Such an assumption was contrary to the every-day practice of the House, and was contrary to the practice of the right hon. Gentleman himself, who during the present Session had constantly put questions and expressed opinions on foreign policy, though he had not pledged himself to any definite course of policy. That was one reason in favour of this Amendment. He understood the right hon. Gentleman, in one part of his speech—that which related to the conversation between Lord Wodehouse and General Fleury—distinctly to disavow any intention on his part, if he had been in office, to have interfered in favour of Denmark; as far as he (Mr. Newdegate) could understand, the right hon. Gentleman, if he had been in power, would have left Denmark to combat single-handed with Germany. If that would have been the policy of the right hon. Gentleman he (Mr. Newdegate) should have disapproved of it, and he thought the House had done rightly in continuing to the present Government their tenure of office, because he understood that the public feeling was, that England ought to have exerted herself to a greater extent than she had done to prevent the gross injustice which had been and was being inflicted upon our Ally. The circumstances which had induced him to give notice of this Amendment were comprised in the concluding sentences of the speech of the Prime Minister, delivered by him on Monday last, when the noble Lord said—

> "Still, the contest is, as regards Schleswig, and not as regards the independence of Denmark, or the safety of the capital of the Danish monarchy. I do not mean to say, therefore—I think it right, indeed, to put in this reservation—that if the war should assume a different character; if the existence of Denmark as an independent Power in Europe should be at stake; if we had reason to expect to see at Copenhagen the horrors of a town taken by assault—the destruction of property, the sacrifice of lives, not only of its defenders, but of the peaceful inhabitants, the confiscations which would ensue, the capture of the Sovereign, as a prisoner of war, and other humiliations of that kind—I do not mean to say that if any of those events were likely to happen the position of this country might not be a subject for re-consideration. We might then think it our duty to adopt another course; but this I say, on the part of the Government, that if any change of policy be thought advisable such change shall be communicated to Parliament, if Parliament is sitting, and in any case the earliest opportunity

of taking the sense of Parliament upon the matter shall be taken."

It seemed as if the result and the alternative referred to by the noble Lord were not at all impossible, according to the news that continued to arrive, and that it might behove England to interfere. It had been said that the Conference was a failure, that it had met without a basis. But he asked, did it separate without a basis? They had it in the protocols before them that all the neutral Powers represented at the Conference concurred with the representatives of England in recommending that the future limits of the Danish Monarchy should be those of the territory north of the Schlei and of the line of the Dannewerke. And as there was a prospect, as the circumstances of Denmark might force this country to take an active part in the settlement of this question, he asked whether it would not be more politic and more respectful to our Allies, instead of treating their labours at the Conference as futile, declaring, in fact, that their labours had proved no less futile than our own, to adopt the terms of this Amendment, which conveyed that this House concurred with the neutral Powers in the view they had adopted for the termination of the war, for the independence of Denmark, and for the future security of the peace of Europe. But he might be told that he was speaking of the proceedings of a Conference and not of a Congress. Well, he thought whether it were a Conference only to consult and to advise, or a Congress, the direct function of which was to decide, in the present case it was wholly immaterial. The House had this fact before them, a general concurrence of the neutral Powers as to the terms on which this contest between Denmark and Germany ought to be concluded. He did not think that the House of Commons could adopt a course more conciliatory or more prudent than that of declaring its concurrence in the decision arrived at in the Conference by the representatives of the neutral Powers. He was far from blaming the Government for convening the Conference. On the contrary, he thought there was better hope in such an assembly for the restoration of peace than in any other measure that was at all likely to be adopted. There was, no doubt, a failure in its objects—namely, that although the representatives of the neutral Powers came to a unanimous opinion, their decision was practically futile, because no Power in the Conference had manifested a disposition to carry out the decision of the majority of the Powers therein represented. It might be urged that after the German Powers refused to accede to the proposal of the neutral powers that different schemes of accommodation and conciliation were hinted at, in which the neutral Powers refused to concur, and they ought to be considered the real arbiters in the matter. But Denmark herself refused to accept any of those schemes, and Russia refused her assent to them. It appeared to him that if this House were to express an opinion upon the evidence of the papers before them, it would be to the purpose if the House were to declare with the view to the permanent establishment of peace and the independence of Denmark, its concurrence in the one opinion, expressed unanimously by the representatives of the neutral Powers in the recent Conference. He agreed with the hon. Member for Rochdale (Mr. Cobden) that it was desirable that the Great Powers should meet to settle such matters by arbitration, instead of by bloodshed; but he put it to the hon. Member whether there was any use in those Powers coming to a decision if they lacked the means to carry it into effect. He thought that the hon. Member must by this time have come to the conclusion that a mere resort to arbitration in affairs of this kind was totally useless, if there were no means available for enforcing the judgment arrived at. It was, in fact, almost an insult to ask the Great Powers to meet in Conference unless the Power that convened them was prepared to act on their advice, not by the mere acceptance of it, but by using the necessary means to carry it into effect. He wished further to remind the hon. Member for Rochdale that the Danish people were a free people, and that the cause of Denmark was the cause of freedom, civil and religious, the cause of constitutional government. Such were the views which actuated him in proposing his Amendment. He was sorry that the order of debate forced him to interpose so early upon the consideration of the House. It appeared to him, however, that the House might well adopt his Amendment in vindication of its own privileges, thus expressing an opinion on a matter, which had been formerly referred to their consideration by Her Majesty's Ministers. Let him advert for a moment to past circumstances. He agreed with the

Member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli), when that right hon. Gentleman attributed the present difficulty to the devious and uncertain course of Her Majesty's Government on the question of Poland. He (Mr. Newdegate) believed that that was the origin of the difficulties in which this country was now placed; and he feared, unless England manifested a disposition to lead the way in the cause of justice for Denmark, that France might shrink from the task, and that Russia would think the menaces which the noble Lord conveyed in his speech of Monday last as little likely to be realized, as those were which Earl Russell had before directed against herself when urging the cause of Poland. He (Mr. Newdegate) feared that England had lost some of her influence with the Powers of Europe. He did not, however, think that the nation was disgraced. He considered that it was of the deepest importance, in the interest of free institutions, and of religious and of civil freedom, as well as in that of the peace of the world, that England should take some steps to regain that influence which he believed she had lost. He did not wish to see England, if it could be avoided, take this step alone; but even if she were left alone in the matter, he thought that she should take that step. Surely neither the spirit of the country nor her resources were sunk so low that she was to be told by her Majesty's Government, at whose disposal she placed £30,000,000 annually for the support of her naval and military services, that when an Ally, to whom she was deeply bound, was trampled upon by a combination of powerful German States, England was so weak, so enervated by luxury, so selfish in her wealth, so impotent in her armaments, and so lost to what she had once proved herself capable of, that she must quietly submit to be a silent spectator of a grievous wrong being done to a weak but friendly State, because Russia or France declined to assist her in a matter which, after all, concerned England as a maritime nation far more deeply than either of the other Powers to which he had referred. In saying this he did not wish it to be understood that he was advocating inevitable and immediate war. The meaning of his Amendment was simply that the House should declare its readiness to co-operate with the Allies of England before those evils ensued, which the noble Earl foreshadowed as possible, and which seemed both probable and imminent from the violence with which the German Powers were acting. He did not desire that we should undertake war single-handed; nevertheless, he would never admit, that if the necessity should arise, England could not make war single-handed, that because she was alone that therefore she must submit to dishonour or humiliation before the nations of the world, that she should for a moment cower beneath insult or aggression on the part of any Power however formidable. It was his belief, if the House should think fit to concur in his Amendment, and should show to the world that the Power that convened the Conference was ready to lead the way in carrying the measures, recommended by her representative and adopted by the majority of the Conference, into effect, that it was probable that the other Powers would concur in doing justice to the manifestation of the ancient courage of their Ally, and would give their adherence to the undertaking. Germany would then be made to see the probability of her being excelled in arms by those Powers whose advice she had rejected, and would be driven to re-consider that course of violence and wrong-doing which she was pursuing. Prudence would then dictate to even 40,000,000 of people, always supposing them to be unanimous in the course they adopted, the folly of encountering the hostility of mighty millions of people united and represented by their combined navies and armies, called to avenge a grave outrage inflicted upon a weak but gallant nation. He was not prepared to vote with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire for a Resolution which implied that his country was disgraced. If the right hon. Gentleman really thought so, then he asked him to join in supporting his Amendment, that it might be proved to the world that if England were disgraced, she was prepared to wipe out the stain as effectually and with as little delay as possible. He advocated that course in no spirit of rashness, or from any desire to give an offence to any of the Powers of Europe. He proposed his Amendment in deference to the judgment of, and out of respect to, those Powers whose advice we sought. It was hardly respectful to convene the Powers of Europe at a Conference, and then to tell the neutral Powers, whose function it was to arbitrate, and whose opinion was unanimous, that though their advice might be very good, they might return back to their respective countries, as England declined to give them any assurance that she was prepared to carry out the advice which they had so kindly tendered. Under the name of the independence of Denmark there were two meanings, one merely the independent Government of Denmark Proper, the other the independence of the kingdom, as contemplated under the terms of the Treaty of 1852. The Great Powers concurred in the treaty of that year in order that they might so strengthen Denmark as to enable her to maintain her independence by herself. Well, that arrangement had in this respect failed. The Powers did not foresee the combination of the German Powers which had since taken place under the auspices of the Diet of Frankfort. They thought that by a combination of several elements within the Danish monarchy they had furnished her with strength to enable her to maintain her independence. That anticipation had been defeated by the intrigues and the combination of the German Powers; when the Diet was created or empowered in 1815 the view was this, that this Diet should be a Federal Power to secure the independence of various small States in Germany. But the statesmen of that day did not anticipate that this Federal Power should become an aggressive Power in Europe, and that there should be a contest between Austria and Prussia as to which should lead in the Assembly of the Diet, and that certain elements in that Assembly, by making use of this rivalry, should command both Austria and Prussia. It was never intended that, in the centre of Europe, there should by these means be established an aggressive Power which should act for the aggrandisement of itself, overwhelming its weaker neighbours, so that it might be enabled to establish a German fleet which should be at its command, it might be for purposes not less aggressive than the course now pursued by the Diet, in its proceedings towards Denmark. That was a combination which had not been foreseen, and therefore he should be glad to see the House adopt the proposal made by England in the Conference. If Denmark, while she yet retained Holstein, her most wealthy province, and the south of Schleswig, had been unable to resist Germany, no one would imagine that if Denmark were reduced, as suggested by the majority of the Conference, she could maintain her independence unless she were guaranteed by the other Powers. It seemed to him that it would be enough if England and Sweden were alone to guarantee the independence of Denmark, and that under that guarantee Denmark could resume her position of an independent Power, as an item in the balance of power in Europe, and as an element for the security of a permanent European peace. But he believed that if it were once known that England and Sweden would guarantee Denmark, Russia would also join in the guarantee, and then they would see Denmark re-established, and with this state of things, that the demand of Germany for access to the sea would be conceded on the part of the neutral Powers by the cession of Holstein and the southern part of Schleswig, whilst at the same time there would be securities for the maintenance of peace, which was the object of the Powers which concurred in the Treaty of 1852. In conclusion, he would say that, believing, as he did, that the noble Lord would not have told them that a contingency might arise which would require that England should go to war with Germany, unless there were good grounds for that anticipation; and thinking that it would be better that England, by adopting the decision of the neutral Powers in the Conference, should manifest her intention to interfere—believing this, he hoped that that House would concur in the conclusion to which he had arrived, that it was wise to act decisively now rather than later; because the deferring our action whilst war continued was only to entail a greater sacrifice of life, and still further to degrade Denmark, who was already sufficiently oppressed. If Denmark was to be satisfied with such a mitigated independence as was accorded to a State dependent upon the Federal Diet of Germany—and that was the prospect they had before them, for to that position Denmark must fall if England did not interfere—it would be better to say at once to Denmark, "England will not aid you to maintain your real independence; England will not exert herself in the sense of her traditional policy as embodied in the Treaty of 1852; England dare not go to war alone." If the House rejected this Amendment, then the people of Denmark would know that the only occasion on which England would interfere would be when the capital of Denmark was taken and her King was a prisoner. If she could obtain no available resource from the friendship of England, then Denmark should be made to understand at once that it would be wise in her to become a dependency of the German Powers, rather than to rely one hour longer upon England; but he must say that it would be an act of cruelty to allow this war to continue without a declaration on the part of the House, either that it was proper to act in the sense of the decision given in the Conference by the neutral Powers, or that Denmark should be emphatically recommended either to make terms with Germany as best she might; if not, that she should seek elsewhere some more trustworthy ally.

MR. H. G. LANGTON seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out the second paragraph of the proposed Question, in order to insert the words "To submit to Her Majesty the opinion of this House, that the independence of Denmark and the possessions of that Cingdom, on the terms proposed by the Representatives of the Neutral Powers in the recent Conference, ought to be guaranteed," —(*Mr. Newdegate,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. KINGLAKE said, that since it was obvious that the Amendment proposed by the hon. Gentleman the Member for North Warwickshire, would be altogether inconsistent with that which he had the honour to place on the notice-book, it might, perhaps, be convenient to the House to regard the two as one, and to permit him, at that early period of the debate, to state the purpose for which he had introduced his Amendment to the House. But before doing so, it would be right to offer this one remark upon the Amendment moved by the hon. Gentleman. The hon. Gentleman proposed that the Government should guarantee to the King of Denmark all that portion of Schleswig which lay north of the dividing line of the Schlei. But this disputed territory was at present in the hands of the German Powers, and, therefore, to propose to guarantee to Denmark territories which were in possession of the German armies was simply to propose war, and something more—war at this moment, and liability to war through all time to come. Because, if we were to guarantee these mixed districts to the King of Denmark he could not imagine that any one would live to see a period when the Government of this country might not be called upon to act on that guarantee. Although they were now engaged in a great party conflict, he asked the House to remember that the transactions forming the subject of the present discussion had also been the subject of debate on several occasions between the first night of the Session and the time when the lips of Members were sealed by the opening of the Conference. He had had the honour of taking part in those debates from time to time, and the speeches he had made showed plainly enough that in many respects he could not and did not agree with the policy of Her Majesty's Government. Many other Gentlemen took a similar view. This disapproval or difference from the policy of Her Majesty's Government continued until the period when the Conference closed. But on Monday last the noble Lord at the head of the Government came down and made one of the most important announcements that the House had ever been called upon to hear. He announced to the House that it was not the intention of Her Majesty's Government in the present conjuncture to advise Her Majesty to take up arms. In that decision of Her Majesty's Government he (Mr. Kinglake) entirely concurred; and the House would therefore understand the dilemma in which he and those who had taken a similar part with him were placed. If he were to vote a direct negative to the censure proposed by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) he should apparently be departing insome degree from that course of remonstrance which he had maintained during the earlier part of the Session; on the other hand, if he voted for the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, he should be censuring Her Majesty's Government at the very moment when they had come to a decision with which he and others so cordially concurred. That was a dilemma in which no one ought to be placed if the forms of the House would allow him to evade it, and for that reason he had put upon the notice-book the Amendment standing in his name. He would remind the House that in the policy of Her Majesty's Government, speaking merely from the votes of the House of Commons, there had been a long acquiescence. ["No!"] He was speaking not of the opinions of hon. Members, but of votes of the House; and that acquiescence lasting for years—for some of the early papers had been delivered years ago—continued down to the day when the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman was announced. He himself, and those with whom he acted, were not responsible for that acquiescence. It was due entirely to the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Disraeli), who, when his hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard (Mr. B. Osborne) made one of the most able statements he had ever heard on this intricate subject—a statement, by-the-by, in which was put before the House in a forcible manner a great deal of what they had heard again that evening from the right hon. Gentleman—confined himself to moving the Previous Question. ["Hear, Hear !"] Hon. Gentlemen cheered as if they supposed that the determination to move the Previous Question on that occasion was a very wise and sagacious decision. They seemed to suppose that Her Majesty's Government having a pitfall before it, it was very clever on their part to keep the House quiet, and to allow the Government to encounter the catastrophe. He did not himself think that an honest way of dealing with questions of foreign policy in that House. The period in question was one, as far as he could judge, when the House had an admirable opportunity of coming to some decision, of indicating a policy, and if not of guiding the Government, at any rate of warning them from some of the dangers by which they were surrounded. The right hon. Gentleman determined not to take advantage of the opportunity, and he moved the Previous Question. He not only moved, but he brought about the Previous Question in a sense sometimes attributed to persons not familiar with the forms of the House, who believed this Motion to imply that the House on its being carried reverted to the last subject of debate. That was exactly what the right hon. Gentleman did; for he went back to the subject of Poland, and the result was that the Previous Question was carried in a double sense of the term. These transactions were followed by the declaration of the noble Lord (Viscount Palmerston) on Monday last. He had now to call the attention of the House to the very singular reservation of opinions on the part of the right hon. Gentleman and of those with whom he acted on the present occasion. On Monday last the noble Lord announced that the Government had come to the determination not to advise the Queen to take up arms; and that was coincident with the close of the deliberations of the Conference. He (Mr. Kinglake) acknowledged that there was here a general conjunction of circumstances, and that the period was quite ripe for the hon. Gentleman opposite to address the Crown on the present state of affairs. Accordingly the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) moved an Address to the Queen. The first sentence of the Address informed Her Majesty of that which they all knew already, and it concluded with a complaint that the just influence of England in the councils of Europe had been lowered. Was that a complaint with which it was worthy for hon. Gentlemen to approach the Throne at a moment when a declaration of the greatest importance had been conveyed from it to Parliament? He could quite understand that hon. Gentlemen opposite might be in favour of peace or they might be in favour of war; but that they should address the Crown after a decision had been announced by the Government on that Question and reserve their own opinion on it was, to him, altogether unintelligible. If any private Member endeavoured to obtain a Vote of Censure on the Government for any portion of their foreign policy, would it not be thought strange indeed if he were to withhold any statement of his opinion on the question of peace or war? Yet that was just what the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman did. There was not a word in it indicating whether or not the Opposition approved the determination announced by the noble Lord. In fact, the question seemed to be forgotten altogether by the right hon. Gentleman in the stress of party politics. The word "peace," however, did creep into the Resolution, but it was mentioned merely as one of the advantages which would result from what the right hon. Gentleman was pleased to call "influence." In distant Asiatic ports a traveller often met with a Consul or Vice Consul who had been lately checked in some of his proceedings by the Government at home, and who was therefore full of complaints to every one who dined with him about the influence of England having been lowered. That was just the sort of complaint with which the right hon. Gentleman at this grave juncture thought fit to approach the Throne. If by influence the right hon. Gentleman meant the might of England, then he entirely denied that it had been lessened. The influence of England in the Councils of Europe depended on the belief that England was strong, and if she kept up her real strength her influence would not be lowered by a number of hasty despatches. The influence of England depended on her actual strength, and the best way to maintain her influence was to hoard her resources, and at such a time as this to avoid so preposterous a war as that into which they would have been plunged had the decision of the Government been other than it had been. The Resolution, as it seemed to him, was directed rather against the effects alleged to have been produced by the conduct of the Government than against any actual shortcoming on their part. It was so worded, however, that he could suppose that it was intended to disclose something else;—it was so framed that one interpretation might be that the credit of England had been lowered by the course taken by Her Majesty's Government. ["Hear!"] Hon. Gentlemen by that cheer showed their adhesion to that view. He should have thought they might have acted more prudently; because it was quite plain that exactly as the charge succeeded against Her Majesty's Government it succeeded, so to speak, against England. He did not wish to be misunderstood on that point. He would not presume to say that because the credit of the country had been mixed up with the misconduct of the Government, the Government should seek shelter in any way under the supposition that criticism of their behaviour would endanger the credit of the country. But what he said was that where the criticism of the Government assumed such a form that if carried it would do injury to the reputation of the nation, then it was the duty of all of them at least to take care that the criticism was fair, to scrutinize it deliberately, and to see that an unjust stigma of this kind was not wrongfully fastened upon England by her own House of Commons. He could not admit that they were driven to so painful a conclusion as that which the Motion suggested. He had from time to time expressed disapproval of much that Her Majesty's Government had done; but he should refuse to go to the length of saying that the mismanagement had been carried so far that the honour of England was affected as alleged. The object he believed was to show that by addressing encouragement and advice to Denmark and threats to the other Powers, England had placed herself in a situation which made it difficult, if not impossible, for her to recede with honour. A single observation disposed of much that had been said with regard to the alleged threats. But he believed that the greater part of that charge would be disposed of by the observation that in almost every portion of the correspondence from which it was possible to evolve anything like a threat it would be found that England was acting in her European character, and common sense would tell them that when such was the case it should be understood that she was speaking to those she was addressing not as a single nation, but as one of the parties to the Treaty of 1852, and in conjunction with her co-signataries. That undertaking was fulfilled when England endeavoured to form a league against the German Powers—a league which through the prudence of the Emperor of the French failed. She did her part when she tried to obtain the co-operation of the other Powers in checking the aggression of Germany, and nothing would have been so quixotic as for England to go to war for Denmark single-handed. England was not the sole policeman of Europe. As to the encouragement said to have been given to Denmark by the noble Lord in July last year, those words had already been adverted to by the Chancellor of the Exchequer; but he (Mr. Kinglake) thought that there was one view of the case arising out of these words which had not been adverted to by the right hon. Gentleman. It should be borne in mind that the words were spoken in a totally different state of circumstances from that which now existed. The words were spoken in July last, but the present cause of war did not arise until after the death of the King, in the November following; and another existing cause of the war was the proclamation of the constitution by the present King a few days afterwards, and the coercion which, if it had taken place in July, would have been under totally different circumstances. With regard to giving advice to a weaker Power, he had always entertained the strongest opinion as to the danger which such a course involved. He knew of nothing more dangerous for a great State to do than to engage in a system of advising a weaker Power when it was in danger of being oppressed by stronger ones. But there was a great distinction between advising a weaker Power to make concessions and recommending it to offer resistance. England did advise Denmark to make concessions, and as far as he knew that advice had in every instance proved to be good. [“No, no!”] Hon. Gentlemen cried “No, no;” but he believed it was so, because in every instance it had the effect of putting Denmark more and more in the right. In no instance, as far as he knew, did our Government address to Denmark any erroneous advice. The tendency of every word addressed to Denmark was to strengthen her by increasing her moral claim upon the assistance of Europe. When, for instance, our Government recommended Denmark to withdraw the Patent of March that was advising her to avoid a continuance in what every one who had read the papers acknowledged to have been an offence against Germany, and so with reference to the Constitution of November. It was, he believed, admitted by all that that Constitution was a breach of the engagements of 1851 and 1852, and, therefore, the Government did well in advising the Danes to place themselves right with regard to those matters. But he did not find that in any instance Her Majesty's Government had advised them to resist. On the contrary, he well remembered that with reference to the invasion of Schleswig they observed a strict silence as to whether Denmark should make any resistance. There was another matter which had not been referred to in the course of this debate, but which appeared to him to be of great importance, not only to the honour of the Government, but to that of England. When a great Power was supporting or encouraging a weaker one under the stress or threat of pressure there always arose this condition of things—that the greater Power dictated to the lesser one the manner in which she should conduct herself in the quarrel. The greater Power, in consideration of the assistance which the weaker one hoped to obtain from her, placed her under obligation to be moderate and to accede to her suggestions; and if the minor Power declined to do so, then, of course, the responsibility of the greater Power ceased. For instance, at the time of the Crimean war, when England was giving, or likely to give, assistance to Turkey, the Porte was kept, so to speak, in a state of subjugation to England. During the whole of that period Lord Stratford De Redcliffe would never allow Turkey to take a course of her own. If that illustration was applied to the case of Denmark, it would be found that Denmark had, he would not say placed herself in the wrong, but had to a great extent discharged England from her responsibility. In the year 1862 Lord Russell proposed terms for the acceptance of Denmark, and procured their acceptance by Austria, Prussia, Germany, Russia, and France. Denmark rejected them. She had a perfect right to reject them, but by doing so she for the time forfeited her right to expect that she would have the support of England. Again, what happened in the Conference? Why, twice over Denmark resisted the counsels of England, and her very last act was to reject the terms proposed to her by France. France and England proposed that the decision of the boundary should be left to the populations. Denmark rejected that counsel, and so lost the claim she had before to the assistance of France. If it was true, as he thought it was, that the honour of England was not at stake, it was still more easily made apparent that no policy could require England to take part in a war of this kind. He believed that Lord Derby said that a war against Germany for this purpose would be madness. He would, therefore, address himself to those who took a more warlike view of the question. But, supposing for the sake of argument that there was a time when war would have been right, that time was gone by. He could enter into the view of the Gentlemen who said that when the German Powers crossed the frontiers of Schleswig there was a cause of war; or of those who said that when the Treaty of London was broken England ought to have gone to war. Those were positions which he should disapprove, but still they were tenable positions, and in the eyes of many men would be right; but to say that after having given up the Treaty of London in the Conference and assented to the invasion of Schleswig we were at the eleventh hour to make up our minds to go to war for a narrow strip of territory in that Duchy, was a proposal which must revolt the common sense of all who heard it. It would be a violation of the principle of non-intervention on which we had been accustomed to lay stress, and a violation of it in its best sense, that it was our duty to abstain from interference in the internal affairs of another State. He trusted that he had made it plain that such a war would be impolitic, that it would be too late, and that it would violate the principle to which he had just referred; but he admitted that to show this would be to show nothing, unless he had also shown, as he trusted he had, that our continued enjoyment of the blessings of peace was consistent with our national honour.

GENERAL PEEL: At last that opportunity, which at an earlier period of the Session I ventured to predict would be afforded to the Government to explain and, if possible, to defend their foreign policy, has arrived; and, at last, we are able to give expression to those feelings which the events that have occurred around us must have created in the breasts of all. I think the House of Commons has only done its duty by refraining, while the Conference was sitting, from entering into any discussion upon this subject. It is not the province of the House of Commons to carry on negotiations with foreign Powers, or to interfere with those upon whom the duty and responsibility of doing so rests; but it is the duty of the House of Commons, which I look upon as the guardian, not only of the interests, but of the honour of the country, to demand the strictest account of the manner in which those duties have been performed, and it is in the execution of that duty that I, or any other Member, have a right to call upon the Government for an account of their stewardship, and to judge by the manner in which it has been executed whether it is right that the honour of the country should be any longer intrusted to their charge. Although, Sir, I address you from this bench, and although I entirely agree in the address which my right hon. Friend has moved, and take upon myself the full responsibility of my share in its proposal, it is not my intention to make a party speech, or for any party purpose. No man in this House feels more strongly, or is more actuated by those party feelings than I am; but there is a greater party than any in this House to which we all belong, and that is our country; and it is as an Englishman, or rather as a citizen of the United Kingdom—for I am perfectly certain that, when the honour of this country is concerned, there will be no distinction between Englishmen, Irishmen, and Scotchmen—that I express those feelings of deep humiliation which I, in common, I believe, with a large majority of my countrymen, have felt for the position this country has been placed in. I have thus distinctly stated the capacity in which I address you, because I always say what I think myself, and not what others think; and no man, far less any party, is responsible for the opinions I am about to express, as to the manner in which the foreign policy of this country ought to be conducted. Now, nothing has created, in my mind, greater astonishment than the admiration which has always been expressed by the party opposite for the foreign policy of the Government. It is matter of notoriety that after they had thrown over their Reform Bill they existed entirely on the credit of their foreign policy. They were extravagant beyond precedent. There was nothing in the measures which they brought forward to recommend them, or rather there were none; neither was there anything in the administration of the various offices, except, perhaps, that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer—for I wish to do justice to everybody—which could entitle them to any large share of public approbation. As I said before, they existed entirely on the credit of their foreign policy, and the personal popularity of the noble Lord the First Minister, that popularity being derived from the feeling which prevailed throughout the country that, at all events, the national honour would be duly guarded as long as the noble Lord was a Member of the Government. How far that feeling has been justified by subsequent events I leave the House to judge. There is not a Member on the opposite side of the House who has not in speeches or addresses to his constituents—and the observation applies to more than one Member on this side—thought it necessary to express his approval of the foreign policy of the Government. To all these the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has a right to say—My policy has ever been the same. From the first moment I entered office, I have constantly and systematically interfered in the affairs of other nations. Notwithstanding all the rebuffs which I have received, and the humiliations to which I have been subjected, I have persevered in that course of moral interference. I do not suppose the noble Lord would like to enter into a detail of all these rebuffs, and it will be sufficient to refer to a few of them. He might say — I remonstrated against the annexation of Savoy and Nice in the strongest language I dare make use of; but recollect it was only a remonstrance and not a protest, and was treated with the greatest possible contempt, no notice whatever being taken of it. Again he might say, I interfered in the affairs of Poland, until it was absolutely necessary for me to do something, or to submit to the humiliation of being told to hold my tongue, and mind my own business—an alternative I gladly availed myself of—assuring the Russian Government, that it was with great pleasure that I heard they continued to maintain the same favourable feelings towards Poland that I had been all along remonstrating and protesting against. With regard to the German States, the noble Lord might tell the admirers of his foreign policy, I endeavoured to intimidate them, by telling them that I could not look with indifference at the course which they were pursuing; but they told me by acts, if not by words, that they were perfectly indifferent how I looked. You will therefore perceive that my system of moral interference has been a complete failure. The noble Lord would be fully justified in addressing this language to the admirers of his foreign policy; but I have never been one of them, and have the satisfaction of knowing that I have been as consistent in the condemnation of that policy, as the noble Lord has been in carrying it out. It is not always that one would wish to be tied down to opinions given, and prophecies made on the subject of foreign policy, some two years and a half ago, in an after-dinner speech to our constituents; but looking back to a speech which I made at Huntingdon on the last day of October, 1861, I see nothing to alter in it, and it is as applicable to the present time as it was to that; and I am about to refer to it for two reasons, first to show that I am not to-night adopting a policy merely to suit the present circumstances, and secondly, and above all, as an answer to that question, which has been so often put, but never answered—What would you have done? On the occasion to which I allude, I had been consoling my constituents for the change of Government which had taken place, by assuring them that, on all the great questions of the day, the good sense of the country had so explicitly and unmistakably declared itself, that it mattered little what men happened to be in power, as the wishes of the country must be carried out. I said, that by the Volunteer movement and the great scheme of fortifications proposed by the noble Lord opposite, the country had expressed its determination to be defended against any attack that could possibly be made upon it; but it was equally determined not to be drawn into a war on account of others, or for the purpose of carrying out an idea. I said then, as I say now, that I was perfectly astonished at the praises lavished by the liberal party on the foreign policy of the Government, and at the proud position which they said we held, and the moral influence which we exercised, in the affairs of Europe, and that I believed our position was, to be disliked and detested by every nation under the sun. True it was we had that amount of respect paid to us which our wealth and power must always command, but it was respect accompanied by dislike and distrust, and not by regard. I said that at that time we were told we were not to rely upon the Emperor of the French, but were to look elsewhere for allies, and I asked then, as I ask now, where was there a single country that would not prefer an alliance with France to one with England, and wherefore all this distrust? Depend upon it, I said, no man is hated by everybody without some cause. I then told them an anecdote of a gentleman who was notorious for constant meddling and interfering with other people's affairs, who got involved in a quarrel in consequence of doing so, and applied to a distinguished nobleman and judge of the world to act as his friend The nobleman said to him, Will you fight? because, if you will not, depend upon it the less you interfere with other people's affairs the better it will be for you; and I said then, two years and a half ago, that if we followed the admirable advice given upon that occasion we should have far less chance of drifting into another war; and I ask now, if we have not been on the point of drifting into another war; and if we have escaped, if it has not been solely owing to our having thrown our honour overboard? I said then, as I say now, that I am as anxious to maintain the honour and to promote the interests of the country as any man can be; but I have to learn that honour is maintained, or interest promoted, by interfering with everybody on every occasion and making use of overbearing language. On the contrary, I observed that man walks safest and most respected through a crowd who avoids interfering with others; and that if there ever was an occasion in which the *suaviter in modo* and *fortiter in re* were to be practised, it was in dealing with nations as proud as ourselves. The noble Lord's method of practising the *suaviter in modo* may be ascertained by his treatment of the German Powers; and what his ideas of *fortiter in re* are, I leave unfortunate Denmark to decide. The noble Lord persevered in his course of moral interference; and, at the commencement of the present year, it had produced the following effects. In the speech from the Throne, on the opening of Parliament, Her Majesty was obliged to omit, for the first time, I believe, the paragraph that informed the country that Her Majesty continued to receive friendly assurances from all Foreign Powers. And no wonder it was omitted, for I read at the time the following account of our relations with other countries, which I believe to have been perfectly correct. It said—

> "Our policy has led us to a point where we must either engage single-handed in a war with Germany, or justly be branded as big-mouthed bullies, who sneak off at the first show of danger, leaving our friends at the mercy of their enemies. Despised in Germany, and laughed at as the manufacturers of *bruta fulmina* launched weekly at the Diet, which simply takes no notice of them, except to publish them for newspaper critics to amuse themselves with picking out all the absurdities and fallacies they contain; execrated in Denmark as perfidious allies; thoroughly estranged from France; laughed at but distrusted by Russia; cursed in their dying agony by the Poles; disliked equally by the Confederates and Unionists in America, we stand alone in the wide world. Our policy, based on no conceivable principle, says one thing in the North, another in the South; advocates one set of principles in Italy, the very opposite principle in Germany. Such is Whig foreign policy.

Now, I would ask, What is it that has reduced us to this state? How has it come to pass that the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs—who in private life is an example of every virtue and every quality which Englishmen honour and respect, and who, during the course of a long public life, has earned for himself a name which even his political opponents — and I have ever been one of them—respect and are proud of; how is it, I say, that this amiable man, who is so much loved and esteemed here, should make himself, or rather his country, so unpopular and so much disliked abroad? How is it that the instant he dips his pen into official ink—and it appears never to be out of it—his whole nature seems to be changed, and instead of conciliating, he contrives to offend everybody, and that not so much by the thing done as by the manner of doing it. It may be said that he has maintained peace, and that we have no enemies; but we have no friends, and are looked upon with suspicion and distrust by other nations. There is a general feeling abroad, founded, I fear, upon too much truth, that we have one policy for the weak and another for the strong; and that, although we interfere with all alike, we treat very differently any breach of treaty on the part of an Emperor of China or Japan, a King of the Ashantees, or a New Zealand Chief, than we do a similar infraction by any of the Powers of Europe. The noble Lord opposite gave as an excuse the other day for not telling us what everybody else knew, that there was a great difference between the declaration of a Prime Minister to Parliament and a statement in a newspaper. I perfectly agree that the time has been when the declaration of the Prime Minister of this country, delivered to the House of Commons, would have been looked upon by all Foreign Powers as binding, and as certain to be carried into effect as that of the most absolute monarch in the world; but is that so now? I need not remind the noble Lord of that of which he has been reminded so often—namely, his declaration that if any body entered the Duchies, Denmark would not be left alone. Again, we have heard him declare that the entrance of Austria and Prussia into Jutland was an aggravation of their already outrageous and infamous conduct. What is the meaning of such language? What is the use of it, unless it is to be acted up to? Is it come to this, that the words of the Prime Minister of England, uttered in the Parliament of England, are to be regarded as mere idle menaces, to be laughed at and despised by Foreign Powers? Why, Sir, it is said—

> "That women fight with words,
> Monks with curses, men with swords."

Now, I have not the slightest wish to see this country engaged in a war of the latter description; but the only way to prevent it with honour, is to avoid having recourse to those two other methods of warfare, in the exercise of which the noble Lords the Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary have become such adepts, that neither woman or monk would have the slightest chance with them. But, Sir, this war of words is neither safe or honourable. There are only two principles on which the foreign policy of this country can be carried out. If you choose to set yourselves up as the champions of the world, and to constitute yourselves the arbiters of other people's affairs, you must be prepared to fight for your position. Other countries as proud as yourselves will not tamely submit to your dictation. If, on the other hand, you are determined not to fight under any circumstances, if peace at any price is to be maintained, why, then, silence and non-intervention must be part of that price. I heard, with astonishment, an announcement of the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary in another place, that the country is so prosperous, that nothing in the world must be permitted to interfere with that prosperity. But what would be said in private life of a man who refused to defend his honour on the ground that he was too rich to be shot at? It would almost appear that the commercial interests of the country had dictated to the Government, that they must shut their eyes to everything that passes abroad; and that if a case should arise similar, according to your own account, to that of the man who fell among thieves, you are not to act the part of the good Samaritan, but, like the Levite, pass on the opposite side of the way, and leave him to his fate, although that fate may have been caused by following your advice and trusting to your promises of support. If you are not prepared to keep your word to your neighbours—if it be to your own hindrance—you had better not only shut your eyes, but your mouths also. Again, if you are prepared to violate your own laws by the seizure of vessels without proof of any infraction of the law—if you say, let justice perish but peace be preserved; and if you do all this at the dictation of a foreign country, conveyed to you in terms so insulting that it appears matter of doubt whether the Minister of this country is to pocket the affront, or the Minister who presents it to pocket the despatch containing it—to be, however, published and proclaimed abroad as having been presented; if these be the terms on which the foreign policy of the country is to be conducted, we are indeed what the first Napoleon described us to be—a nation of shopkeepers; but the shopkeepers that existed in his day—from one of whom I am proud of being descended—were of a different race from these, for they preferred their country's honour to their own gains; and, instead of peace at any price being their motto, they preferred honour at any price, and what is more they paid for it. Now, I would preserve both the peace and the honour of the country; but you (the Government) have imperilled the one and tarnished the other. I say emphatically that you have tarnished the honour of the country, for I appeal to every Englishman, let his politics be what they may, whether he has not felt a sense of the deepest humiliation at seeing a small country whom we were bound by treaty to acknowledge, and by promises to defend, overwhelmed by odds, which, if a similar event had occurred in private life, the greatest coward in the world would have rushed forward to rescue the weak from the strong, without inquiring into the cause of the quarrel, but which in this case you have described to be an outrageous and infamous attack of the strong upon the weak. There was a discussion in this House last week as to whether the breed of English horses had deteriorated. I trust that there can be no question as to the breed of Englishmen; at all events, we may derive one consolation from what has passed, but one I trust so remote that not the youngest of you will live to witness it—but you may tell your children, or your children's children, that they will be ruled hereafter by monarchs in whose veins flow the blood of that heroic race, who have proved themselves worthy of reigning over a free and brave people. Sir, I have said that I would maintain both the peace and honour of the country, and I do not see why the Foreign Minister of this country, who, I trust, will always be an English gentleman, should not be guided in the conduct of the affairs of his office by exactly the same principles that would govern his private life. I would have him jealous alike of his country's honour, and his own—if either were really insulted—I would have him

"Right the wrong where it is given,
If it were in the court of heaven."

But I would not have him easily offended, or imagine people intended to insult him, who had not the least wish to do so. I would have him live on terms of peace and friendship with everybody; a friendship founded on mutual good will, on mutual respect, mutual forbearance when any cause of difference arose, but, above all, a mutual reliance on each other's honour and good intentions. And I would not wish to see any closer bond of union between them. I am opposed to all treaties and guarantees that render it necessary to interfere with the affairs of others; and you may depend upon it, that a country that is guided by these principles will not only live in peace with her neighbours, but will be respected and looked up to by the whole world. Such I believe would be the effect of the policy I have laid down. The effect of the policy pursued by Her Majesty's Government may be summed up in one short sentence —You have made us the open shame of our enemies, the very scorn and derision of all that are round about us.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, that whatever might be the merits of the speech of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman, (General Peel) there could be no doubt that it was very fittingly delivered in support of the Resolution moved by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bucks; for unquestionably that Resolution was not of an explicit character. At a time when it was most desirable to speak plainly on a subject which was capable of plain and intelligible exposition, the Resolution left it in doubt whether it was for peace or war. ["Oh!"] Did the Resolution censure the Government for having abstained from warlike operations, or did it censure the mode in which the negotiations had been conducted? If it meant the last, it would have been very easy to have said so, and, without leaving the question in any doubt, it might have made it quite distinct that, in the opinion of hon. Gentlemen opposite, the Government had done quite right in abstaining from hostilities and in not going to war. It was very easy to perceive what the real object of the Resolution was. As he had said the speech of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had been very fittingly delivered in support of the Motion. The first part of it led him to think that the policy of the right hon. Gentleman would have chalked out for the country during last year was that of abstaining altogether from interfering in the affairs of our neighbours, of taking no part in the struggle in Germany, of attending to our own domestic concerns, and not running the risk of entangling ourselves in Europe. The right hon. Gentleman would have made no treaties and given no guarantees. But who was it who made the treaty of 1852? The right hon. and gallant Gentleman's friends were in office at the time, and he (the Lord Advocate) thought he was entitled to ask who it was who made the Treaty of 1852? In asking that question he was obliged also to ask why it was that they made it, and why they at that time put themselves forward to interfere in the affairs of their neighbours? The right hon. and gallant Gentleman said England was disgraced and degraded because they had sat still and seen a weak Power oppressed by a strong one. Would the right hon. Gentleman, then, not have sat still and witnessed such a sight? If not, would he have endeavoured to prevent it by negotiation; and if negotiation failed, would he have had recourse to war? Let them say what they liked — let them wrap it up in what rhetorical artifice they pleased —the Resolution before the House was a war Resolution. ["Oh, oh!"] Were it not so would anything have been easier or more appropriate than that now, when the people, through their representatives, were to give an opinion on the policy of the country, hon. Gentlemen should declare in plain terms whether they thought a policy of peace or a policy of war was right for this country? He did not ask the hon. Gentleman opposite to say what their own policy was, but he was entitled to ask them to say what the policy of the Government ought to have been. The hon. Gentlemen opposite, in moving this Resolution, were not speaking, and did not intend to speak, to this country only. They were speaking to Europe, and especially to the belligerents, who would not stop to scan their nicely weighed periods, but would take that Resolution to mean war. He accepted the Motion as a Vote of Censure, and as such it was perfectly reasonable that the sense of the House and the country should be taken upon it. He (the Lord Advocate) was prepared to deal with the Resolution in that sense. There were only two questions involved in the discussion — first, whether they ought to have taken an active part in the war between Germany and Denmark; and secondly, whether, supposing they were right in not doing so, the negotiations had been so conducted as to render them fairly liable to the censure implied in that Motion. He would maintain with confidence that there was no ground whatever for the censure now sought to be cast upon the Government. In the first place, he said it was not true that they had held out delusive promises to Denmark, but that, on the contrary, from first to last their language had been of a totally different character; that they had neither held out, nor did Denmark believe that they had held out, to her hopes which had been falsified. In the next place, as regarded Germany, he said it was not true that they had used the language of menace, but that their language had been suited to the occasion, and had been rightly and properly employed. In the third place, he said that, whatever expectations they had held out on the one hand, or whatever warnings they had given on the other, they had shown that they were ready to act up to them; and, in the fourth place, he said they were perfectly right not to go to war. He would endeavour not only to enunciate but to prove these propositions — but when they were all proved there was something behind; and if they stopped with those propositions they would do but scanty justice to the protracted diplomatic struggle which formed the subject matter of the Conference. He had read the Correspondence, and it had not produced on his mind the sense of humiliation which seemed to exist on the other side. So far from thinking the position of this country had been lowered or its honour tarnished, he did not know of one European Power among all those which had signed the Treaty of 1852 which was so well entitled as England to look back with the feeling that it had done its duty. In order properly to test the truth of the allegation that delusive encouragement had been given to Denmark they must separate the representations made to that State from those made to the German Powers. The Treaty of 1852 did not originate in any officious meddling with the concerns of other people, but was notoriously concluded in the interests of Europe with the active concurrence of both parties in the State. Although it contained no guarantee, the considerations which induced the British Government, in conjunction with their co-signataries, to bind themselves by it in 1852 fairly claimed some attention at their hands ten years later. In September, 1862, the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary addressed a letter to the Danish Cabinet, who resented it as an interference with their internal affairs; and at home there was also a good deal of discussion on the matter. Had the advice of Earl Russell then been listened to by Denmark, probably the present complications might have been long deferred; if not wholly averted. In March, 1863, the storm began to gather, and the Danish Government took up the subject which in 1862 they declined to entertain. In the following June came the threat of Federal Execution; and a month later the speech of his noble Friend (Viscount Palmerston), who expressed his belief that as things then stood, if there was an interference with the Danish monarchy, Denmark would not find herself alone in resisting it. The meaning of the noble Lord plainly was to express his belief, which he was well entitled to entertain, that the Powers who were parties to the Treaty of 1852 would not allow her to stand alone. But this implied no pledge of material assistance on the part of this country single-handed, nor was it understood in that sense. On the 31st of August a despatch was addressed by Lord Russell to our Minister at Berlin, stating that he had informed the Prussian Chargé d'Affaires that it was not his intention to make any communication to the Danish Government after the reception which was given to his suggestion of September, 1862; but that if Prussia and Austria persisted in advising the Confederation to make a Federal Execution then, they would do so against the advice already given by Her Majesty's Government, and must be responsible for the consequences, whatever they might be. Thus far there was no encouragement of Denmark; and nothing more took place till October 13, when Lord Russell wrote to Sir Augustus Paget at Copenhagen to suggest the way in which the Federal Execution might be met by the Danish Cabinet. It was only by examining the Correspondence that they could test the allegation that false hopes were held out to Denmark. On the 14th of October an interesting communication was made to Earl Russell by Sir Augustus Paget reporting conversations which the latter had had with the Danish Minister, M. Hall. That despatch showed that Denmark had not then the least reason to suppose she would receive material assistance from this country, although our Minister at Copenhagen ventured to assure her of our "good offices," and that the Danish Government then thought the time was most favourable for her to go to war with Germany, relying, not on any representations made to her by the British Government, but on the "public feeling of England, France, and Europe." In the latter part of the conversation between them, M. Hall directly put it to Sir Augustus Paget whether Denmark would have a guarantee from the Powers to support her in certain contingencies; and Sir Augustus Paget stated that there was no use in forwarding such a proposition to his Government. On the 17th of November Earl Russell wrote to Sir Augustus Paget in these terms—

> "Her Majesty's Government are very reluctant to interfere with regard to the Danish Constitution, and therefore I cannot instruct you to urge

> the King to take a course which may be very unpalatable to his subjects. At the same time, if you are questioned, you may say that as His Majesty desires, doubtless, that the proposed mediation should lead to a good result, the probability of its doing so might be greatly increased if his assent to the Constitution were to be suspended until a settlement of the international question was effected, or at least had made some progress."—*Danish Papers*, No. 3, 206.

The correspondence went on till Lord Wodehouse was sent to Copenhagen, and he wished to direct the attention of the House to a letter of the 21st of December, 1863. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli), in proposing his Resolution, alluded to that letter with great emphasis, with the view of giving certain passages of it as much effect as possible in the eyes of the House. But there was a passage in it to which the right hon. Gentleman had not directed attention, but which was of no little importance. Lord Wodehouse, in narrating to Earl Russell the particulars of an interview which he had with M. Hall on the 20th of December, said—

> "I entreated his Excellency to weigh well the gravity of the dangers which threatened Denmark. General Fleury had informed M. d'Ewers and me that he was instructed to tell the Danish Government that France would not go to war to support Denmark against Germany. It was my duty to declare to him that if the Danish Government rejected our advice, Her Majesty's Government must leave Denmark to encounter Germany on her own responsibility. Surely there was nothing inconsistent with the honour of Denmark in yielding to the united counsels of England, France, and Russia."—No. 4, 418.

The House would remember that the advice given by Lord Wodehouse to M. Hall was a joint one, for he had been in direct communication with the representatives of France, Russia and Sweden. The correspondence, from first to last, showed that, so far from a promise of active assistance having been given by this country to Denmark if she resisted, there was a direct statement that if Denmark did not do away with the Patent of March and abolish the Constitution of November 18, the British Government would not be able to in any way interfere in the affair; and Sir Augustus Paget expressly stated to M. Hall—

> "I replied by stating as clearly and as forcibly as I could the immense advantage it would be to Denmark if negotiation could be substituted for war; the support she might expect in the one case, and her entire isolation in the other."

It was quite true that at a later period, after M. Hall had resigned and Bishop Monrad had become Minister, there was a direct appeal from Denmark for the active assistance of the friendly Powers, on the ground of the measures which she had taken in order to procure a peaceful solution. But there was a paragraph in the letter of Earl Russell to Sir Augustus Paget, dated February 19th, which showed that this country had not undertaken to take up arms for Denmark irrespectively of the circumstance whether the other neutral Powers might take the same step. Referring to a note to the Danish Minister, dated February the 11th, Earl Russell in his letter of the 19th stated—

> "With regard to the request that friendly Powers should come to the assistance of Denmark, Her Majesty's Government can only say that every step they may think it right to take in the further progress of this unhappy contest can only be taken after full consideration and communication with France and Russia. These Powers are as much interested in the maintenance of the integrity of the Danish Monarchy as Great Britain; and Her Majesty's Government may fairly have recourse to their advice and concert in any measures to be taken for the preservation of that integrity."—No. 5, 704.

In fact it had never been in the contemplation of England that she would come forward to contend single-handed against the German Powers, and she had never given Denmark occasion to think so, and Denmark, in point of fact, did not think so. Then came the charge against Her Majesty's Government that they had used menaces to the Germans. It appeared to him that that was very easily disposed of. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman who had first spoken had charged England with a readiness to menace, but not to fight. There might be some difference between the great Powers as to their readiness to fight—but in the communications of our Government with France and Russia, material assistance to Denmark had been one subject which we had pressed on their consideration. He did not know why it should be supposed that when England directed a remonstrance to the German Powers that was a menace, but when France directed a remonstrance to them that was only a reasonable expostulation. The words used by Earl Russell by way of expostulation were identical with those employed by the French Government; and the truth was there had been the greatest reason for Earl Russell's remonstrances. It was impossible to over-estimate the elements of difficulty which the Government of this country had had to contend with in the negotiations on this question. There had come over Germany a spirit of quite a different character from that which had been supposed to prevail with the great Powers. Whether in the first instance Prussia and Austria were at the head of the new movement—whether they were voluntary or involuntary leaders of it when this Schleswig-Holstein question became one in which the neutral Powers had to negotiate—he was not prepared to say; but this was certain, that all over Germany a spirit had sprung up which formed a new and most difficult element in the Schleswig-Holstein question. The House were now aware of the view which Austria and Prussia took of the treaty of 1852; but certainly he could not see how those Powers could be absolved from the obligations which they had incurred as parties to that treaty, no matter what might be the obligations which they owed to the German Confederation. When the right hon. Gentleman spoke of the loss of our influence in Germany, he would remind the House of Sir Alexander Malet's observation, that it was no wonder England no longer had influence with the German Diet when neither Prussia nor Austria had been able to preserve her influence with the Diet any longer. He asked whether the right hon. Gentleman who had brought forward these Resolutions was of opinion that England should at once have declared the Treaty of 1852 to be at an end. The Government had not taken that course. They had advised Denmark; they had remonstrated with the German Powers; and he did not think there was one word in any of Earl Russell's despatches which could be considered extravagant. The difficulty which the Government had had to encounter, and the responsibility which they had had to bear were both great. He thought that so far from meriting the condemnation implied in the right hon. Gentleman's Resolutions, the country owed the Government a debt of gratitude. [*Ironical cries of* "Hear, hear!" *and Cheers.*] On the one hand they had had to contend with a public feeling in Germany which even Austria and Prussia could not oppose; on the other they were met by the natural sensitiveness of a gallant nation, conscious of their own inferiority in point of numbers and resources, but also firm in the assertion of their rights and their independence. Those conflicting elements had been encountered with, as he thought, great moderation and great prudence; and though we might not have been successful in bringing about a settlement between the German Powers and Denmark, we had, nevertheless, unquestionably given the contending parties and Europe the only chance they had of a pacific solution. He believed the country had suffered no loss of influence—no loss of reputation. It was quite true that there were always parties in the several continental nations who were ready to cavil at the principles which regulated the diplomacy of this country, and to represent that the acts of our Government were to the disadvantage of the reputation of England. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman who had spoken last (General Peel) said we were always unpopular abroad, and he thought we were so because we were always meddling in other people's affairs. But might it not be possible that there was another reason for the unpopularity to which the hon. and gallant Gentleman alluded? Were our free institutions so popular abroad? Be that as it might, he had no doubt there were those abroad who were ever ready to represent that this country was losing her influence. He did not wonder at it; but he did wonder that any sympathy or any feelings in common with those people should be found among any portion of the politicians of this country. There was no real loss of influence. The great Powers knew well how unwearied, how constant, how single-hearted the efforts of England had been. We had no interest in the matter but as connected with the general peace of Europe — the general cause of right and of humanity; and, whatever the result of this debate might be, he was perfectly certain England would stand high as ever among the nations of the world.

Lord STANLEY: Sir, I seldom trouble the House, nor shall I do so at length upon the present occasion; but there are some remarks of the learned Lord which I cannot allow to go forth to the public without comment. The learned Lord may be, and I believe is, a very able and successful advocate, but I do not think he has been particularly happy in his criticism to-night. He began by taunting my right hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Huntingdonshire (General Peel) with inconsistency in opposing all treaties of guarantee, whereas he had something to do with the Treaty of 1852. Now, in the first place, my right hon. Friend had nothing whatever to do with that treaty—he was not a member of either of the Governments that held office during that year. In the next place, the Treaty of 1852 was not a treaty of guarantee. In the third place, though I do not intend on behalf of Lord Malmesbury and those who sit near me to disclaim any responsibility that can fairly attach to them, still it is a historical fact that the negotiations that led to that treaty were practically concluded at the time when the Government of Lord Derby came into office; the matter was placed on that footing that it would have been hardly possible for England to draw back; and, therefore, whatever responsibility rests upon those who concluded that treaty, a very small portion of it devolves on those who sit on this side of the House. The learned Lord says, if this Resolution is anything it is a war Resolution, and what the Resolution condemns is abstaining from warlike operations. When I heard that, it seemed to me that the learned Lord had been arranging his defence before he heard the attack; and that he had taken great pains in fortifying that part of his case which was never destined to be assailed. To that assertion the answer is simple. My right hon. Friend the Member for Buckinghamshire told the House distinctly in the course of his speech—I am speaking in his presence, and if in the slightest degree I am inaccurate he will set me right—that if he had to deal with the matter, speaking on his present knowledge, he would have adopted the policy which has been followed by the Emperor of the French—namely, to declare to Denmark, in the first instance, that though we should mediate in a friendly manner, we should not interfere by force. Well, I confess I do not understand how, after that distinct statement from the leader of Opposition, it can be said this is a war Resolution. I pass, then, from the speech of the learned Lord. I listened with great interest to the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It is the only real defence of the Ministerial policy we have heard to-night. Everybody listens with interest to the Chancellor of the Exchequer on great questions; but it seemed to me—whether it arose from natural temperament or the peculiarities of the case with which he had to deal—he seemed more at home, and infinitely more happy, when attacking us on this side of the House than when attempting to vindicate the policy of the Government. Sir, he expended a great deal of pleasant sarcasm on the form of this Vote of Censure. It is always easy to criticise the form of a Vote of Censure. I am afraid it is not within the scope of Parliamentary ingenuity to make a Vote of Censure agreeable to those against whom it is directed. The right hon. Gentleman was very anxious that, instead of the Address moved by my right hon. Friend, we should have proceeded by a Vote of Want of Confidence—and no doubt as a Parliamentary tactician he was quite right. No doubt a Vote of Want of Confidence would have been more convenient to right hon. Gentlemen opposite. In a Vote of Want of Confidence, when pressed hard on one subject you can always escape to another. You may thus get rid of unpleasant details and embarrassing inquiries. The right hon. Gentleman, I do not doubt, would have had a right, for instance, to call in aid those measures of finance which I, for one, admire. Perhaps he would have called in aid that remarkable speech on the amendment of the Constitution, which if he had known this debate was coming he would have allowed to stand without a preface; and, as a last resort, if this had been a Vote of Want of Confidence, he would have dwelt on the fact, which none of us dispute, of the great personal popularity of the noble Lord at the head of the Government. But if we think that these foreign affairs have been badly managed, I see no reason why we should not prefer saying so in plain and intelligible words. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said, "Your Resolution is colourless—nobody knows what it means. You talk a great deal of frankness and candour. I wish you would practise that old English mode of speaking." Now, I will adopt that advice. I will tell you what I think this Resolution means. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will not consider me discourteous when I tell him that it means that we think you have blundered these foreign negotiations from beginning to end; and that we intend to call upon the House to say so. Then there was another point made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer—and he did not use the phrase, but there could be no doubt about the sentiment—he denounced us indignantly for what he called trading on the humiliation of the country. I am glad that is responded to, because I wanted to deal with the argument. Is it really meant that if we think the Foreign Office by its mode of conducting business has diminished the influence, power, and honour of England, we are not to say so because somebody may say that is trading on the humiliation of the country? Why, that doctrine would simply amount to this, that in foreign affairs no matter can be dealt with frankly, no error of the Government is to be exposed, but the opinion of the Foreign Office must be held to be the opinion of England without dispute; and if we think that the Foreign Office has mistaken the temper and feeling of the people of England, we are not to say so, for fear of the remarks that may be made abroad. According to that doctrine, there cannot be the least chance of setting matters right. The Foreign Office alone is authorized to represent the nation, and the interference of Parliament in foreign affairs becomes altogether nugatory. The Chancellor of the Exchequer went on to contend that the language used in this Resolution was unprecedented. Certainly I did not come down to the House with a bundle of precedents. I did not come prepared to show what was the exact strength of the language used on former occasions of a similar kind. But I have some recollection of Resolutions proposed on former occasions, and the language used in former debates; and I confidently affirm that the language of my right hon. Friend's Resolution and speech are mild and moderate compared with that used in former days—on such occasions, for instance, as the Treaty of 1763 and the Treaty of 1782. One memorable instance I recollect. In 1795-6, in the days of the French Directory, the first Lord Malmesbury was sent on an embassy to Paris. Mr. Burke was very strongly opposed to that step; he looked on it as incompatible with the honour of the country, and when some information was asked, and an apology was made for delay in supplying it on the ground that Lord Malmesbury's journey had occupied a long time, Mr. Burke said it was no wonder he had taken a long time to reach Paris, because he travelled the whole road on his knees. Then the Chancellor of the Exchequer said, "You are only attacking us for the past; you don't say what ought to be done now." Now I remember the saying of a very celebrated statesman, for whom the Chancellor of the Exchequer professes the greatest veneration; Sir Robert Peel declined (the words were his own) to prescribe till he was called in; and that is, in such cases, a reasonable refusal. We are not simple enough to suppose that, however ample may be the information laid on the table, these blue-books contain the whole state of matters. I do not charge the Government with unjustifiable suppression—all I say is, that there must be in diplomatic affairs a great deal that is never made public. All that relates to the workings and feelings, the private designs and intentions of Cabinets—many things that are talked about freely, and written about in private letters, are not seen in print, and are only known to the parties actually engaged in negotiations. We have not the means of judging what it may or may not be possible to effect now, and to ask us in the absence of such materials to decide, is simply unreasonable. But I repeat that whatever this Resolution may be, it is not a Resolution in favour of a policy of war. If it were, I can only say that, for myself, and I believe for many others on this side of the House, no consideration would induce me to give it my support. If the Question before us were only this, is it or is it not right to fight for Denmark—if you could narrow the Question to that simple issue, then I will not merely say I should agree with the Government in the tardy and hesitating decision to which they have come—if it is a final decision, upon which the noble Lord's speech last week throws some doubt—but I should declare that to engage in a European war for the sake of these Duchies would be an act, not of impolicy, but of insanity. The noble Lord last week threatened us conditionally with a war. I try to look at the best side of things, and am willing to believe that he did not mean it. I believe it was not the announcement of a future policy, but the indulgence of an inveterate habit. One can imagine that the noble Lord may have been in favour of fighting at a time when fighting, however impolitic, would have led to substantial results; but to say that now, after Holstein is gone, Schleswig taken, and Jutland itself in German hands, you will fight for Copenhagen, is very much as though some ally of ours were to say, "Ireland may be invaded, and we won't help you; Scotland may be invaded, and we won't help you; England even may be invaded, and we won't help you; but let them touch the Isle of Wight, and then see with what eagerness we shall come forward in your defence." But I do not want to dwell upon this. I am ready to assume that the policy of the noble Lord is intended to be a policy of peace. But when I am asked to fix my eyes upon that one aspect of the question, and overlook everything else—when I am asked to overlook all the errors which have been committed on account of that one error which has not been committed—I say that that is too great a claim upon the indulgence of an independent Member. I take it that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Bridgwater (Mr. Kinglake) is now accepted as substantially the Amendment of the Government, and, as far as the words of it go, it contains nothing which in my opinion is not just and correct. But though it does not say in words anything which I do not believe, it implies much that I cannot assent to. It really seems to say this:—"You, the House, have only one Question before you — namely, whether you desire to fight or don't. The Government have chosen not to fight. In that decision they are right, and as for any unpleasant results you may experience at the present time, any humiliation to which you may have been subjected, any hard words you may be receiving all over the Continent, that is nothing; it is the price you are paying for a policy of peace." Now, that latter proposition I distinctly deny. I deny that there is any connection, however slight, between what I must call the humiliating position in which England is placed and the adoption of a policy of peace by the Government. I believe that a policy of neutrality and non-intervention may be not only a safe but a respected and an honourable position. France in this very quarrel has remained neutral. She said openly and aboveboard what she intended to do, and she has kept her word; and no man now, even of those who are most bitterly hostile to the Emperor of the French, pretends that her position is lowered by the part she has taken. So we have ourselves been neutral, and not long ago, on a great question. The Italian war was a great war, affecting the distribution of political power. It was a war which keenly excited the sympathies of the country, but we remained neutral, and nobody thought the worse of us. All the world except an infinitesimal minority, thinks we are right in the neutral position we have maintained during the great American contest. Going further back, in the Crimean War, Austria and Prussia chose to maintain a position of neutrality. We abused them, and Russia abused them also, as belligerents are apt to abuse neutrals. Russia said they were ungrateful, and we said they were selfish, but they thought they knew their own business best; and now, looking calmly back, I do not think that either Power has lost credit with Europe for the part which it then took. So in this instance I say that not only might you have remained neutral with honour, but you might have offered advice and mediation, and having offered that advice and mediation, and having failed, you still need not have been discredited, provided you had taken the one precaution of saying at first, at least to Denmark, "So far we mean to go, and no further." This is the point at which, in my mind, the failure of the whole policy of the Government begins. I do not suppose that any man will contend seriously that the estimation in which England is held just now can be considered as gratifying to English feeling. The learned Lord said our position in this respect was satisfactory, and he gave a curious proof. We had only, he said, to look to the record of what had passed in the Conference to see how much we were respected, because the diplomatists were very civil. Now, it is not the habit of diplomatists to use uncourteous language, and therefore I think we may pass by this evidence. I rather prefer the evidence which the Chancellor of the Exchequer—rather oddly, as I thought, for a Liberal Minister—spoke of as the trash of Continental newspapers, meaning those newspapers that were attacking England; but the difficulty is to find those that are not attacking England. He spoke of the absolutist party, but the democratic press of Germany has been just as loud in our condemnation. I know much allowance must be made in these matters. We are a great European Power, we have enjoyed great prosperity, we are not either individually or as a Government the most conciliatory of mankind, and no doubt we do create abroad a good deal of envy, jealousy, and ill-will. We must make allowances for all this; but I do not think there has ever been a period when the policy and the position of England have been spoken of all over the Continent as they are spoken of now. That is not merely a question of newspapers. Every Englishman who resides abroad will tell you so, and it is only too easy, if it were not an invidious and odious task, to collect witnesses upon that point. Now what is the explanation of this feeling? Does it exist because we were bound to help Denmark and failed to do it? No—nobody will say that. In strict justice we were not bound to help Denmark, and if we had abstained from doing so, and said we had intended so to abstain, not one word would have been uttered against us. All those attacks upon us came because, not meaning to help Denmark by arms, we omitted the obvious duty not to excite hope and rouse expectations which we knew, or ought to have known, it was not in our power to fulfil. I am not going to quote from the blue-books. I do not care to refer to sentences here and there out of despatches which will bear out what I say. My right hon. Friend (Mr. Disraeli) did that most carefully, and, having heard the comments of the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon his quotations, it did not seem to me that his reply very much affected the result. I do not care to dwell even upon that famous statement of the noble Lord at the head of the Government how, in certain contingencies, Denmark would not stand alone, because I fully allow that those words were uttered under circumstances somewhat different from those which exist now. But what I say is, that when you take a man's or a nation's affairs out of their own hands—when you assume the duty of advising, managing, directing, and when that is done by a very strong Power to a very feeble one—you incur a moral responsibility towards those who take your advice, you are giving an implied guarantee that they shall not suffer by taking your advice—unless you have given them fair warning beforehand — as France did, and as you might have done—that you meant to interfere by mediation and advice alone, and meant to go no further. If you had done that, Denmark would have shown less of that temper, which one cannot help admiring, because it is almost heroic, but which is not prudent or politic; Germany would not have been exasperated to her present state of frenzy; and it is possible, and not improbable, that this quarrel might then have admitted of an amicable arrangement. Now, I do not accuse the Ministry of any intention to mislead the Danes in this matter. That is a charge which I will make against no one; and, in this case, there would not have been any possible motive for misleading. So far from being indifferent to Denmark, I conceive that the Ministry took up the Danish cause with a sympathy which was strong, but which was not founded on very accurate knowledge, and that they were not a little perplexed when they found how strong a case in point of reason and of law the Germans really had. I remember that one energetic Member of the Government, in addressing his constituents, rather prided himself on knowing nothing about the cause of dispute, and, what is more, he said he doubted whether anybody else was better informed. I dare say that was a very accurate representation; but I do not think that ought to have been the state of mind existing among a Ministry on the verge of a European war. What I complain of in the Government is the want of a policy. I do not believe there has been at any time on their part a deliberate determination to adopt a policy either of war or of peace; and the House will, no doubt, remember that the same thing went on upon a larger scale eleven years ago. At that time a phrase was used which has become historical—that England was drifting into war. I believe no more correct description could have been given of our course. If a decided line, either warlike or peaceful, had then been taken from the first—if Russia had been warned in the first instance that England would make the entry into the Principalities a *casus belli*, she never would have gone there; and if, on the other hand, Turkey had been informed that she must not look to us for material assistance, she would have made terms, not perhaps favourable, but still terms compatible with her independence, and by which war would have been avoided. But in 1853, the Ministers of this country at one moment threatened Russia, and at another encouraged Turkey, and at the same time they were profuse in their protestations that they wished only for peace, and that nothing but peace would follow. And so it came about that both parties were duped. Russia was sure that we should not fight, Turkey that we should; and Europe was surprised into a war. I will not profess to say that I feel any great apprehension that the same thing will take place now. The country is more wide awake now on these questions than it was then, and public feeling will be too strong for diplomacy. I do not think that we are drifting into war; but it is possible for a nation to get into such a position that it has before it the alternative of war on the one hand, and on the other—I will not say of dishonour—but discredit. That is the state of things which I believe exists now, and with which this Resolution professes to deal. It is a state of things which justifies a protest being made by this House, and on which the opinion of this House ought to be given. If, as we have been told, there is from the decision of this House a still further appeal, we shall face that appeal without fear. What have hon. Gentlemen opposite to appeal to? Their home policy? Except in finance they have none. Their foreign policy? Can even partizanship describe it as successful? Can you go the country with this for your watchword—"France alienated, Germany insulted, Denmark abandoned, Poland encouraged and left to perish."

Mr. COBDEN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

INLAND REVENUE (STAMP DUTIES) BILL.—CONSIDERATION.

Order for Consideration read.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he had considered the clause relating to Irish distillation as to which there had been a controversy on a former evening, and he had come to the conclusion to withdraw it from the Bill, and the Attorney General would look more closely into the matter during the recess. With regard to the clauses affecting Irish brewers, his desire was to give them the same advantages as brewers in this country. If there were any desire that the Bill should be postponed for a short time, he should raise no objection.

Sir HUGH CAIRNS suggested that the third reading should be postponed for at least a week, so that, if there were any possible objections to the Bill, the House might be put in possession of them.

Mr. HENNESSY was glad that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to negative the 16th Clause, to which he had first objected, and that some explanation had been given of the other two clauses, which he thought Irish Members would see were of very great importance, and did not relate to fiscal reform, which no Member would have presumed to discuss.

To be read 3° on *Monday* next.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS BILL—[*Lords.*]

[BILL 168.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Sir GEORGE GREY, in moving the second reading of the Bill, said, that some of the recommendations of the Royal Commission which had inquired into the state of education in our Public Schools, would, when carried out, affect the governing bodies, and the object of this Bill was merely to provide that no new vested interest should be created after the passing of this Act, which should stand in the way of any future regulations which Parliament might think proper to make.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir George Grey.*)

Sir WILLIAM FRASER said, this Bill was a very important one, affecting, as it did, the interests of an influential body of men, and he thought therefore that its object should have been explained more fully than had been done by the right hon. Gentleman. They had no means of knowing that the new Parliament which they were to have next February would condescend to legislate on this subject. He hoped, therefore, another opportunity of discussing the merits of the Bill would be afforded even at this late period of the Session.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at half after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, July 5, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Salmon Fishing (Scotland) Acts Amendment (No. 2) * (No. 167); Local Government Supplemental * (No. 174).

Committee — Facilities for Divine Service in Collegiate Schools * (No. 183); Public and Refreshment Houses (Metropolis, &c.) (No. 184); Greek Loan * (No. 171).

Report—Clerks of the Peace Removal * (No. 179); Greek Loan * (No. 171); Pilotage Order Confirmation * (No. 180).

Third Reading—Government Annuities, &c. * (No. 145); Superannuation (Union Offices) * (No. 154).

Withdrawn—Bribery * (No. 155).

ALLEGED REVIVAL OF "THE HOLY ALLIANCE."

QUESTION. NOTICE.

VISCOUNT STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE: My Lords, it is on the ground of personal explanation that I claim your Lordships' indulgence for a few moments. On referring to the morning papers which I am most in the habit of reading, I find that the notice I gave, or intended to give here, yesterday, was not stated with the accuracy which usually characterizes the Reports of your Lordships' proceedings. The main point of my Notice is nearly or altogether omitted, and words are put into my mouth — unintentionally, no doubt — which it was not my intention to express. Without complaining of this confusion, no doubt accidental, I wish to state that the Notice had principally in view the prevailing rumours of the revival of the so-called Holy Alliance. It was only in connection with that I referred to the remarkable Correspondence which was published, as your Lordships are aware, in a well-known morning print (*The Morning Post*) yesterday and on the previous Saturday. On the merits of that Correspondence I passed no judgment. It was not for me to moot whether the Correspondence be really authentic, as maintained by the paper in question, or fabricated, as declared on high official authority. A declaration coming from the Prussian Government, a Power in friendly connection with Her Majesty, must necessarily command my entire respect. Supposing the Correspondence to be a mere fabrication, no one would be readier than myself to condemn so disgraceful and unwarrantable a deception; but the circumstance which I have already brought to the knowledge of your Lordships is not affected by the character of the Correspondence, whatever it may be. I repeat that the despatches published yesterday in extracts and translation were shown to me many weeks ago in the French language, and, so far as I can recollect, substantially the same as those just published by a gentleman of undoubted respectability. This fact is, however, no proof of the authenticity of these documents, though many persons may think it gives these documents some additional claim to attention, and it certainly goes far to exonerate the publisher from any suspicion of complicity in practising on the credulity of the public. With respect to my intended Notice, the forms of the House do not admit of any proceeding with it at the present moment, and I propose to defer its consideration to a more convenient opportunity. Of the three remaining nights in this week, two are assigned preferentially to the Orders of the Day, and a very important Motion stands on your Lordships' Minutes for Friday. It only remains for me at present to lay my Notice on the table. It will stand for Friday, the 15th instant.

VISCOUNT STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE then gave Notice

"To draw attention to the prevailing rumours concerning a supposed revival of the so-called Holy Alliance, and to inquire whether Her Majesty's Ministers have any information thereon which may be communicated to Parliament without prejudice to the Public Service."

DENMARK AND GERMANY—ALLEGED PRUSSIAN ATROCITIES.

QUESTION.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY: My Lords, seeing my noble Friend the Foreign Secretary in his place, I take the opportunity of putting the Question to him of which I have given him notice. In *The Globe* of last night there appeared a telegram to this effect—"On a partial clearance of the battle-field yesterday 400 Swedish volunteers were discovered, to whom no quarter was given." What we have to gather from this telegram is, that 400 wounded men lying on the battle-field were bayonetted in their helplessness by the Prussian soldiers. I wish to know from the noble Lord whether he can give us any information on this matter; and if he cannot do so at present, whether he will be good enough to make inquiries and to give to the House and the country the benefit of the information which he succeeds in eliciting. I myself will go the length of saying that I believe every syllable of this statement, and I will tell the House my reason for doing so. I think the conduct of the Prussian troops in the bombardment of Sonderborg and in massacring helpless women and children is in itself a proof of the capability of these troops to perform such an act of cowardly violence as is here ascribed to them. This very morning I heard a story strongly corroborative of the disposition of the Prussian troops to perpetrate such enormities. At the siege of Duppel a Swedish officer, seriously wounded, was left upon the field, and the Prussian soldiers coming up and seeing that he was alive bayonetted him three times upon the ground and left him for dead. By the blessing of God, life was not extinct; he lived to recover and to tell the story to his brother, who is a meritorious officer in Her Majesty's service. In the interests of civilization and Christianity it is very desirable that the story told in this telegram should be disproved. I therefore hope that the noble Lord will be able to obtain from the Prussian Government information not only that the statement in question is untrue, but that the authorities in that country view with as complete abhorrence as ourselves acts of such atrocity.

Earl RUSSELL: I can only say that no notice is taken of such an occurrence in any of the despatches received by Her Majesty's Government. I shall, of course, make the requisite inquiries.

The Marquess of CLANRICARDE reminded his noble Friend and the House that the barbarous act alleged to have taken place, but which until it was confirmed he should not implicitly believe, was by no means isolated in its character. On former occasions similar atrocities had been among the strongest inducements to this country to embark in war, especially at the time of the French Revolution. He trusted his noble Friend would take care to ascertain from good authority the facts as they really had occurred.

BRIBERY BILL.—QUESTION.

Lord CRANWORTH wished to ask the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Brougham) whether it was his intention to proceed further this Session with the Bill in which he had interested himself.

Lord BROUGHAM said, it was not his intention to proceed further with the Bribery Bill this Session. He was bound to believe that the Members of the other House were resolved, if possible, to prevent bribery and corruption, and if such was their resolution they might, by a Standing Order, require every Member on taking his seat to make a declaration that his return had not been procured by corrupt means.

FACILITIES FOR DIVINE SERVICE IN COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS BILL—(No. 183).

COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

The Earl of SHAFTESBURY moved the addition of a clause, securing to the parish the advantage of all contributions to the offertory, whether held in the parish church or in the school chapels.

The Bishop of OXFORD opposed the Amendment. When there was a school service in a parochial church the offertory money ought to be at the disposal of the clergyman; but when the service was held in the school chapel, the application of the money ought to be settled by the authorities of the school.

After short discussion, clause *negatived.*

Amendment made; the Report thereof to be received on *Thursday* next; and Bill to be printed as amended (No. 183).

PUBLIC AND REFRESHMENT HOUSES (METROPOLIS) BILL—(No. 184.)

COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to order).

On Clause 2,

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE moved the omission of the words which give power to Town Councils to adopt the provisions of the Bill if they think fit.

Earl GRANVILLE opposed the amendment.

Moved, To omit from ("and") to the end of the clause.

After short discussion—

On Question, Whether the words proposed to be omitted shall stand part of the clause?

Their Lordships *divided:* Contents, 31; Not-Contents, 24; Majority, 7.

Amendments made; the Report thereof to be received on *Monday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended (No. 184).

CONTENTS.

Westbury, L. (*L. Chancellor*).

Armagh, Archbp.

Devonshire, D.
Grafton, D.
Somerset, D.

Caithness, E.
Chichester, E.
De Grey, E.
Granville, E.
Russell, E.

Saint Germans, E.
Shaftesbury, E.

Sydney, V.
Torrington, V.

Cork, &c., Bp.
Down, &c., Bp.

Belper, L.
Camoys, L.
Churchill, L.
Cranworth, L.
Crewe, L.

Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Hamilton, L. (*L. Belhaven and Stenton*).
Hatherton, L.
Mostyn, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough*) [*Teller.*]
Portman, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll*).
Wodehouse, L.
Wrottesley, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Bath, M.

Amherst, E.
Bandon, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose*).
Malmesbury, E.
Minto, E.
Nelson, E.
Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Shrewsbury, E.

Hawarden, V.
Hutchinson, V (*E. Donoughmore*) [*Teller.*]
Sidmouth, V.

Abinger, L.
Bagot, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery*).
Calthorpe, L.
Churston, L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Egerton, L. [*Teller.*]
Inchiquin, L.
Polwarth, L.
Redesdale, L.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT SUPPLEMENTAL (NO. 2) BILL—[NO. 174]

SECOND READING.

Moved, as regards the Local Government Supplemental (No. 2) Bill, That the Resolution of the House of the 21st April last, "That no Bill confirming any Provisional Order of the Board of Health, or authorizing any Inclosure of Lands under special Report of the Inclosure Commissioners for England and Wales, or for confirming any Scheme of the Charity Commissioners for England and Wales, shall be read a Second Time after Tuesday, the 30th Day of June next," be suspended, and that, on the Ground of special Reasons, the said Local Government Supplemental (No. 2) Bill be read a Second Time; *agreed to* (*The Lord Stanley of Alderley*):

Bill read 2^{a} (according to Order), and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

House adjourned at a quarter before Seven o'clock, till To-morrow half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, July 5, 1864.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered*—Poisoned Grain, &c., Prohibition Act (1863) Amendment*; Expiring Laws Continuance*.

First Reading—Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans)* [Bill 191]; Poisoned Grain, &c., Prohibition Act (1863) Amendment*[Bill 192]; Expiring Laws Continuance* [Bill 193]; Turnpike Acts Continuance* [Bill 194].

Second Reading — Game (Ireland) [Bill 116]; Improvement of Land Act (1864)* [Bill 187] (*Lords*); Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* [Bill 185]; Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)* [Bill 184].

Committee—India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment* [Bill 183]; Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers)* [Bill 62].

Report—India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment* [Bill 183]; Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers)* [Bill 62].

Considered as amended—Street Music Metropolis* [Bill 186]; Indemnity* [Bill 97].

Third Reading—India Office* [Bill 166]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland)* [Bill 100]; Divorce and Matrimonial Causes (Amendment)* [Bill 162] (*Lords*); Local Government Act (1858) Amendment* [Bill 155], and *passed*.

IRELAND—THE REGIUM DONUM.

QUESTION.

SIR HERVEY BRUCE said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Government will, in accordance with the request of a numerously signed Memorial, increase the Grant commonly called "Regium Donum" to the Presbyterian Church in Ireland?

MR. PEEL, in reply, said, the Memorialists had asked the Treasury to consent to an increase of the Regium Donum from £40,000 to £56,000 in order that the Parliamentary stipend of the ministers of endowed congregations might be increased from £70 to £100. The subject had been fully considered, and the Government did not feel themselves at liberty to recommend an increase of the Grant.

THE POLICE FORCE AND MR. ARNOLD.

QUESTION.

MR. WHALLEY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether Police Constable 244 B, as to whom Mr. Arnold, the Magistrate at Westminster Police Court, publicly stated on two several occasions in the month of May last, that he could not believe him on his oath, or to that effect, is still continued in the Force?

SIR GEORGE GREY said, in reply, that he did not know on what authority the hon. Gentleman had stated that Mr. Arnold had on two occasions made the statement attributed to him. Since he had seen the notice of the hon. Member's Question he had made inquiry, and he was informed to-day that though the cases had occurred in May, and it was now July, no representation had been made by Mr.

Arnold to the Home Office or the Commissioners of Police. If a Magistrate was satisfied that a policeman had misconducted himself it was his duty to make a representation to that effect in the proper quarter; and in such a case the matter would undergo a thorough investigation. In this case no complaint whatever had been made that he was aware of.

ARMAMENT OF THE NAVY.

QUESTION.

Sir JOHN HAY said, he rose to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, To lay upon the table of the House a Return showing the number of Guns in store and in use of such a nature as the late experiments show can be effectually used against Armour-clad ships of the *Warrior* class; and also to ask what steps Government are taking to provide a sufficient supply of Guns for the armament of our forts and fleets, of such a nature as late experiments show can be effectually used against Armour-clad ships and forts, specifying as follows:—The calibre of Gun; whether Rifled or Smooth bore; the Construction of Gun; Cast Iron, Coil, Steel, or Wrought Iron; the Weight of Gun; the Length of Bore; the Weight of Shot and Shell; and the Service Charge of Powder.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, he was sorry he could not lay upon the table a Return entering into such minute details of the armaments of this country. He did not believe that on any previous occasion Returns entering into such minute particulars had been granted, as the effect would be prejudicial to the public service, such information being made known not only to that House, but to the whole world. He had no objection, however, to state, as the hon. and gallant Gentleman was aware, and as he had stated to the House several times this Session, that pending the course of experiments which were now going on we had no guns in the public service which could be relied on in the circumstances contemplated by the hon. and gallant Gentleman's Question. The only guns we were in possession of were a small number of twelve ton guns which the House was aware had been proved effective. The Government had ordered—and they were now in the course of construction — 150 guns of weights varying from six to seven tons, which, if rifled, would have a calibre of about seven inches, or, if smooth bores, of nine inches. There was also in course of construction seven more of twelve ton guns, and provision had been made in the Estimates for a number of guns of twenty-four tons weight for placing upon fortifications. These fortifications, however, were not so far advanced as to be ready for the guns, and the guns might be appropriated to some other purpose.

THE ALLEGED MASSACRE OF SWEDES.

QUESTION.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he can inform the House whether there is any truth in the report contained in *The Times* of that morning, that the Prussians had taken 400 Swedes in the Island of Alsen, and that no quarter had been shown to them. He also wished to know whether the Swedes were supporting the Danes in this contest?

Mr. LAYARD: In reply to the Question of my noble Friend, I beg to state that no information of that nature has reached the Foreign Office.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Ordered, That the first seven Orders of the Day be postponed till after the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate relative to Denmark and Germany.

DENMARK AND GERMANY—VOTE OF CENSURE.

RESOLUTION—(MR. DISRAELI).

ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [SECOND NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [4th July],

> "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to thank Her Majesty for directing the Correspondence on Denmark and Germany, and the Protocols of the Conference recently held in London, to be laid before Parliament:
>
> "To assure Her Majesty, that we have heard with deep concern, that the sittings of that Conference have been brought to a close without accomplishing the important purposes for which it was convened:
>
> "To express to Her Majesty our great regret, that, while the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government has failed to maintain their avowed policy of upholding the integrity and independence of Denmark, it has lowered the just influence of this Country in the counsels of Europe, and thereby diminished the securities for peace."—(*Mr. Disraeli,*)

[*Second Night.*

And which Amendment was, to leave out the second paragraph of the proposed Question, in order to insert the words "To submit to Her Majesty the opinion of this House, that the independence of Denmark and the possessions of that Kingdom, on the terms proposed by the Representatives of the Neutral Powers in the recent Conference, ought to be guaranteed,"—(*Mr. Newdegate,*)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

Mr. COBDEN: We are indebted to the two hon. Gentlemen who have put Amendments on the paper for having enlarged the scope of our deliberations. The hon. Member for Bridgwater has proposed to move an Amendment to the effect that the approval of this House is due to Her Majesty's Government for the course which they have taken in avoiding war for the defence of Denmark. I think that is an Amendment which, without endorsing the proceedings by which that result has been arrived at, the House will be pretty generally inclined to accept. The hon. Member for North Warwickshire has moved an Amendment recommending that this country should guarantee to Denmark the disputed possessions of Schleswig-Holstein—possessions left in dispute after the Conference, thus raising the issue, "Aye," or "No," whether this country shall adopt the policy of intervention and war in the case of Schleswig-Holstein.

Mr. NEWDEGATE explained that the meaning of his Amendment was, that the proposals of the neutral Powers in the Conference should be supported by the House.

Mr. COBDEN: I apprehend that the hon. Gentleman means to support that policy by war. That is all I meant to infer, and the hon. Gentleman does not contradict me. The right hon. Gentleman who brought forward the original Motion has not confined himself to a declaration of fact, or to a statement of the judgment of this House on the conduct of the Government, as he would, I think, have been wise in doing, but he has rather sought to lead us into what I may call the region of prophecy, for he has proposed for our assent a declaration that the course which the Government has pursued has had the effect of lowering us in the councils of nations, and has diminished the securities for peace. Now, whether we have been lowered, or are to be lowered in the councils of nations, will depend on our future conduct; for at the present moment I am constrained to admit that, as far as the conduct of our Foreign Office is concerned, we do not stand in a very satisfactory position. But with respect to the declaration that the course which has been taken will have the effect of diminishing the securities for peace, I join issue distinctly with the right hon. Gentleman. I am of opinion that what has happened — I mean the exposure of the utter futility of our foreign policy—the complete breakdown of our diplomacy—will have the effect of extracting these foreign questions from this time henceforth, from the dark recesses of the Foreign Office to the publicity of this House, and will therefore afford, probably, a better guarantee for peace than anything else that could have occurred. But while I say this, do not let it be understood that I am prepared to endorse or excuse the course which the Foreign Department took in the late negotiations. I consider it to have been deplorable — most unsatisfactory. I do not speak with censure or harshness of any attempt made by the Government to promote peace. I would not even quarrel with them for hawking about in every capital of Europe their useless importunities for peace. But what has struck me in reading these voluminous despatches is the great want of sagacity on the part of our Foreign Minister —that is to say, the want of knowledge and appreciation of the forces and motives, and even the passions, which were guiding and controlling foreign nations in these matters—motives and forces that appeared to me to be so transparent that even a child might perceive them. In the absence of that knowledge our Foreign Department has, I think, needlessly and perseveringly exposed itself to rejections and rebuffs, and, I must say, as far as that department is concerned, to humiliation from all parts of the world. So much for the question, which lies very much between the front bench on the other side of the House, and the front bench on this side. There are, however, matters which go much beyond the opposite interests of those in power and the aspirants for office, and if it were not so, I should not take part in the debate. There grows out of this debate a question of principle as affects our foreign policy. With this question of Denmark and Germany, two issues are brought clearly before us—I mean the question as to the dynastic, secret, irresponsible, engagements of our Foreign Office, and also the question which is not ancient but new, and which must be taken into consideration in all our foreign policy from this time — the question of nationalities — by which I mean the instinct, now so powerful, leading communities to seek to live together, because they are of the same race, language, and religion. Now, what is the Treaty of 1852, of which we have heard so much, and which forms the pivot and basis of this discussion? Eight gentlemen met in London about the celebrated round table to settle the destinies of a million of people, who were never consulted on the matter at issue. Let us take note of this event. It is the last page in the long history of past diplomatic action. It will not be repeated again. I mean that there will never again, in all probability, be a Conference meeting together to dispose for dynastic purposes of a population whose wishes they do not take into account. Let it be borne in mind that it is on that policy of secret, irresponsible diplomacy, and on the question of nationalities that our debate turns, and that our troubles—so far as they are wound up in this affair—are concerned. We all know what followed the attempt to force a population to live under conditions not acceptable to themselves. The Government of Denmark, it is now admitted on all hands, not merely failed in their obligations, but violated their engagements towards Schleswig-Holstein, which was virtually consigned to the rule of the Danish dynasty by the Treaty of 1852. The Danes troubled and annoyed the population of Schleswig-Holstein in a way most peculiarly painful and affecting a people most sensibly. I mean the Danes interfered with the use of their language. Denmark annoyed that population with functionaries speaking the Danish language, and sought to constrain the youth of Schleswig-Holstein to learn the Danish language, whether they wished or not, and to give privileges and advantages to the Danish Universities as against the Schleswig-Holstein Universities. They tried again precisely the same thing which was so futile in the case of Holland, when that country tried to force her language on the unwilling population of Belgium. In both cases there were the same features. There were two decaying and almost obsolete languages contending against languages which have acquired a supremacy in Europe. The consequence was that the Germans, sympathizing with their own race, and those who spoke their own language in Schleswig-Holstein, took up the cry raised in those provinces. Now there is not one of us who, for the last ten or twelve years, have occupied any prominence before the public, who has not been assailed with pamphlets and lectures emanating from learned professors in Germany, and having reference to the grievances of the German population in Schleswig-Holstein. I have received these publications, and I may speak of them almost by the cubic yard, though I am afraid that I have not been a very attentive reader of them. But we must not forget that at the very foundation of this question, which we seemed disposed to treat so summarily, there lies a real grievance. Well, this agitation in Germany on the Schleswig-Holstein question continued for nearly ten or twelve years, and at length culminated in such a state of excitement, and, indeed, we might almost say frenzy, that the Diet of Germany, feeling that there might be a revolutionary movement in favour of the Schleswig-Holstein population, assembled with the view of taking the matter into their own hands. The Diet is a slow body, having an imperfect organization, and before they could act, two great Powers—Austria and Prussia—intervened in the affair between the Schleswig-Holstein people and the German people, and invaded Schleswig-Holstein at the head of their standing armies, which are the standing evil of Europe at this time. Now, do not let us suppose when we arrive at this point, that because the absolute Governments of Austria and Prussia entered into this contest that circumstance at all obliterates the original merits of the case. It is very difficult, I own, to conceive for a moment that such a cause is just; at least to conceive that liberty and nationality are on the side of a cause of which the Austrian and Prussian Governments are the champions. Our very gorge rises at the idea of the Austrian Government sending Hungarian, Croatian, Bohemian, perhaps Italian troops, into Schleswig-Holstein to fight the battle of nationality and freedom. The fact is that these two Governments have been playing the demagogue to the German people, and there are none so subservient to the passions of the people as your sceptred demagogues. Now, I am not going to trouble the House with a single quotation from the blue-books, and I hope to propitiate the favour of the audience by removing all dread of that infliction from them. But in order to mark the change which has taken place in the progress of society in Europe, in order to show to what a degree democratic principles, or, if that be offensive to you, popular sovereignty in Europe has progressed during the last thirty or forty years, let me read, in connection with this invasion of Schleswig-Holstein by the two Powers, doing the behests of the German people, an extract from the manifesto of the Sovereigns of Austria, Russia, and Prussia, at Laybach, May 12, 1821, the epoch of the Holy Alliance—

> "Useful or necessary changes in legislation, and in the administration of States, ought only to emanate from the free will and the intelligent and well-weighed conviction of those whom God has rendered responsible for power. All that deviates from this line necessarily leads to disorder, commotions, and evils far more insufferable than those which they pretend to remedy. Penetrated with this eternal truth, the Sovereigns have not hesitated to proclaim it with frankness and vigour; they have declared that, in respecting the rights and independence of all legitimate power, they regarded as legally null and as disavowed by the principles which constitute the public right of Europe all pretended reform operated by revolt and open hostility."

That was the doctrine of these absolute Sovereigns in 1821, and now we are told on the authority, not only of our own representatives, but of the representatives of Austria and Prussia themselves, that they are constrained in the course that they are now following by the necessity they are under by the pressure, to use the words of the noble Lord the Foreign Minister, put upon them by the German population. I have mentioned this most significant and pregnant fact, because it shows how completely the state of Europe has changed, how little you need be under any apprehension in future of a Holy Alliance of Sovereigns—there may be a Holy Alliance of the people, though that does not seem very likely as yet—and because it shows to what a degree everything is altered in Europe with which we have now to deal, and that your foreign policy will require to be adjusted from time to time in accordance with these changes. Now I come to our own course in these proceedings. What were we to do when these two great military Powers invaded Schleswig-Holstein? We were right, I think, in offering our mediation. There can be no office more dignified, there ought to be no office more safe, than that of a mediator. If there be blessings on any one, we are told they are for the peacemakers, or for those who attempt to make peace. There has been, unfortunately, in this country a tendency —I will not stop to inquire by which party it has been promoted; but there has been a tendency when assuming the office of mediator to pass the boundary line which separates the mediator from the partisan. No sooner had we entered into the Schleswig-Holstein question, professedly with a view to attempt to keep the peace, than public speakers, public writers—probably there are some among my audience now—instantly assumed the attitude of partisans; and finding they could not carry their own views by counsel were disposed to become belligerents at once. Nothing could be more unfortunate for the cause of peace than that such a principle should be recognized. When you attempt to fill the post of mediator, you ought not to run the risk of being dragged into the position of principal. Why, even under the old system of duelling, except in the most barbarous times of the Ireland of the last century, it was deemed very sharp practice if a gentleman, because he went out as a second, was obliged to play the part of principal with the other second. I am now going to say what one who spoke for the mere sake of popularity would not care to say. The great fault we commit is that we allow ourselves to be betrayed into something like threats, without duly measuring the power we have to carry out our menaces. There is, I say, a policy of menace in this country. It is familiar to those who read certain journals, who hear certain questions put in this House—such questions as those about where our channel fleet is. In another place men who ought to know better, and whose voices ought to be heard in other accents than those of the incendiary, have been talking about sending our fleet to the Baltic. We are bound to treat this question in the same way as other countries treat it, and we should be the veriest Chinese if we did not look the matter fairly in the face ourselves. Have those who talk about entering into these continental quarrels, and settling them in a spirit of dictation, ever considered what is our ability to carry out our will in any way on the Continent of Europe? For our own defence at home our powers are, if I may speak it without irreverence, all but omnipotent. All the world could not assail us with success in our island home. But when we talk of our power to coerce military nations on the Continent, we should remember it is very limited indeed. "Send a fleet to the Baltic" was the utterance we heard in another place. What would a fleet do in the Baltic? Blockade the Prussian ports? Why, the railways have practically rendered blockades innocuous. I will tell you all the difference a blockade of the Prussian ports would make. We got 1,200,000 qrs. of wheat from Prussia last year. If there were a blockade, it would come by railway, at a few shillings additional expense, through Holland, Belgium, or France, and the same thing would happen in regard to the other exports and imports. Practically, blockades have lost their former power as an instrument of war, excepting in an extraordinary case, such as we may see in America, where the blockading party also commands the internal communications of the country. I must not forget to mention that our commerce is also liable to attack. Recent experience has shown that you cannot localize a war, and we should be exposed to retaliation on the ocean. What could we do in the case of war with Prussia? Our war would be with the whole German people; for, as I said before, the Austrian and Prussian Governments are merely doing the behests of the German population. The latter have an honest sympathy with the Schleswig-Holsteiners. They are actuated, I believe, by generous motives; and I dare say a large portion of them are heartily ashamed of the champions who forced themselves into their service. What could you do in a war with 40,000,000 of Germans to carry out your own will in regard to this question? I am now speaking in answer to the hon. Gentleman the Member for North Warwickshire. What could you do to maintain that slice of land in Schleswig for the Danes? We should have to fight the whole German people, in a frenzy of excitement, thoroughly in earnest, imbued with convictions which are the growth of ten or twelve years' constant pamphleteering, lecturing, and newspaper reading. You might attack Austria. You might dismember Austria from her outlying provinces, but would the German population greatly grieve to see the extra-Teutonic limbs of Austria cut away? You would not be attacking the German race there, and it is against them that you think you have a grievance. Your navy would do little. Is it proposed to send an army either to Germany or elsewhere to contend in the field against a great military nation? Your army is already engaged in other fields. You have at this moment upwards of 70,000 troops in India and 9,000 men for the depôts at home, making about 80,000 troops for India alone. You have two little armies in China, separated from each other by 1,000 miles of country. For the first time you have this year placed a detachment of troops in Japan. You have 10,000 men fighting somebody's battle—I will not say whose battle—in New Zealand; you have from 10,000 to 15,000 troops in British North America committed as a point of honour to the task of defending a frontier line of 1,500 miles against a nation which can keep 700,000 men in the field. You have, besides, other detachments at the Cape of Good Hope and the West Indies, and you are just emerging from a war with Ashantee, to say nothing of your garrisons in Malta, Gibraltar, and elsewhere. The world never saw such a dispersion of forces as that. It is a received maxim in war that concentration gives strength, and dispersion entails weakness. I do not say a word as to the policy of keeping these troops distributed all over the world. I merely state the fact, and I ask you whether you think the circumstance of your having these troops scattered abroad in these remote fields is not duly taken into account, and is not employed in discounting your force in the eyes of any nation in Europe to whom you use menacing language. I say that it would be folly and that it would be childish if we were to conceal from ourselves these facts. I do not quote them to disparage your power at home. I began by saying that you are all but omnipotent at home; but when your newspapers are telling us that it is with difficulty that you can find recruits to serve in your army you surely cannot expect foreign Governments to be intimidated at the prospect of your going to war with them on land. These, I am afraid, are the circumstances under which we not only resort too much to threats, but they are circumstances under which our Government has actually proposed within the last six months to unite with other countries on the continent in going to war with Germany. If there is any country in the world with which we ought to be able to live at peace, it is with the German population, for on that principle of nationality which has now become the loadstone of peoples we are by race and religion more allied to the Germans than any other people. [An hon. MEMBER: The Danes.] No, I do not except the Danes. It was in the winter of last year, according to a revelation now made to us, that our Government proposed, in conjunction with France, to go to war with Germany, or, at least, to give material aid — that is the language in which diplomatists express their readiness to go to war—to give material aid to Denmark; and we are saved from a war, not by the discretion of our own Government, but by the wisdom of the Emperor of the French. Nay, more, we were willing to have joined Russia in this crusade against Germany. That, of course, was one of those propositions which on its face must be abortive, and it is one of those proofs of the weakness of our foreign diplomacy to which I have referred. Russia was not likely in conjunction with England to go to war with Germany. It was only last autumn that our foreign Minister, speaking on the Polish question at Blairgowrie, denounced Russia in terms which amounted to a declaration of outlawry, and yet within four months, I believe, from that time we were sending proposals to Russia to join us in going to war with Germany. Call that a policy! It is diplomaticanarchy. Suppose France had joined us in going to war with Germany, what would have followed next? Are we quite agreed and united with France in all our continental objects? I maintain that there is no country on the continent with which we could fitly join in a continental war, for this reason—there is no great nation on the continent that stands on the same footing with regard to the continent as we do. There is no great country there which either has not something to lose or something to gain by a war. We have neither. We have no territorial connection at all with the continent, and while I am as anxious as most people—you will all give me credit for that—to see this country united with France, yet I think it would be a very questionable policy for the Governments of those two countries to join together in any war against Germany. We can fight our own battles in a good cause against all who are our aggressors, but the danger of joining with any other country in going to war is this—that you are no longer masters of your own movements, and you will never have it in your power to make peace. Bear in mind that in the month of January these negotiations were going on, and they might at any moment have culminated in a war for this country. Recollect the unsuspecting state of this great commercial community, and recollect to what extent all our manifold enterprises have been developed. If a war had broken out, or had been announced at the opening of Parliament, what might have been the consequences to this community? What would have been the condition of Parliament? That is the material question for consideration, for I look to this House as the administrator of the wishes and the will of the country with regard to these questions. I have seen lately a very remarkable manifestation of the opinion of this House and its divergence—its discordance not only with what I believe to have been the tendency of the Cabinet, but what was to a large extent out of doors the popular feeling on the subject of war. We heard a fortnight ago that there was a talk of the country being likely to be plunged into a war for Schleswig-Holstein. You know what many of the papers—some of them supposed to be under the inspiration of certain parties who were writing up war at that time, but those who had the opportunity of mixing with Members of this House on both sides of the House felt that war on the part of the Government for Schleswig-Holstein would not have been supported by a majority of this House. I believe that those Members of this House who represent the great interests of the country, who come here from the great centres of the mining, manufacturing, commercial, shipowning, and agricultural interests, and who are in constant and almost, you may say, mesmeric communication with the more intelligent minds of their own localities—I have no doubt that they felt an unseen power pressing upon them the necessity of avoiding war on this most trivial and almost incomprehensible question. It was the feeling of the Members of this House that prevented the possibility of the Cabinet, or of any section of the Cabinet, taking a single step of a hostile kind that might have led us into war. But let us not forget that we were in great danger before Parliament met of being involved in a war by a secret alliance from which this House could not possibly have disentangled itself? I say deliberately, and I challenge any one to contradict me, that there are not fifty men in this House now who would vote for a war with Germany for Schleswig-Holstein on any issue that has been presented to us. If I am not speaking the truth, let me be contradicted. Indeed, I almost doubt if there are five Members in this House who would take such a course. I think the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Newdegate) found some difficulty yesterday in finding a seconder. [*Cries of* "Whalley," *and laughter.*] Well, it was the hon. Member for Peterborough who seconded the Motion. And we know that there is a strong and a friendly sympathy on certain topics which draws those two hon. Gentlemen together. I put it to hon. Gentlemen in this House—to you on this side who support the Government, and to you on the other side who may very shortly have to take upon yourselves the responsibilities of office, I put it to both sides of the House, —is it not high time that there was some mode devised by which the Government should know the wish of this House upon these and kindred questions, because we do not know to what extent this very war which is now raging may extend? It may spread over Europe, and the question that we have to ask of ourselves is whether we ought to take part in it. I have told you for two years that I attach no importance to the question whether the noble Lord here is in office or Lord Derby. I think you are very wrong in trying to remove the noble Lord. He does your work better than Lord Derby would. He throws discredit on Reform; he derides the 220 Gentlemen who are pledged to vote for the Ballot; as the right hon. and gallant Officer the Member for Huntingdon (General Peel) said yesterday, he spends more money, and is far more extravagant than we would allow you to be if you were in office. Besides all this, if you will give him time; if, instead of challenging him, or, to recur to the simile of my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, if instead of killing him, and thus lessening the pain of his dissolution, you will allow him to die a natural death, speaking officially, I have always been of the impression, that after he has thoroughly demoralized his own party, he intends when he makes his political will to hand over office to you as his residuary legatee. You see that I understand what our French neighbours call "the situation." But I want you, irrespective of party, which is long since dead in this House, to consider the importance and gravity of these foreign questions. They will trouble you when you come into power. Recollect there are only two classes of questions on which Governments when in office fall:—the one class is foreign questions, the other is financial. [An hon. MEMBER: How about Reform?] Oh, no, we do not go out upon Reform. It is only you (the Opposition) who do that; and you will know better another time. Is it not worth your while, then, at the only time when you can draw serious attention to questions of foreign policy, to try and enunciate a better principle for our guidance in future? What is the ground of our foreign policy? Why do we interfere in these affairs abroad? I hardly know of one treaty which binds us to go to war on the continent. There was only one treaty of the kind in the settlement, as it was called, of Vienna, and it was entered into by England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia, by which those Powers bound themselves solemnly, in the name of the Holy Trinity, by force of arms if necessary, to prevent for ever any member of the Bonaparte family from sitting on the throne of France. I am not aware of any other treaty—[An hon. MEMBER: Belgium]—by which we bound ourselves to go to war. That is the exception. Well, why do we trouble ourselves with these continental politics? We have no territorial interest on the continent. We gain nothing there by our diplomatic meddling. Our general excuse is —and it is a phrase that is stereotyped in the despatches of the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary — that we have a policy founded on what is called "the balance of power"—a thing I never could understand; but I believe the present balance is a figment that was supposed to have grown out of what is termed the great settlement of Vienna, but which I term the great unsettlement of Vienna. But can we, in the face of these growing popular interests, any longer base our foreign policy on that Treaty of Vienna? Recollect that we are not bound to do anything by force to maintain that treaty. All we are bound to do is not to violate its undertakings. What has that Treaty of Vienna done for Europe? I have in my hand a short extract — and it is my only one— from the writings of a great Italian, one of the noblest and most disinterested, one of the most accomplished and bravest of the patriots of modern times, and who in the struggle for the independence of his country bore the heat and burden of the day, but who has not been so prominently before the world of late as he was formerly. I mean the Marquis Massimo d'Azeglio. Writing in 1847 he says—

> "We believe that all the disturbances which have agitated Europe from 1815 to the present time, all the discontent and revolutions of these thirty-two years, and the moral inquietude which more or less agitates society have been caused by the unnatural and forced partition of Europe by the Congress of Vienna. Its measures for the establishment of peace and tranquillity in Europe have proved the germ of all the wars and revolutions which have since occurred, because the only interests there cared for were those of dynasties, families, and privileged classes, without any consideration of national feeling, or of the inevitable wants of that new state of society which the Revolution had created."

Now, that is the character of the Treaty of Vienna; these are its consequences as traced by the hand of one of the most distinguished members of that community which suffered so much from it; that was written in 1847, and you had a period that convulsed all Europe, full of dynastic change and fearful revolution, two years afterwards, and I ask is it not necessary that we should discard the idea of ever troubling ourselves again, of ever diplomatizing or entering into negotiations abroad, with the view of maintaining what is called the balance of power as settled by the Treaty of Vienna? Now, what in common parlance is the reason why we are invited to interfere in continental quarrels? We frequently hear it said that we must protect the weak against the strong. But, supposing we were gifted with such supreme wisdom and justice that we were entitled to take the office of universal judge, I have shown you that we have not the material force at our disposal for the purpose. Besides, I sometimes hear it stated in this House, when we are complaining of the conduct of our Government towards Brazil and other small Powers, that it is the small Powers which presume upon their weakness; and if we are always to take up the cause of the weak because they are weak, we shall certainly be for ever troubled with the quarrels of half the world. Then we are told that we must fight for the right. But there is a right and a wrong in every case, and if we are always to choose one side or the other because it is thought to be the right, how is it possible we can ever enjoy any peace or quietness in this country? The truth is, we all have our pet projects for interference abroad. One party among us wishes to interfere for Poland, another wishes to interfere for Hungary, another would interfere for Italy. Some would even go to America and interfere in that terrible struggle. Now, if we are to take up a line of foreign policy which is to be for the redress of great wrongs, and if I were called upon to say what should be my project, I should say that Venice has the first claim on this country, because Venice had a glorious history of a thousand years; she was a commercial Power, with a career somewhat analogous to our own—a Power which, if her annals were fairly written, giving a comparison between her and other countries at the time when she flourished, would be seen to have certainly the best title to existence of any country on the continent, and to existence especially at our hands as a commercial people. Yet the sign and seal of England is attached to that treaty which assigned Venice to Austria. Now I do not myself speak in public on the question of the wrongs of the continent, because I do not feel that I should be justified in invoking the aid of my countrymen to fight the battles of other States; yet, if there is one country which has more claim than another upon us, it is the country I have named. But then, to undo the wrong we did at Vienna towards Venice we should have to fight against our own engagements, and, in fact, against our own signature. Moreover, our own country requires peace. Some people think it is very degrading, very base, that an Englishman should speak of his own country as requiring peace, and as being entitled to enjoy its blessings; and if we allude to our enormous commercial and industrial engagements as a reason why we should avoid these petty embroilments we are told that we are selfish and grovelling in our politics. But I say we were very wrong to take such measures as were calculated to extend our commerce unless we were prepared to use prudential precautions to keep our varied manufacturing and mercantile operations free from the mischiefs of unnecessary war. You have in this country engagements of the most extensive and complicated kind. You have extended your operations during the last twenty-five years to such a degree that you are now actually exporting three times as much as you did twenty-five years ago—that is, your foreign commerce and the manufactures on which it depends have grown in a quarter of a century twice as much as they grew in a thousand years previously. Is not all this a motive for at least taking all reasonable precautions to avoid these continental quarrels? And, as we have had a narrow escape now, I hold that I am justified in making this calm statement to the House, in hopes that outside of this .party conflict — of which I offer no complaints — something may come calculated to place us upon a better footing in regard to our continental relations. I do not know when I could have an opportunity of saying so much on this subject — as it is always regarded as an abstract question—except on this occasion. I have taken very little interest in the mere party question at issue between the two sides of the House. I think the greater question is the effect which this dilemma of both parties, and particularly of the Government, should have upon our foreign policy for the future. I maintain that we must have a change in the foreign relations of this country, or a change in our Foreign Office. The present system of diplomacy has broken down. Our Foreign Office has lost its credit with foreign countries. You cannot from this time approach a foreign country on any question of foreign politics, in which you will not be looked upon with want of consideration, and, indeed, with mistrust. And why? Because foreign countries feel that when they are dealing with the Foreign Office the Foreign Office is not, in fact, a power; the power is here; and foreign Governments more than suspect that your Foreign Minister is often playing a game with them from time to time merely to suit his policy and his prospects in this House. Such being the case, I maintain — and I know I have spoken outside of your party contest in a way, perhaps, that entitles you to my thanks for having listened to me so well—I maintain that it behoves us to adopt a different policy, to let it be known that it is our policy, and to let the Government feel that it is necessary they should act up to it. The present system cannot go on. It requires a change not only in the interest of this country, but in the interest of other countries allied to us by neighbourhood or commerce; nay, it requires a change on higher grounds—in the interest of peace, civilization, and humanity.

LORD ROBERT CECIL: Sir, I have some difficulty in following the hon. Gentleman the Member for Rochdale, because this Motion is an attack on Her Majesty's Government, and it appears to me that although he spoke as their advocate his enthusiasm in their favour does not rise to a very high temperature. In fact, the hon. Gentleman seems to me to be about as good a friend of Her Majesty's Government as Her Majesty's Government have been of the Kingdom of Denmark. But there is this remarkable difference between the two cases—that whereas Her Majesty's Government gave to Denmark abundance of good words and no material aid, the hon. Gentleman is about to give to the Government all his material aid, while he accompanies it with a full dose of what certainly cannot be called fair words. I listened with much pleasure to the greater part of the speech of the hon. Gentleman as a straightforward expression of the opinions which he is known to hold; but there was one portion of it which I heard with regret. I regret that considering the position in which the country stands towards Denmark—no matter from what cause—one holding so prominent a position in this House should have thought it right to fling upon that unhappy country reproaches for what has passed. Denmark has not much to thank us for; but we have steadily maintained her right upon the points to which the hon. Gentleman has touched; and I think it would only be fair that we should not now attempt to re-open these unhappy discussions, and to cover with reproaches a country which has too much reason to complain of our acts. I cannot, of course, agree with the doctrines of foreign policy laid down by the hon. Gentleman. But I will say this—that if the hon. Gentleman had been Foreign Secretary instead of Lord Russell, I fully believe this country would occupy a position proud and noble compared to that which she occupies at this moment. He would at least have been entitled to the credit of having acted from the first on fixed and definite principles, of holding out in the name of England no hopes which she did not intend to fulfil, of entering into no engagements from which she was ready to recede; it would be felt that, whatever might be her course, she had acted from high motives and upon a distinct policy, and not from a desire to obtain influence by words while she was afraid when the moment for action came to second it by deeds. My complaint of the policy of Her Majesty's Government is, that it is founded upon no definite principle, that it is oscillating, vague, and fluctuating in its course. If you look at that policy for the last two years you will, I think, be struck by the fact—indeed, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer has acknowledged it—that it divides itself into two parts, and that the dividing point of these parts coincides, curiously enough, with the date at which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ashton (Mr. Milner Gibson) began to interest himself in this question. We know that up to a certain period the right hon. Gentleman kept himself studiously aloof from the question; he knew nothing about it; and it is not improbable that other Members of the Cabinet were in a similar position blessed with a like ignorance. But from the moment the right hon. Member for Ashton, and those who agree with him, began their studies on the Danish question, there was a complete turn in the policy of Her Majesty's Government. Before it was all war; and since it has been, with some slight exceptions, all peace. In fact, to adopt a scientific nomenclature, there has been in that matter what may be called a pre-Gibsonian and post-Gibsonian epoch. It is impossible, in a discussion of this kind, to avoid committing the great offence of quoting despatches, and I shall have to refer to the blue-book for the purpose of showing that at the pre-Gibsonian period the policy of Her Majesty's Government was so warlike that not only did they utter threats but they neglected all the ordinary pacific means of settling the dispute. We know that the hon. Member for Rochdale would suggest, as the best mode of dealing with the difficulty, arbitration, or mediation, or a Congress. But the curious thing is, that Her Majesty's Government had an opportunity of resorting to that pacific mode of settling the question, but that they were so warlike and so resolute that they treated that opportunity with contempt. The House will remember what was the state of things in the month of October last. King Frederick VII. was not then dead, and the difference with the German Powers had, therefore, not risen into anything like an insoluble difficulty. On the 23rd of October Sir Andrew Buchanan wrote to Earl Russell a despatch which has not yet been quoted, and which is, I think, well deserving of the attention of the House. In it he states—

> "I may mention here that M. Bismarck asked me some days ago, whether it might not be possible to effect an arrangement by arbitration; and I replied that, as countries did not submit questions affecting their independence to the arbitration of the Governments of other States, Her Majesty's Government were not likely to ask Denmark to do so." No. 3, 174.

Here was an offer to refer the dispute to arbitration coming from the man who had showed how powerful he was upon this question, who had dragged Austria in his train, and who made the German States to do his bidding. No doubt, therefore, any solution to which he had given his adhesion would have been effectual and complete. But that offer was treated by the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary with absolute contempt. He left the despatch in question wholly unnoticed: he did not even acknowledge its receipt; and it appears not to have entered into his contemplation, that he had there an opportunity of terminating the difficulty and of preventing all the bloodshed and all the misery to which it has since given rise. If the hon. Member for Rochdale had been in office and had received such a despatch he would have seized the opportunity at once, lest it should not occur again, of settling a contest which threatened to be bloody and exercising the influence of England in a really peaceful manner. There was another mode of settling the question, namely, mediation; and that mode too had been placed within the reach of the Government. But the Government had a remarkable facility for doing everything at the wrong time. They offered a mediation in October, and it was rejected. On the 5th of November—still before the death of King Frederick VII.—Sir Andrew Buchanan wrote to Earl Russell as follows:—

> "Such being the circumstances, he (M. de Bismarck) said he would ask whether I thought Her Majesty's Government might not be disposed to address a fuller despatch to Sir Alexander Malet, stating that the Danish Government had expressed their readiness to submit the international differences between Denmark and Germany to the mediation of Great Britain; and that Her Majesty's Government, convinced that the Diet were equally desirous with Denmark to bring their international differences to an amicable solution, now offered their mediation to the Diet." No. 3, 197

They had thus an offer of mediation from the most powerful Minister in this dispute; but for one unfortunate moment in their official career Her Majesty's Government were seized with a fit of dignity—it was their first offence of the kind and apparently their last. On the 9th of November Lord Russell wrote as follows to Sir Andrew Buchanan:—

> "As matters now stand, Her Majesty's Government have come to the conclusion that it is inexpedient for them, at all events for the present, to make any further proposal to the Diet." No. 3, 199.

What reply did M. de Bismarck give to that declaration? On the 14th of November Sir Andrew Buchanan states to Lord Russell—

> "All he (M. de Bismarck) could say was that if your Lordship had complied with the suggestion in my despatch of the 5th inst., and if you had written to Sir Alexander Malet in the exact terms of that despatch, so as to bring the matter anew before the Diet in a form which, in his opinion, would have met the objections which they had raised to the previous communication made to them from Copenhagen, through M. de Tydow, the Prussian Government was prepared to give their vote in favour of the proposal which it was hoped Her Majesty's Government would have made, and to have supported it with all their influence; and he begged me to say that if Her Majesty's Government would re-consider their decision, and still act upon his suggestion, their offer of mediation would be supported by Prussia, if she stood alone, which he hoped she would not do, as he felt assured she would carry a majority of the Diet with her." No. 3, 204.

That was M. de Bismarck's opinion of what would have happened if Her Majesty's Government had accepted the proposal. But they dawdled with the matter; they did not seem to know their own minds, and, as it frequently happens with people in such a position, something occurred which made repentance too late. On this occasion that something was a very important event—the death of Frederick VII. Before Her Majesty's Government could make up their dilatory minds the death of Frederick VII. presented an insurmountable barrier to all projects of that kind. But what would probably have been the success of that mediation, if the offer had been accepted, we may learn from the communication of the Austrian Plenipotentiary. On the 27th of November Sir Alexander Malet wrote to Earl Russell as follows:—

> "This communication, confidentially made to me by Baron de Kubeck, was accompanied by an expression of great regret that our offer had not been made during the lifetime of the late King of Denmark, when Austria would readily have accepted the friendly proposal." No. 3, 280.

There was another chance irrevocably lost. There had been opportunities for arbitration and mediation. There was yet another means of settling the question pacifically, and that was by the holding of a Congress. I do not think it has come generally to the knowledge of the House that the proposal was made by the Emperor of the French for the first time. On May 30, 1863, M. de Bismarck suggested a Conference as the best mode of settling this question. Sir Andrew Buchanan wrote at that date that M. Von Bismarck suggested that a Conference would be the best mode of settling the question. The Danish Minister would be found making the same suggestion, and you will find that the difficulty lay in the blank refusal, or in the unaccountable delay, of Her Majesty's Government. I can only attribute this to the fact that Her Majesty's Government had made up their minds to war—if they took no pains to obtain a peaceable solution of the difficulty, we can only suppose that they had made up their minds to a settlement by the sword. We were told by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that there were no threats used by Lord Russell which were not in conformity with the language used by Prussia and France. I confess I was astounded by that statement. I should like, at a later period of the debate, to hear this assertion justified by some of the right hon. Gentleman's Colleagues on the Ministerial bench—justify that assertion by a comparison of the language held by the two Powers. The language of Prussia and France had been as studiously restrained and dignified as that of Lord Russell was immoderate. Will the right hon. Gentleman give us any parallel instances to such phrases as this?—

> "Should Federal troops enter Holstein on purely Federal grounds, Her Majesty's Government would not interfere; but should it appear that Federal troops had entered the Duchy on international grounds, Her Majesty's Government may be obliged to interfere."

Was there any language held on the part of France or Russia which conveyed a threat like this? Again, Earl Russell, writing to Sir Andrew Buchanan, on December 24, 1863, said—

> "It would be no less impossible for Her Majesty's Government to enter into any engagement, that if the Federal troops should not limit their operations to the Duchy of Holstein, but should on some pretence or other extend their operations to the Duchy of Schleswig, Her Majesty's Government would maintain an attitude of neutrality between Germany and Denmark." No. 4, 413.

There is a material difference between that and the statement of the French and Russian Governments. I will give the right hon. Gentleman one more opportunity for comparison. On January 4, 1864, Earl Russell writes to Sir Andrew Buchanan—

> "In reply to your Excellency's despatch of the 2nd instant, which was received on the 4th, I have to inform you that Her Majesty's Government consider you were right in stating to the Prussian Secretary for Foreign Affairs that they had not said that the relations between England and Prussia might be endangered by an invasion of Schleswig, although they considered that such an invasion might do so if due time were not given to the Danish Government to grant the concession which they were required to make." No. 4, 488.

This was as distinct a threat as ever was made. There was not a word in any of the French or Russian Despatches which amounted to such a threat. But we are told by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that all the efforts of Lord Russell were prompted by the belief that we should have the assistance of France, and that he never offered any threat except upon that hypothesis. I think the right hon. Gentleman must have forgotten part of a conversation which took place between Count Bernstorff and Lord Russell towards the close of that period, which I have denominated the warlike period of the policy of the Government. Here is what Earl Russell said to Count Bernstorff, and the House will judge from it whether Earl Russell was then thinking of the single action of England, or of a European combination. Earl Russell, writing to Lord Bloomfield on January 14, 1864, says—

> "It is to be observed that in speaking to Count Bernstorff on the occasion alluded to, I had expressly declared that I could not say what the decision of the Government might be, as the Cabinet had not yet deliberated, and, consequently, not submitted any opinion to the Queen; but that, judging from the general current of feeling in Parliament and in the nation, I thought an invasion of Schleswig by Germany might lead to assistance to Denmark on the part of this country." No. 4, 534.

There was no thought of a European combination in that statement—that was assistance to be given to Denmark by this country alone. I believe the noble Earl had been able meantime to consult the right hon. Member for Ashton (Mr. Milner Gibson), after he and his Colleagues had commenced their study of the Danish question, and perhaps that might have had an influence in causing some modification of that opinion. These despatches are dry to read and hear, but the House will feel that changes of this kind, so derogatory to the honour of those attacked, ought to be supported by proofs. I want to call the attention of the House to one more passage, in proof that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not a shadow of foundation for saying that the policy of Lord Russell went on the supposition of assistance from France. Does the House remember the conversation between Lord Napier and Prince Gortschakoff, when Lord Napier pressed upon Prince Gortschakoff the necessity of arresting the march of the German Powers, and said—

> "I represented to him the pressing necessity of arresting warlike preparations, and combining the Powers least directly interested to prevent the attack on Schleswig which seemed imminent, or that it might be possible that the Germans might find themselves confronted with the armed intervention of Great Britain."

I presume that Lord Napier, in thus speaking of the armed intervention of Great Britain, did not speak without authority, and that he knew what he had a right to threaten or to promise. Anyhow his statement has not been disavowed, and I take this despatch as substantial and irrefragable proof that Lord Russell at that moment meditated resisting the Germans by the efforts of England alone, and that he was so confident in the course that he intended to take that he did not shrink from expressing it in promises and threats. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer made so strong a statement that I took his words down. The right hon. Gentleman said —

> "I am not aware of a single word having been said by his noble Friend by way of menace to the German Powers after it was found that a European combination in support of the treaty was no longer obtainable."

I believe the date is put about the 24th of January—I mean the date when it was thought that a European combination was impossible. I should have thought the declaration of the Prime Minister afforded a sufficient refutation of that statement. But we have something more distinct. We have a despatch from Lord Russell, dated February 20, 1864, a long time after the Government were assured that a combination of the European Powers was almost impossible, in which he says—

> "The intelligence of the entrance of German troops into Jutland has been received by Her Majesty's Government with surprise, for no previous intimation had been conveyed to them of such an extension of the field of hostilities being contemplated by the Austrian and Prussian Governments. You will not disguise from M.

Bismarck that this proceeding is looked upon in a very serious light by Her Majesty's Government." No. 5, 710.

["Hear!"] I gather from these cheers that hon. Gentlemen opposite do not think this a threat. But it is difficult to know what hon. Gentlemen would regard as a threat. I remember a story of a naval officer who once endeavoured to justify the use of the profane habit of swearing, by saying that the men would never think him in earnest if he did not swear; and it seems as though hon. Gentlemen opposite thought that, unless the Foreign Secretary did not proceed to diplomatic execrations, no expressions of his, however strong, amounted to threats. But I think it is a fair principle of interpretation to examine a man's language in a particular case by the light of his other works. Now, we have a large literature of threats in the handwriting of Lord Russell, and by examination and collation we may arrive at the meaning of the noble Earl. No doubt hon. Gentlemen remember a dispute with Brazil in the spring of last year. Some of the officers of the *Forte* went out to dinner, came home afterwards very happy, got into trouble with a sentry, and were put into a Brazilian prison, but were released as soon as it was discovered that they were naval officers, and were sent back on board their ship. This outrage excited the deepest indignation on the part of Her Majesty's Government, and Lord Russell wrote a despatch to the style of which they had since become more accustomed, demanding that the authors of the alleged outrage should be punished, that an apology should be given, and directing our representative in Brazil to inform the Government of that country of the serious light in which the matter was viewed by the British Government. What followed? The Brazilian Government did not accede to the demand. Did Earl Russell wait for further information to guide his future course? Not a bit. The next thing we heard was that the British fleet had seized a number of Brazilian ships. I do not know whether the Prussian Government are students of English blue-books; but if they are, and if they did not know the judicious distinction which the noble Earl always drew between the strong and the weak, they would have come to the conclusion that these words about "the serious light in which the matter was viewed" meant that if the advance into Jutland were continued any further reprisals would be executed upon Prussian ships. I think that after that despatch it was too much for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to say that after any European combination had become hopeless no threats were made to Germany. What did the House hear the other night at the close of the speech of the noble Viscount? Was it a threat or was it not? I have conversed with many Members on both sides of the House about that speech, and the general feeling appears to be that it was the most melancholy exhibition which any Prime Minister of this country had ever made before the House of Commons. After all our threats had been despised—after the independence and integrity of Denmark which we had asserted in the face of the world was the object of our highest interest, after we had failed in every attempt at pacification or to maintain that independence and integrity—the noble Lord came down to the House and told us that if Copenhagen were taken, if the people were slaughtered, and if the King was taken prisoner of war, then we would not fight—but the time would then have come when the Government would re-consider their determination. I think that since the time when Ancient Pistol swallowed the leek, saying that he did so for revenge, such an exhibition has never been presented to the world. We have been told by the hon. Member for Rochdale, of the dangers that might accrue to this country through war, especially to our mercantile marine. Earl Russell has said the same things and told us of the hostility of America, and of the antagonism of Russia, of our enormous commerce and our great interests in India, and we have been reminded of the magnificent Budget of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Admitting this, still it might have been found out in the autumn of last year. If these considerations are sufficient to keep England from striking now, they should have been sufficient to keep England from threatening them. Look at the difficulty of your situation now. You cannot by any form of words you can use persuade Foreign Powers that you are in earnest. In any future European complications that may arise, you may tell them that your interests are greatly concerned, that you are not indifferent to a question, that you view the matter in a very serious light, that the aggressors might be met by armed intervention; but until you have committed yourselves to irrevocable war, you will not be able to make those listen to whom you address yourselves. This loss of dignity and honour is not a sentiment; it is a loss of actual power. It is a loss of power which will have to be brought back at some future day by the blood and treasure of England. The conduct of France in this matter has been spoken of, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer has denied that there were any promises made by us to Denmark, which could be considered in any way as a slur upon the honour of England if they were disregarded; and he went through the statements of the right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire, and seemed to satisfy himself that he had confuted them. I shall confine myself to one of them—but one promise is as good as a hundred, and one disregarded promise casts upon the escutcheon of a country disgrace which is only increased in degree by multiplied repetitions. The one case to which I refer, which the Chancellor of the Exchequer passed over adroitly, was the conversation of Lord Wodehouse with M. Hall, respecting the November Constitution. Now mark—we are told that the Government, with respect to any promises or threats which they made, acted always upon the assumption of the co-operation of France. Now, let the House mark what Lord Wodehouse reported himself to have said to M. Hall—

> "I entreated his Excellency to weigh well the gravity of the dangers which threatened Denmark. General Fleury had informed M. d'Ewers and me that he was instructed to tell the Danish Government that France would not go to war to support Denmark against Germany. It was my duty to declare to him that if the Danish Government rejected our advice, Her Majesty's Government must leave Denmark to encounter Germany upon her own responsibility."

Let the House observe the passage in which the contrast between France and England is strikingly drawn. France had distinctly and positively stated through General Fleury that she could not support Denmark against Germany by arms. Lord Wodehouse, on the part of England, stated nothing of the kind. He spoke conditionally, "If you do not withdraw the Constitution, we will leave you to encounter Germany." But did not Lord Wodehouse thereby imply that if Denmark did what he demanded then England would not leave Denmark to encounter Germany upon her own responsibility? I know that in the ordinary events of life neither Lord Wodehouse nor Lord Russell nor any Member of the Government in dealing as man with man would leave a person in a difficulty from which he had promised to extricate him if he did certain things, and those things were done. But, then, it is said that Denmark delayed to do what we asked. But when the Chancellor of the Exchequer referred to this point had he forgotten another portion of the same despatch of Lord Wodehouse which went far to diminish, if not entirely to destroy, the weight of that objection? Lord Wodehouse writes—

> "I said that the Danish Government were the best judges of the manner in which the law could be changed, but of course he would understand that Her Majesty's Government would never advise recourse to unconstitutional means."

The Constitution could not have been repealed at that moment except by unconstitutional means. The Rigsraad then sitting was, by its own constitution, dissolved upon the following day, and a new Rigsraad could not have been summoned without a certain delay; but long before that period of delay had elapsed the Danish Government signified to Her Majesty's Government that they were ready to adopt the advice that had been given to them and to withdraw the November Constitution. M. Hall was compelled to resign because he refused to carry out the policy which the King of Denmark saw by the promise of Lord Wodehouse was the only policy which Denmark could safely adopt at that time. M. Hall was sacrificed in order that the help of Great Britain, as promised by Lord Wodehouse, might be obtained. The King parted with his Minister, adopted an unpopular policy, repealed the Constitution which had only just been passed, and submitted to the indignity of acting at the bidding of a foreign Power, all upon the faith of the promise that if that were done England would not leave Denmark to encounter Germany alone, and upon her own responsibility. I may be asked what policy with regard to the future I recommend to be adopted. As to the immediate future, it is absurd to ask a Member of the House of Commons, who has no knowledge of the information which is in the possession of the Foreign Office, to offer an opinion upon that point. As to the ultimate future, I confess I agree very much with what has been said by two hon. Gentlemen, holding very diverse sentiments on many subjects—the right hon. and gallant

Member for Huntingdon (General Peel) and the hon. Member for Rochdale (Mr. Cobden). If we did not mean to fight we ought not to interfere. If we did not intend to carry out by arms our threats and measures, we must abstain from the luxury of indulging in them. That is the only policy for the future which I believe is involved in the censure of the Government for the past. As to the immediate matter of Denmark, I am told by all my Danish friends that it is too late to do any good. Whether that be so or not, and whether or not any good would accrue to Denmark from the passing of this Motion, at all events one thing remains—if we cannot save Denmark, we may at least rescue England from the danger of suffering similar dishonour for the future. We can record upon the Journals of the House a condemnation of the offence of those who had betrayed Denmark and brought England into contempt; and we can rescue the country from the danger to which she is exposed during every hour that a Ministry which has shown so low an appreciation of the national honour is suffered to continue in office.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, that he had listened with great interest and attention to the able speech of the noble Lord the Member for Stamford, but he had heard no answer to the question which he had put to himself throughout this debate. What would be the immediate policy of the Opposition if it succeeded to power? He knew what the feelings of the noble Lord were upon this subject, and how well-informed he was, but still the noble Lord gave no intimation of the direction in which his influence would be exerted — whether it would be for immediate war, or for such steps as would lead to immediate war, or whether it would be in an opposite direction. He trusted the House would go back to the real question before it. The question at issue really was whether the present Vote of Censure should be treated with the view of placing the Gentlemen opposite in power and displacing the present Ministers. Surely, then, those who desired to promote the interests of the country must be informed before they were asked to vote with the Opposition what, if they came into office, they themselves would do in this particular crisis. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire, in his long and eloquent speech, inveighed against the past conduct of the Government; but when he came to the policy which ought at the present moment to be adopted, he only indulged in vague generalities and statements, and said it was not his business to inform them what he would do if he had to guide the destinies of the country. ["Hear!"] Hon. Gentlemen opposite appeared to cheer that statement; but their respective constituents would like to know, before they gave their vote for any set of men, what line of policy they meant to adopt if they obtained office. If they explained their policy, hon. Members would know why they supported them, and could meet their several constituents with a clear vindication of their votes, inasmuch as they gave them in favour of a set of men who had distinctly declared the precise policy they intended to pursue. Whereas, if their constituents now demanded of them their reasons for not supporting this Vote of Censure, their simple answer would be because the party who were moving it, and who sought to displace the Government, declined to tell the House what they would do in the event of their acceding to office. The hon. Gentlemen opposite declared that they would enter office, if at all, fettered by no conditions, and therefore they would not inform the House what line they intended to take. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bucks said, indeed, "My policy is the honour of England and the peace of Europe." But that, after all, was vague and puerile language. Surely it was not come to that, that the chief of any party in that House should think it necessary to say those were the principles of his policy. Even a school-girl, if asked upon the subject, would naturally reply that such ought to be the policy of England. But Parliament wanted to know in what manner the right hon. Gentleman opposite and his friends meant to secure "the honour of England and the peace of Europe." He (Mr. Forster) had heard with great pleasure last night the excellent speeches of the right hon. and gallant Member for Huntingdon (General Peel), and of the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley.) He entirely agreed with almost every word uttered by the right hon. and gallant Gentleman. But at the end of his extremely talented and straightforward speech he left the House somewhat in the dark, and if he gave them any information as to his own views of what his policy would be, that information appeared to him (Mr. Forster) to be contrary to that which they gathered from what had fallen from him in the beginning of his speech. The right hon. Gentleman said that the time was past for England to threaten unless she was prepared to carry out her threats—that she must not play the "game of brag" any longer, and that we could no longer trade on the prestige we had gained by the French war. But at the end of his speech the right hon. and gallant Gentleman gave the House some little light as to the policy that would be undertaken by the Opposition if they succeeded to power. He said—

> "I emphatically declare that you have tarnished the honour of the country; but I appeal to every Englishman, let his policy be what it may, whether he has not felt a sense of the deepest humiliation at seeing a small country whom we had promised to protect by treaty overwhelmed by a stronger force."

Now, he (Mr. Forster) did not believe that we did promise to protect Denmark by treaty. But if a Ministry came into power, a prominent member of which believed that we had promised by treaty to protect Denmark, it would be very difficult for that Ministry at once to secure the peace of Europe and the honour of England. It would be necessary for a Minister who felt that, to fulfil our treaty engagements at whatever danger to our peace or the peace of Europe. He now came to the speech of the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn. The noble Lord made an able speech, with every word of which he entirely agreed. The noble Lord seemed to throw some light as to what his policy would be, but not a single sentence fell from him which would even imply that, in his opinion, a promise had been given by this country or by any of our Governments to protect Denmark by treaty. If there were such a promise given, he (Mr. Forster) need not say that war would be inevitable. These being the facts, it was necessary that hon. Members should make up their minds whether they would place confidence in the hon. Gentleman opposite. The Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman opposite was neither more nor less than a Vote of Censure upon the Government for the past, and a Vote of Confidence in the right hon. Gentleman and his party for the future; and in giving their vote upon it, they must make up their minds whether they had confidence in the right hon. Gentleman. The hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) came forward, as he generally did, the champion of a bad principle, which might have been powerful some time ago, but was no longer so. He came forward on behalf of war—a principle which he (Mr. Forster) had hoped had died away. The Amendment of the hon. Gentleman was certainly one which would lead us inevitably into war. The first question would be whether the words of the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) "stand part of the Question,"—that was to say, whether or not that was the proper time to give any opinion respecting the past conduct of Ministers. It was desirable that this Question should be plainly put. For himself he was not disposed to approve of every step which had been taken by Her Majesty's Ministers. On the contrary, he felt that they were deserving of blame for the course they pursued in misleading Denmark. But in justice he must say, that in taking the vacillating course they had done, the Ministers had but too much reflected the state of feeling in the country; and that if they were to blame, the right hon. Gentlemen opposite were also liable to censure. But at a time when we had before us a most critical present, and a serious and important future, they should not indulge in idle Votes of Censure on what had happened, but rather consider what they should do now, and to what hands they should confide the administration of affairs and the future policy of the country. He did not agree with the right hon. and gallant Member for Huntingdon that any promise had been held out to Denmark by treaty; but he did think that there had been in the conduct of the negotiations by the Foreign Office, still more in the speeches made by Members on both sides of the House, and still more in the writings constantly published in the organs of public opinion, a sympathy expressed for Denmark that might well have led that gallant people to suppose that we should not leave them alone in this struggle. That being the case, he thought it was the imperative duty of that House not to do anything that would increase that misunderstanding, if it really did exist, and not to allow any feelings of party, or any natural desire of the right hon. Gentlemen opposite to take the place of the present Ministry, to bring about such a result. Now, he asked whether the passing of this Vote of Censure would not increase that misunderstanding? We could not expect the citizens and politicians of the Continent, and still less those who were engaged in the present struggle, to understand exactly the way in which party fights were conducted in that House. They could not comprehend how that great Assembly, in adopting the Resolution before them, intended only to consider the past policy of the Ministers, and not to provide for the future. The Government having declared after some hesitation that they would not directly interfere on behalf of Denmark, and that no British fleet should go to the Baltic—should that declaration be followed by a Vote of Want of Confidence in Her Majesty's Ministers, he said it was impossible for the people of Denmark to suppose otherwise than that England did intend to come forward and help them. Now, it was the duty of that House to prevent any such misunderstanding arising. It was impossible not to consider on general grounds what the result of a change of Government under such circumstances would be. He, himself, had very little choice as to whether the present Ministers should continue in office or the right hon. Gentlemen opposite should replace them. It appeared to him that if we were to have a Conservative Government—and it seemed we were likely to have one for some time—he would rather see it conducted by avowed Conservatives. It was impossible to deny that the hopes of many Gentlemen on his side of the House who were in favour of the cause of progress and true Reform, had been a little damped by the conduct of the noble Lord at the head of the Government. Only a short time ago an influential statesman appeared to have been won over to the cause of real progress and Reform. Their hopes had, however, been somewhat damped on a late occasion, when a critical question had been lost by the vote of that right hon. Gentleman, from whose conversion they had expected so much. There were therefore no particular grounds why he and those hon. Gentlemen who sat around him should wish for a change from one Government to another. But it was important for them to be enabled to tell their constituencies that they had taken that course which was best calculated to preserve the country at peace, to maintain its honour untarnished, and to prevent any misunderstanding arising in the minds of foreign Powers. The hon. Member for Rochdale had read a salutary lesson to the House as to what ought to be the policy of this Government in reference to foreign struggles; but his hon. Friend had not touched very much upon this question—namely, that whatever might be the interests or the power of England, they must still consider the duty of England. He (Mr. Forster) believed that we had a great lesson taught us by the Schleswig-Holstein affair. It behoved them to consider very narrowly whether, in fulfilling their duty to other nations, it was not their business to make the principle of non-intervention their rule. Now, supposing that they had left this question alone, was there any Member on either side of the House who did not believe that there would have been less bloodshed? We had got the credit of having originated the Treaty of 1852, and of thus having handed over the people of Schleswig-Holstein to Denmark without their consent. But it was now generally admitted that we were instigated to that treaty by Russia. If, then, when the difficulties arose between the King of Denmark and his subjects, we had said that they must settle them amongst themselves as best they could, could it be supposed that, strengthened though his subjects were by the sympathies of a kindred German race, he would not have come to some agreement with them long ago? But the Ministry only stopped short of war. He did not doubt when Her Majesty's Ministers declined to interfere in the war that they were influenced by the feeling that such an interference would inflict the most serious injury upon our commercial interests. They must also have felt that though we had a strong fleet we had not a large army, and that we could not carry on such a war without subsidizing foreign armies. But they probably felt more than this—they probably hesitated to plunge into a war of this kind because they knew that they would be applying the torch to the most combustible materials, which, if ignited, would probably involve in flames the whole of Europe. But it was said that a war would certainly burst out, either sooner or later, in which we should be involved. It would then be our fault if we got involved in this war, for there was no valid reason why we should plunge into it. Forces on the Continent were too equally matched for any one of them to threaten us. Let us consider on one side the old despotisms of Europe, with large standing armies, still endeavouring to keep down the spirit of nationality and of freedom struggling throughout Europe. Behind those despotisms there was the revolutionary party endeavouring to remodel Europe and to rise against their rulers. And all this time was the Emperor of the French narrowly watching the movements that were going on, and considering what advantages might arise out of them for himself and France. His noble Friend (Lord Robert Cecil), who was a member of the old aristocracy of England and of the Conservative party in this country, and who some months ago had a strong feeling in favour of war, had himself felt that we could not come to the aid of Denmark without the help of the revolutionary element in Europe. With regard to the balance of power in Europe, there never was a time when there was less danger than at present of Europe being mastered by one Power or one dynasty. All this showed that—thank Providence!—we were so placed we need not interfere in the struggle. But they were told that the just influence of England was lowered by the policy which had been pursued. Now, what was the meaning of that language? He could not but suppose from what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bucks, that he had no intention of carrying out the views of the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn, or even of the right hon. and gallant Member for Huntingdon; but rather that he looked forward to keeping our just influence by what, perhaps, he would call the adroit manœuvre of hooking England on some foreign country, and of helping the French Emperor in his views and designs to obtain greater power and influence by diplomacy, and, if we were driven to carry that diplomacy into war, of being no longer left alone. Surely that, above all things, was the least the country desired. It was not our business to assist the French Emperor in his designs to re-model the map of Europe. Surely, if it be really necessary, for the preservation of our just influence, to have *entente cordiale* with France, we were not called upon to join with the Emperor of the French in all his designs. If so, he (Mr. Forster) would say it would be much better for us to remain aloof altogether, and hold no cordial communication with France. He trusted that the result of this debate would be to convince us that the time had arrived for effecting a change in our foreign policy, and for replacing that meddling, dishonest system of apparent intervention, but which was really non-intervention, which had been the policy not only of the present Government, but of every Government for some years past, by an honest, dignified, and plain-spoken system of non-intervention. But in order that they should learn that lesson and practise it, he for one did not feel it necessary to vote with the right hon. Gentleman opposite, who at this critical juncture refused to reveal his policy. The only hint he dropped before them, as showing how he would maintain the just influence of the country if he were intrusted with the direction of its foreign affairs, was in favour of the principle than which none could be less palatable to English feeling—namely, subserviency to the Emperor of the French in his designs for remodelling the map of Europe.

Mr. BUTLER-JOHNSTONE said, that the question before the House was not whether our policy should be one of intervention or non-intervention, whether we were to make use of the influence which we possessed as one of the great Powers for the welfare of Europe and the interests and honour of England, or whether we were to take refuge in that other policy of not meddling—minding our own business, as it was called; but the question was how the Government in their late diplomatic negotiations had dealt with the interests and honour of this country. By the vote which they were called upon to give they were asked to protest against the foreign policy of the Government which had brought them into this dilemma — either that they were obliged to abandon a weak ally whom they had taught to look up to us for assistance, or to reverse the traditional policy of this country, and engage in an impolitic war. It was for having reduced the country to this miserable alternative that they were called upon to give their support to what he believed to be a thoroughly honest Vote of Censure upon Ministers. Some hon. Members had found fault with the Resolution because it was not strong enough. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had asked why was an insidious vote of that kind to be proposed rather than a direct censure. Now, to his mind he had never read a stronger or more direct Vote of Censure than that proposed by his right hon. Friend. What they maintained was that the policy of the present Government for the last eighteen months had been, to say the best, a perfect *fiasco*. It had been said that it was only on "the ribald trash" of a foreign press that the Resolution was founded. But when they found that such papers as the *Révue des Deux Mondes* and the *Journal des Débats*, which held the highest position among the press on the Continent, and which had always been favourable to England, used the same language with regard to our foreign policy, was it not rather too much to talk of the "ribald trash" of the Continental press? He recollected that on a debate on some Bill—he thought it was the Indian Reform Bill—the noble Lord now at the head of the Government said that if two men were seen laughing together they might be sure they were laughing either at *Don Quixote* or the Indian Reform Bill. Now, he (Mr. Butler-Johnstone) would say that if they found two men laughing together in any coterie of politicians on the Continent they might be sure they were laughing and sneering at the foreign policy of the British Government. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in defending the Government, had said, in the first place, that we had not taken any other position before Europe except what had been taken by other neutral Powers, and the whole gist of his argument was that we stood in the same relative position as regarded Denmark, as Russia and France; but he afterwards claimed credit for having taken up a more prominent position, because he said we were more anxious to keep to our engagements. According to the right hon. Gentleman, then, in the first place, we had not taken a more prominent position before Europe; and in the next place, we had. He might be allowed to say that the defence of the Government seemed to be made in the spirit of Shylock; but though their obligations were such as would not bind a Jewish usurer, they were obligations which were generally considered binding upon gentlemen. "I cannot find it; 'tis not so nominated in the bond," was the tenour of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer. "We did not promise you material assistance" was, in fact, the substance of his statement; but, certainly, the impression from the whole tenour of our negotiations on Europe, and especially on the minds of the people of Denmark, was that it implied the giving of material aid. He found from the correspondence published in *The Times* that the people of Copenhagen could scarcely believe even now but that a Queen's messenger was on the high road with the information that this country intended to interfere between them and their spoilers. "Sister Anne, do you see any help coming?" but the reply was still, "Nothing but a little dust, nothing but another despatch." The truth was that the people of Denmark had acted in a certain way upon the faith of implicit promises made to them by this country; for when a great Power like England stepped forward and took the matter out of the hands of a small Power like Denmark it involved an implied obligation on the part of the Government not to leave Denmark in the lurch if she accepted the advice which was given her. Denmark withdrew her Patent of March at our suggestion, and took measures to revoke the Constitution of November; she retired from Holstein and allowed the Federal Execution to take place as she would not otherwise have done, and at last she consented to the cession of a large amount of territory. All this Denmark had done at our suggestion — and yet it was said that we remained in the same position as France. If the Government had determined to announce to the King of Denmark that he could not expect to receive material assistance from England, it was their duty to have done so at the time when General Fleury made a similar declaration. Their very silence upon the point seemed to imply a different intention. He remembered very well that, thinking at the beginning of the Session that the question was not one which should be allowed to drag this country into war, he had asked the noble Lord at the head of the Government why he did not issue a proclamation of neutrality. His desire was to obtain from the Government something more than mere Sibylline utterances, so that, if necessary, a Resolution upon the subject might be proposed to the House. He was answered by the hon. and learned Attorney General who said—

> "The hon. Member has proposed to the Government a question so unusual that I cannot think he is serious in asking it. . . . At the same time, the respect we feel for the hon. Member makes us think it right to give some answer to the hon. Member; and the answer is simply this. It has never been the custom to issue proclamations of neutrality in any case in which Her Majesty's Government have felt that they have a deep interest involved pending negotiations which may or may not have the result of calling for action on the part of Her Majesty's Government. . . . It is absolutely necessary that Her Majesty's Government should reserve to themselves the power of taking any course which the honour of Great Britain and Europe may require. Therefore, to issue a pro-

clamation of neutrality, which is a declaration that you will remain neutral during the course of a war, whatever eventualities that war may involve, would be a most undignified and inconsistent course."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxiii. 1941.]

Now it was not this or that suggestion or declaration that was so important—it was the sum of all those declarations and despatches put together. It was the whole tenour of the conduct, the declarations, and despatches of the Government which showed that there was some justice in the reproach of the "trash" of the Continental press that England had abandoned her ally. The question was not one between the Opposition and the Ministerial benches, but between the people of England and those who had had the management of our foreign affairs. He had most certainly felt that this was not a subject upon which the country ought to go to war, nor did he stand there for the purpose of defending the conduct of Germany throughout these negotiations. He was quite willing to admit that her conduct had been marked by undue violence, overbearance, and highhandedness. He thought that every German must feel the sting of the reflection, that the aggression of his country was directed against one of the very smallest of the independent Powers of Europe. What, however, took away from the sting of that reflection and lent to German aggression the only dignity it possessed was the fact that that aggression had been perpetrated in the very teeth of England's power, in the face of the declarations of her Foreign Minister, and in spite of the menacing attitude of her diplomacy. The Government had talked of "moral influence and support" until those terms had become a by-word and proverb among nations, but the real moral support which we have afforded in this quarrel has been the moral dignity which we have lent to German aggression. It was for those reasons that he felt that we had been brought to the terrible alternative of waging an impolitic and unnecessary war or abandoning an ally. It might be asked what the Government should have done? and though, perhaps, his opinion might be of little value, he would state what course he thought they should have pursued. He thought that two years ago, when the matter really assumed an important aspect, the Government ought to have seriously considered whether or not it was necessary for this country to interfere seriously in this dispute. If, after consideration, they came to the conclusion that it was not necessary to interfere in the question, he believed the best thing for them to have done would have been to have left it entirely alone. If they believed that reasons of State policy, reasons of European policy, impelled them to a different conclusion, they should have reminded Denmark that she had failed in the fulfilment of her stipulations and engagements, and that she had therefore put herself in a wrong position. They should have told her that unless she fulfilled those stipulations and engagements in the letter and the spirit they would wash their hands of the affair entirely; but that if she would follow the advice they gave her they would defend her against the whole of Europe. If the Government had come to that conclusion there would not, in all probability, have been a Dano-Germanic war now. He confessed he was surprised to hear the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer invoke a comparison between the foreign policy of Her Majesty's present Government and the foreign policy of Mr. Canning. To his mind there never was so great a contrast. What was the policy of Mr. Canning with reference to Spain? Mr. Canning said that the war was one in which it was not absolutely necessary for this country to engage, and that although our feeling might be one of regret that foreign Powers should be putting such a pressure upon Spain, we could not regard the question as one which should involve Europe in war. He went on, however, to say there were two limitations that if any attack were made upon our faithful ally, Portugal, we should render her every assistance in our power; and that if the new Government of Spain should attempt to coerce and re-conquer the almost independent provinces of South America we would not allow such a course to be adopted. What was the consequence of that policy? Portugal was threatened by Spain. The news arrived, he believed, on Friday, the 8th of March; a Cabinet Council was held on Saturday, and it was determined to send assistance; the course of the Government received the assent of the Sovereign on Sunday, and on Monday the troops were on their march for embarkation. That was the conduct of Mr. Canning. He thought that the critical error of the Government consisted in this—that at no epoch of those negotiations had they come to any deliberate and definite Resolution as to their conduct in the event of certain specific contingencies. It had been said by a living author that want of success arose often not from any neglect of the right method of attaining our ends, but because we did not in reality know what aims and ends we had in view. So it was with the Government, for he believed that they had never yet deliberately made up their minds as to the nature of their ultimate aims. They said their object was to keep the peace of Europe. Of course the peace of Europe was the aim of all Governments, and the hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. Forster) had complained that the statements from his side of the House were too vague, and demanded some specific statement of the means by which it was intended to bring about that desirable result. There were obvious reasons why it was impossible to satisfy that demand. It was only the other day that the noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had said in another place that he had received important proposals from Paris. How could they on his side of the House, in ignorance of the despatches which had been received by the Foreign Office (except those laid on the table), undertake to specify the means which they would adopt? It would be perfectly preposterous for them to say what they would do under certain circumstances without being aware of the nature of those circumstances. The Lord Advocate and the hon. Member for Bradford had attempted to fix a war policy upon his side of the House. He repudiated such an attempt. If the honour of the nation demanded it they were perfectly willing to face Europe in arms; but if it were possible to save the country from entering upon a war in which those on his side of the House had no part or parcel in bringing about, that was a policy which they would pursue. The Resolution moved by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli) had been moved in the interests of peace, for it was felt that to go to war at the present moment would be impolitic and suicidal. There could be no question as to the policy which the leaders of the Opposition would act upon. But Parliament could not leave the foreign affairs of this country in the hands of men who for the last eighteen months had been blundering, blundering, and blundering, till they had become involved in a tissue of difficulties of their own construction. They had menaced Russia, and the consequence had been to bring upon unfortunate Poland deeper calamities than she would otherwise have suffered. What was it which had rallied the people of Russia round the Russian Government on the Polish question, except the fact that foreign Powers were interfering? That it was which had made the Russians rally round their Government in a way they had never done from 1812 up to that time. Our Government had pursued a system of notes and joint notes and threats and warnings and menaces. If he was asked to describe in one word what their policy really was, he would say that it was what Mr. Canning would have called areopagitical; and the means which they had adopted to carry out that policy were impotent menaces. They had gone from court to court in Europe with propositions—with menaces—and the result had been that these impotent menaces, which it was never intended to carry out, had left their sting with those who had dared to use them. When he spoke of the noble Earl at the head of the Foreign Office, he did so with all due humility. He knew the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire had said that the history of the noble Earl was a part of the traditions of that House and the country; but, though he concurred with the right hon. Gentleman, he would say this—he did not think there was any official post in which the noble Lord would be more sure to distinguish himself by failure than he was in that of Foreign Minister. He did not believe it would be possible to find anywhere else so square a man in so round a hole. He further thought that one of the chief faults of his administration was the spirit of discussing foreign questions as if he were dealing with merely speculative matter—as if European questions were questions which only required the application of speculative talents — as if the whole difficulty was not in the collision of hostile wills and adverse forces. The noble Earl asked the French Government to leave Rome, and France told him to mind his own business. He went to Russia and lectured her about the Poles. He was told to hold his tongue. He went to Germany and lectured them on the obligations of the Treaty of 1852. In effect he got the same answer—to hold his tongue and do his worst. The areopagitical spirit of the noble Earl's policy, wanting as it did all force and energy, was destructive of the foreign policy of this country. But the House had been told by the learned Lord Advocate of the industry and indefatigability of the noble Earl. Of course, all Foreign Secretaries were industrious and indefatigable. Indeed, so indefatigable had been the noble Earl that he had completely knocked up his permanent Under Secretary, and but for the herculean frame and capacity of the Parliamentary Under Secretary, the political capacity of the staff of the Foreign Office would have been exhausted. The supporters of the Resolution before the House were warned to take care; they were told that we might not do better by changing Ministers. Well, though the consolation was only a poor one, he might observe that they could not possibly do worse. There appeared to be a sort of constitutional compensation in these matters, and they found that when a Ministry broke down in a particular department, the Ministry who succeeded were particularly strong in that department, but broke down in some other. Lord Derby's Government broke down because, from the peculiar difficulties of their political position, they failed to make their finances acceptable to the country. It was succeeded by a Government which was considered to be particularly strong on finance, but broke down in consequence of the inefficiency of its war administration. It was followed by a Government, in which the War Minister was a noble Lord (Viscount Palmerston), who, from his policy during half a century, was supposed to be, of all others, fitted for the post. The country then got a Government which did not break down through failure in any particular department, and therefore it was no exception to the rule; it broke down because it was not tenacious of the honour of the country. He might refer to a right hon. Gentleman on the Treasury Bench (Mr. Milner Gibson) to bear out his assertion that it fell because it did not answer a despatch which the honour of the country required should be answered. It was his belief that the people of England would insist that any Foreign Minister who might succeed the noble Earl should act in a different way from that in which he (Earl Russell) had acted. Sitting where he did, he confessed he could view any change of Government with great complacency. He did not think the present Government possessed the confidence of the country. That very night the Secretary of the Admiralty had told them that we had not yet got a serviceable gun; the War Department itself had not been very successful in avoiding public scandals; the Home Department had been outwitted by a country attorney — he alluded, of course, to the Townley case; and the Colonial Office had not satisfied the House and the country in respect of the New Zealand war. Whatever might be the talents of the individuals comprising the Administration, the Government as a whole could not be said to have been successful. It was urged that it would be a disgrace to enter on the records of the House a Resolution stating that the influence of this country had been diminished; but, for his part, he feared that that was the only thing the people and Parliament of England could do—namely, to enter their solemn protest against the manner in which the foreign policy of England had been conducted by the present advisers of Her Majesty; and it was for this reason he gave his hearty support to the Resolution which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire had placed in the hands of the Speaker.

Lord HARRY VANE said, that having on former occasions expressed opinions favourable to the Danes, without retracting these he wished to explain his present views. He now felt that the Treaty of 1852 could not be carried out. He thought the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had hardly been consistent in the course of his speech. He had avoided naturally — as all on the other side had avoided — expressing any definite view as to the course which he would recommend to be adopted at the present crisis of things. He did not altogether blame them for that. It was the part of an Opposition to criticize, not to prescribe. Therefore, as a general rule, he did not find fault with an Opposition for not stating what its policy would be on every question that might arise; but on a question which agitated Europe, and respecting which they proposed an Address to Her Majesty expressing censure of the policy of Her Majesty's Government, he did think it was in fairness and justice incumbent on the Opposition to state what would be their policy. He did not mean to say they should go into details, but they should state in broad terms what their policy was. The hon. Gentleman who had just addressed the House said there were certain particulars in respect of which the Opposition were not informed; but was not that also a reason for not expressing so strong an opinion in the Resolution before the House? Fault had been found with Her Majesty's Government for recommending that certain concessions should be made by Denmark. He, on the contrary, quite agreed with the hon. Member for Bridgwater (Mr. Kinglake) that the concessions recommended did not place Denmark in a worse position, but, on the contrary, they placed her in a stronger position before the world. He contended that the German Powers put themselves in the wrong when they were not content with the offer of the British Government to enter into a diplomatic engagement for the revocation of the obnoxious constitution, and undertook an invasion, first of Schleswig, and subsequently of Jutland; but he believed they had undertaken the war in consequence of pressure put upon them by the smaller German States and the German people, and could not stop. They had proceeded against Denmark in order to avert disturbances at home. He could not, therefore, find fault with the Government for any concessions which they recommended to be made by Denmark, and which, indeed, were equally recommended by Russia and France, for the moral position, if not the material position, of the Danes was thereby strengthened. Though parts of the correspondence might be considered to offer expressions which might be construed into menaces, he did not find that England made any promises to Denmark of material aid. The people of this country sympathized with the Danes, but it was never supposed by Denmark that England would undertake a great war alone for her sake. The British Government acted as mediators, for the people of England would have been discontented with any Ministers who held themselves entirely aloof. The only question was whether we had held out an unconditional promise of assistance. He maintained that we had not. It was not until the latter part of January that this country made a direct proposition to France to offer material aid. We made the same proposition to Russia, who in her peculiar condition with regard to Poland, and not feeling under obligation to render material aid, also declined it. Was it, then, possible for this country, under the circumstances, to do anything more than remonstrate with the German Powers? He did not agree with the hon. Member for Rochdale (Mr. Cobden), and the hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. Forster), in their views of foreign policy; but, at the same time, he admitted that on an occasion when the honour and the interests of this country were not concerned it would be extremely Quixotic to enter single-handed on a contest with Germany. It was difficult to say where a war, once began, would end. It would be impossible to give material aid to remove the German armies from the continental possessions of Denmark. Undoubtedly this country might render assistance by sea, and the noble Lord at the head of the Government did, in his speech the other night, hint at certain contingencies in which this country might act; but he trusted that the German Powers would not push their successes so far as to attack Zealand or Copenhagen. With regard to Austria we might undoubtedly act against her in the Adriatic; but he regarded her as an unhappy instrument carrying on a reluctant war, and he was told that at Vienna the war was extremely unpopular. Austria was carrying on a war in contradiction to her own principles, and though for the sake of "hegemony" she might think it necessary to preserve her position in Germany against Prussia, and to conciliate the opinions of Germany in case of attacks from without, she still must feel her own participation in the war to be most inconsistent; for the result of it must be to give Prussia increased influence in the north of Germany, and Austria cannot by possibility gain by it. It was preposterous that Austria, whose empire was made up of many different nationalities, should go to war ostensibly for nationality. It was just now very much the fashion to criticize the Treaty of 1852; but that treaty should be read by the light of the past, not of the present. It could not have been anticipated at the time the treaty was entered into by any of the statesmen concerned in its preparation, that such a change would take place in the opinions and circumstances of Europe to impede its execution and cancel its operation. It appeared from a despatch of Count Rechberg, the Austrian Foreign Minister, that even in the beginning of 1863 there was no very strong disinclination on the part of the German population of the Duchies to remain under Danish rule. It was not till some of the German Princes took up the matter, and German agitators began to labour, that the complexion of affairs was altered. There were faults also, he was bound to admit, on the part of the late King and his Government which tended to estrange the Germans in the Duchies. Experience, moreover, proved that although an absolute monarch might hold sway over two rival nationalities, that task was beyond the power of a democratic assembly such as prevailed at Copenhagen. An example of the insuperable difficulty attending the Government of two several nationalities, might be found in the late Kingdom of the Netherlands. It might have been supposed that a great manufacturing and a great commercial country like Belgium and Holland would have united amicably; but the antagonism of language and race asserted itself, and a separation ensued. Again, it had been found impossible to maintain two independent Legislatures in England and Ireland, and the smaller country was, therefore, joined in representation to the larger, which by its ascendency governed the whole. It was true that between Norway and Sweden the only connection was that of the Sovereign; but there were peculiar circumstances in that case. He entertained warm feelings of sympathy for the Danes, but he thought that brave and gallant people had carried their resistance to the advice given to them too far. It was a misfortune that they did not revoke the obnoxious Constitution of November before the dissolution of the Chambers which had voted it. As to the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman, he regarded it simply as a Vote of Censure—as a party move. The fact was, that this Question was being used merely as the stalking-horse of party. Of course, if the right hon. Gentleman thought he could displace the Government he was quite right to make use of the occasion; but he must not flatter himself with the idea that the case was not very transparent. Up to the present moment they were quite at a loss to know what would be the course taken by the other side if they were in power. The Gentlemen opposite contended that the country had been humiliated; but they did not point out how. It seemed to him that the Government had done all that under the circumstances they could fairly be called on to do; and although he regretted that they had failed in this object, he would not admit that there was any humiliation involved in that failure; and how it had lowered the influence of England in the councils of Europe he could not perceive. No doubt the Germans were just now extremely indignant at England for the part she had played; but why was that? It was because England was the only Power that had endeavoured to fulfil the engagements into which she had entered; and there was surely no dishonour in occupying that position? As to peace, he could not see any increased securities for it in the line indicated by the other side. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite (General Peel) began by repudiating all party feeling, and then launched forth into one of the most vehement party speeches which have characterized the debate. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman, however, took care not to say anything definite as to the policy he would recommend; and, in fact, his remarks had very little to do with the Danish Question at all. Taking the right hon. and gallant Gentleman at his word, they would, perhaps, come to the conclusion that the policy of the hon. Member for Rochdale was that which ought to be pursued; but he did not understand how such views could be reconciled with those of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bucks, with whom the right hon. and gallant Gentleman no doubt hoped some day to find himself in office. For his own part, he felt bound to express deep regret at what had occurred. Having at one time been much interested in Scandinavia, and acquainted with many Danes, he cherished profound sympathy for the misfortunes of the gallant little kingdom of Denmark. It was impossible not to feel sympathy for the condition into which that country had fallen; but that feeling would not induce him to consent to a vote which would be of no service, and was intended to be of no service to Denmark. They had heard the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley) declare that he would be no party to armed interference on behalf of Denmark. What, then, would Denmark gain by the accession to office of hon. Gentlemen opposite? It was said that advice had been tendered to the Danes, leading them to retire from strong positions; but if these had not been abandoned they would only have been driven from them with greater slaughter in the earlier stages of the conflict. Looking at the overwhelming force which Germany could bring into the field, it was impossible that Denmark could offer effectual resistance. Believing that there had been no substantial difference of opinion between the neutral Powers, and that the influence of England had not been in any way lessened, he should vote against the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire. He could not help regretting that another issue not germane to the question, and not involved in the question, should have been raised in the Amendment placed on the paper by the hon. Member for Bridgwater (Mr. Kinglake.) The original Motion was not of a warlike tendency, and the different paragraphs had no warlike meaning; they were vague and colourless, and though conveying a Vote of Censure, were not intended to mean anything or to bind to any policy. The right hon. Gentleman who introduced it fully concurred that it would be unadvisable to enter single-handed upon a war in favour of Denmark, and simply sought for an expression of opinion upon the conduct of the Government. It was, therefore, to be regretted that any independent Member should have interfered to prevent a vote being taken on the direct issue of whether a change of Government was or was not expedient, and he trusted the hon. Member would withdraw it.

MR. LIDDELL said, it was almost refreshing to hear from the other side of the House a speech professing to support the policy of the Government, for up to that point the difficulty of an attentive listener would have been to discover on which side of the House their policy had been most impugned. He did not think the noble Lord who had just spoken had made out any case in support of the vote he intended to give. The issue raised was clear and distinct—it was that the influence of England had been lessened by the conduct of the Government in the course of the late proceedings. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had accused Gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House of ungenerous and unpatriotic conduct in the Motion they had put forward. A reproach less merited, or proceeding from one less entitled to make it, he hardly remembered. Not once, but scores of times, Members of the Opposition had rescued from defeat the Government of which he was so great an ornament, and while the Cabinet were engaged in conducting difficult negotiations the Opposition left them entirely unmolested. The great argument used at the other side of the House was that the Opposition had no policy. But that was an unfortunate taunt for the Chancellor of the Exchequer, because it was his great prototype, the late Sir Robert Peel, who, in reply to a challenge by the Government of the day, replied that it formed no part of the functions of an Opposition to declare a policy. He rejoiced that the good sense of the House had chosen the present topic for discussion, as it afforded a legitimate opportunity for considering the policy of interference by one nation, however powerful, in the conduct by another of its own affairs. He was glad that the subject had fallen into such able hands as those of the right hon. and gallant Member for Huntingdon (General Peel) and the hon. Member for Rochdale (Mr. Cobden), and he believed that the policy had received its death-blow in the course of the present debate. The production of these papers showed, and it was admitted by the Government, how completely this policy had failed. In the present instance, a policy of isolation was impossible; and though he did not contend that England should assume that attitude of isolation from Continental affairs for which her position, geographically speaking, fitted her better than any other of the European nations, yet it was the duty of her statesmen gradually to relieve themselves from the trammels imposed on the nation by the web of negotiations, guarantees, and treaties bequeathed by the diplomacy of former ages. Diplomatists, like lawyers, created the contests by which they lived. It had always been a matter of surprise to him that the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary should voluntarily have plunged into a dispute surrounded by so many difficulties and intricacies as this Dano-German question. He remembered that, in giving evidence before a Committee some two or three years ago, Mr. Hammond, of the Foreign Office, speaking of negotiations for the removal of commercial restrictions, said, "The more you press a reluctant Government, the more likely you are to encourage that Government in its reluctance." He wished that maxim had been borne in mind by the noble Lord during the late negotiations. If he wanted a proof of the impolicy and inutility of interference by nations in matters not concerning them he should find it in the Treaty of 1852. That treaty professed to provide for the integrity of the Kingdom of Denmark, and to maintain its independence in perpetuity; but, instead of doing so, it sowed the seeds of its dissolution, threw down an apple of discord, and placed Denmark in the grasp of those Powers which were now engaged in her extermination. The treaty dealt with the question of the right of succession; but Frederick VII., who might, perhaps, in conjunction with his Diet, have a right to dispose of the succession to the Crown of Denmark, had no right to confer the succession to the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein on one who was not the rightful inheritor. Under no circumstances had he the right to do that without consulting the Duchies; and, being a member of the Diet, he had no right to do so without consulting the Diet. That was the question which was now felt by Germany, and which agitated the Duchies in connection with the further question of the protection of German interests. Now, the protection of German interests was as much the duty of Germany as the protection of English interests in any part of the world was of England. The question of right did not arise until the death of the late King, and then a settlement became absolutely necessary. No doubt the King had a good motive at heart when he designated the present King as his successor; but the Government of Denmark had pursued a policy of irritating oppression, which had the effect of disuniting Schleswig from Denmark, and causing her rapidly to gravitate towards Germany. When the death of the late King occurred, Austria and Prussia found themselves unable to control the feeling of Germany in favour of the independence of their countrymen in Schleswig and Holstein, and they were obliged to choose between abandoning the treaty or finding themselves in the midst of a revolution. They chose the first course, and placed themselves at the head of the movement, and had by so doing probably prevented greater evils than those that had actually occurred. It was only fair to Germany that these things should be remembered, and he did not think that he had overstated the case. As to foreign interference, all that it had done had been to make Germany more aggressive than she would otherwise have been, for the Germans were a proud people and resented foreign interference with their affairs. More than that—it had rendered Denmark from the beginning more obstinate, less willing to admit her obligations to Germany, and had induced her to resist the efforts of Germany to obtain for German subjects those rights which unquestionably belonged to them. According to the statement made last night by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, up to January last the Government had done all in their power to invite concert and co-operation in maintaining the provisions of the treaty. Happily they failed in obtaining that concert and co-operation, or we should long ago have been engaged in an European war. It is true that in that case war might have been prevented in Denmark; but it would inevitably have been aroused in Italy, and we should have found the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs adding fuel to the fire. If a war had been excited in Italy new combinations would have arisen, and a conflict might have been commenced of which no man was wise enough or bold enough to predict the end. It had been argued that they on that side the House ought not to attack the Treaty of 1852, because it was Lord Malmesbury who concluded it. But in that lay exactly the objection he entertained to the policy which had prevailed for so many years at the Foreign Office—namely, that it necessarily runs in one channel. With regard to the Conference, he thought the position occupied in it by Germany had been mistaken. She entered the Conference as a victor, and it was impossible to deny the right of the strong to make the most of the chances of war. Germany had conquered and was holding Schleswig. She was, therefore, in a position to dictate her own terms for the arrangement of peace, and was not in a position to be dictated to. In the Conference, a boundary was proposed by Germany; and he was one of those who believed that Germany was sincere in the proposal she made to secure the independence of Denmark for ever, and at the same time to afford due protection to German interests. As far as the independence of Denmark went, so long as there was any German leaven left in Denmark it would remain to disturb the whole. As a necessary consequence, a nationality represented by 40,000,000 would have a tendency to absorb a portion of that nationality represented by 1,200,000. The mistake made by Denmark was that she tried to absorb that nationality which naturally gravitated towards a larger Power. In the Conference, a boundary line was proposed, not by Denmark, but by England, which would have cut off the southern or wholly German districts of Schleswig, but left the mixed districts, which Germany had as much right to protect as the purely German ones united to Denmark. The German Powers proposed a line which would have included the mixed districts, but they did not obstinately adhere to that line, although Denmark, supported by England, did to hers. The Germans did not officially propose a line further south; but Counts Bernstorff and Apponyi gave the Plenipotentiaries to understand that they were prepared to consider such a line. England persuaded Denmark, and Russia backed her up in it, not to consent to that line; and he firmly believed that, had it not been for the presence of those great Powers, the question of frontier would have been settled there and then between Germany and Denmark in such a way that the independence of Denmark would have been preserved and adequate protection would have been secured for the Germans. The negotiations failed. That failure did not affect us; but it would affect Denmark, which must inevitably be crushed by the great Powers with whom she was at war. He hoped that neither the Conference nor those debates would be entirely without effect in moderating the excitement and anger of those Powers; but at any rate foreign interference had as yet done little for Denmark. Perhaps he had already detained the House too long; but he felt strongly, not only on the Danish Question, but on other questions which occupied the attention of the House, how mischievous had been our policy of interference. It was perhaps not desirable to enlarge the area of debate, but this policy of interference had been pursued both in China and in Africa. In both cases it had failed, and in both it had been reversed within the last couple of months by the very Government which adopted it. In condemning the foreign policy of the Government, the House ought to include their policy in those parts of the world in the condemnation. He desired to condemn this vacillation, and to see established something consistent, some basis upon which our foreign policy was to proceed, so that foreign nations and the people of England might understand one another. The only country with which the Government had not interfered was America; and why had they not interfered there? Because they were afraid. They were afraid to interfere there because the foreign policy of America was an intelligible, honest, and bold policy. The Americans said, "We will not meddle with you, and you shall not interfere with us." Interference in America meant war; and that judging by their acts in other parts of the world, was the only reason why the Government had not interfered in America. He applauded them for not doing so, but his satisfaction did not arise from any want of interest in the American contest, in which he believed that the majority of the people of this country felt more interest than they did in the war in Denmark. He should give his vote to-night—["Not to-night"]—not to-night, but whenever it was required, with satisfaction, and he should be prepared to justify it before the country at any moment at which the Government might give him the opportunity of doing so. That was the feeling of hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House. They had been accused of being unpatriotic and ungenerous. He had proved that they had shown no want of generosity towards the Government during the course of these transactions. The Government said that they had been sincere and had done all that they could; but they had left Denmark in a scrape. That was plain; and that was what they were called upon to declare by their votes. He only hoped that the House of Commons would be sincere, because he wanted to know whether they could trust the evidence of their senses. Could they trust "the man in the street," or "the man in the lobby?" Was there any value to be attached to their interviews with their relatives, friends, and acquaintances out of doors? Because, if there was, there was a common opinion that the policy of the Government had been mistaken and mischievous. He only wished that they could vote in secret on this Motion; not because they on that side of the House desired to conceal their votes—because they were proud of and prepared to justify them—but to spare the feelings of many friends of his who were about to vote to save the Government at the sacrifice of their own opinions.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU: Sir, if the policy advocated by the Opposition were really a war policy, as has already been hinted by hon. Members in this debate, I certainly could not consent, upon such an occasion, to give them my support. Their policy however is, I conceive, of a very different character. It is founded upon a principle which certainly ought to be always enforced—a principle which has rendered the country prosperous as long as it has been followed; and the abandonment of which has always brought evils on the land. Those who have sought to fix on us the stigma of a war policy, must have been sorely puzzled and disappointed when they heard the speech of the noble Lord the Member for Stamford. That noble Lord, whose warlike tendencies are so well known, and whose sympathy with the Danes has been so notorious, had not a word to offer in favour of war. It is true that he endeavoured to make out some apology for the conduct of the Danes. He said, for instance, that they had not neglected the advice which we gave them on so many occasions, and which they as often repudiated. He also took upon him to assert that we asked them to withdraw a constitution which had become the law of the land, and to perform an act which would clearly have been unconstitutional. I think that the noble Lord was in error. The Danes have on every occasion rejected our advice; at least, they have never followed it until the time was long past when it could be of the slightest avail. The noble Lord must also remember that although M. Hall, the Danish Minister, agreed to withdraw the obnoxious decree of March, he did not do so until after that decree had been carried out, and had become law, by the passing of the act which established the constitution of November. M. Hall himself said, when he withdrew the decree, that he did so because it had become nothing but a worthless piece of paper, since the substance had already been secured by an act of the Rigsraad. Thus he threw scorn and contumely in our faces, at the very time that he professed to grant the request which we had so long urged in vain. Nay, he openly declared that he had dissolved the Rigsraad which passed the act, in order that no new Rigsraad could be called together except by putting in force the very law which we had demanded that he should revoke. Clearly, then, we are not bound in honour to go to war for the Danes. Moreover, nothing which we have ever said or intimated, or hinted, has led the Danes to believe that we would go to war for them. Despatches of September and October have been profusely quoted, in order to make out a contrary proposition. But what did Sir Augustus Paget write on December 22, in relating a conversation with M. Hall? "M. Hall replied that . . . . there was no promise of support if Germany continued her aggressions." We cannot go beyond that statement. It is conclusive up to the end of last year at least. The Opposition can, therefore, not believe that we have given Denmark any grounds for believing that England would go to war for Denmark. What, then, is the policy which the Opposition are seeking to enforce on Her Majesty's Government, and which I trust will be always successfully enforced? It has been much alluded to since the speech of the gallant Member for Huntingdon (General Peel). I can, indeed, add but little to that speech. He argued in favour of non-interference; and, certainly, there is no question in which the evils of interference or meddling protection have become more apparent than in that which is now under consideration. This whole crisis has sprung from that mistaken policy of intervention on both sides. We interfered in Denmark; Germany protected the Duchies; and both Denmark and the Duchies have now good reason to exclaim, "save me from my protectors." The Germans said that the Duchies were oppressed by the Danes; they therefore invaded the Duchies, and devoured their crops like a flight of locusts, in order that the Duchies might be oppressed by Germans. We have been as bad. We did not respect local rights; we did not allow a people to govern themselves and manage their own affairs, but stepped in to interfere. Both in 1850 and in 1863 we favoured the attempts of a Copenhagen mob, which forced on the King a centralizing policy, like that of the Czar in regard to Poland, or of Austria in regard to Hungary, or of Prussia in regard to Posen. What is the Treaty of 1852? It is either a mere promise that we would offer no resistance if the King of Denmark changed the succession to his Crown—in which case, we are now bound by our pledge not to interfere. Or else that treaty binds all the contracting Powers to render their assistance in bringing about that change in the succession. In that case the treaty is a flagrant instance of the policy of interference. In the late Conferences, Lord Clarendon was induced to admit that if the treaty was a contract between each of the Powers singly with Denmark, then it has been annulled by war. While, on the other hand, if in spite of the want of mutual ratifications the treaty binds all the parties by a common engagement to each other, then it amounts to a guarantee. Treaties are always the result of interference; and they prolong that meddling policy into after years. But treaties settle nothing. The Treaty of 1852 has not availed to settle anything. France said it was a foolish piece of bungling, and long ago declared it to be a nullity. The German Powers have declared themselves free from its restrictions. The neutral Powers, by what was termed "the English proposal," have virtually set it aside. For the treaty proposed to bind the Duchies to Denmark by a personal union; while the neutral Powers proposed to separate the greater part of the Duchies and place them under another Sovereign. Russia, too, as it appears from some secret despatches, regards the treaty as an old horse which has done its work, and seen its best day, and is fit only for the knacker's yard. No more did the Congress of Paris of 1856 avail to settle anything. At that Congress a declaration was formally agreed to in favour of arbitration, and against privateering and paper blockades. How does it work? At the Conference Lord Clarendon appealed to that declaration in order to enforce arbitration; whereupon one of the Plenipotentiaries asserted that mediation only had been intended. "No," said Lord Clarendon, "the term 'good offices' includes both mediation and arbitration." "By no means," cried M. Balan, "I was at the Congress of Paris, and remember well that the term 'good offices' was chosen because we found it impossible to agree to anything definite or to fix upon any precise term." Here, then, it was openly avowed that the language of treaties has no definite meaning. As to blockades, all the Plenipotentiaries agreed that a Prize Court alone can decide whether a blockade is effective or not. This part also of the declaration has, therefore, been declared valueless. With regard to the prohibition from privateering, what occurred? Prussia declared her intention, much to the alarm of Russia, to employ privateers if the war should continue; and a few pages of the Conference Papers are full of the expressions of alarm which were uttered by Baron Brunnow at such a declaration. The fact alluded to by the hon. Member for Rochdale is another instance of the worthlessness of treaties. By the Treaty of Vienna, of November 20th, 1815, all the great Powers bound themselves to prevent a Buonaparte from ever occupying the Throne of France, and engaged to use all the forces at their disposal to carry out this common object. Why have we not observed this treaty? "Because it was not convenient," I shall be told. Precisely! Convenience is of more weight than treaties. If a treaty suits our convenience we appeal to it; if not, we cast it to the winds. Treaties then can never be stable; they continually bow to convenience; they are fluctuating and uncertain. International Law alone can be appealed to. This is like a wall in the plain, which may be passed with ease, but ever remains to mark the boundary; while treaties are like the long herbage which grows on the top of the wall, and which waves and sways in the wind, ever presenting a different appearance to the eye.

I used, Sir, to complain of the expenditure of the country, and move various Resolutions in favour of reduction. But I have now made entry of this in my list of illusions. It is futile to attack the symptom while the cause of disease is there, while the virus still infects the blood. The cause of expenditure is this meddling interference. To make this more intelligible, let us take an analogous case. The various landowners in a county do not invade each other's property, and meddle in each other's affairs. If they did, there would be constant litigation and expensive law suits. In order that they might live as neighbours should do, and preserve amicable relations and enjoy the amenities of life, they carefully abstain from meddling, either by word or act, in each others affairs. So it is with States. It is meddling which costs money, and necessitates armaments. This is apparent from the evidence given before the Committee of Public Accounts. Sir Richard Bromley, the Accountant General of the Navy, said—

> 149.—"The last ten years have been a race for building, a race for getting in stores, and a race for getting men into the service."

The Duke of Somerset said—

> 1408.—"There are demands made upon the Admiralty for naval force by the Foreign Office, and by the Colonial Office in different parts of the world. All those demands lead to expense."

Mr. Gladstone said—

> 1543.—"A considerable change has taken place in the practical working of our system of late years. Until 1853-4 the expenditure of the army and navy ran within certain accustomed channels; the amount of it varied but little from year to year,

and the application of it did not vary much. . . . . Of course I speak of a period before the operations of the Russian war had arisen, which entirely altered their character. . . . . For the last three years, either military operations, or political operations approximating to a military character have been in progress."

To return to our analogy: if a landowner meddles, even if he be so rich and powerful that he can carry his lawsuit, by appeals, from one court to another, and so weary out his opponents, yet he is hated and shunned by the rest, and loses all his influence in the county. It is the same among nations. Nay; Lord Russell himself seems to have had a misgiving at the Conferences, and to have felt that the honour of England was gone; for we read in the Conference papers—

> "It appears to Earl Russell that it would agree but little with the honour of the European Powers not to succeed in finding a solution for the difficulties which remain to be settled, without a recommencement of the war."

Therefore I say that we should live like neighbours with foreign States, and leave them to settle their affairs, and then our expenditure would speedily be reduced. Some one may say, however, that this would be a selfish policy ["Hear, hear."] That cheer informs me that this objection has been lying before the minds of hon. Members. The term selfish relates to an individual man only. It is the duty of a Government to do whatever is best for the governed. To do what is most advantageous for the nation is therefore not a "selfish policy," but is the duty of Government. "Selfish" and "isolated policy" are clap-traps, which are meant to catch the unwary and bewilder the unconscious. A state which is isolated, that is to say, which has no ambition, becomes the refuge of all weak States, and, therefore, the arbiter of the destinies of Europe.

Our grand meddling, I have said, was in 1852. What have been the results of it? What, in the first place, was the object of this interference? At page 81 of the Protocols of the Conference we read—

> "The Treaty of 1852 was concluded with the object of consolidating the peace of the North."

And the very next page, (p. 82), contains these words—

> "The political and administrative independence of the Duchies [that, namely, which had been debarred by the Treaty]; this was the motive for which the German Powers made war."

And what are the results? The Holy Alliance has been again formed on one side; while the Scandinavian Trefoil is ranged on the other. The absolute and despotic character of the Alliance has been well depicted by the hon. Member for Rochdale. It is also apparent in the Conference papers. There we find Baron Brunnow asserting that a King may alienate a portion of his territory, imposing or not imposing conditions on that alienation, just as he chooses; and that he may do this without consulting the wishes of the inhabitants, but merely "in virtue of his own rights of sovereignty."

In the Conference, things went most favourably for Germany. The German Powers might have secured the independence of Schleswig and Holstein, together with the personal union with Denmark which the treaty provided for. But they repudiated the treaty entirely, unsettled everything, and preferred to renew the war with Denmark. Austria, Prussia and Russia had by this time shaken hands over the grave of Poland. Or, rather, Russia proceeded to use Austria and Prussia to put down the rebellion in Poland, to stir up rebellions in the Danubian Principalities, and to restrain projected aggressions in Finland. With Russia at their back, of course Austria and Prussia can advance as far as they choose. Besides, the alliance covers half the globe; it extends from the Rhine through Europe and Asia into North America; and comprises two millions of men under arms. De Broglie wrote long ago that Sweden has everything to fear from Russia and Prussia in alliance, and Denmark in subjection. The only set-off to this power is that France may be thus forced to draw nearer to England. It is time, therefore, that we should ask ourselves what we mean by foreign policy; or at least we should know what are the objects to be attained by diplomacy. The rank or weight of a power is necessarily founded on three bases; namely, military power, wealth, and alliances. Setting apart all sentimental foreign policy (these not being the days of chivalry), there can only be three objects in a foreign policy: the increase of naval and military power; the increase of wealth; and the strengthening and multiplying of alliances. With regard to the first; the more the military power is increased, the more you take from the wealth of the country. The military power should therefore be of a merely passive character; it should be for defence only. Aggression weakens States. The Dutch increased in power by persistently abstaining from meddling, and by studying only the augmentation of their commerce and wealth. They carried grain for other nations, who wasted themselves by war. This policy they pursued until they entered upon the war of succession; then their power declined, and their commerce and wealth crossed over the sea to our shores. As to the power which results from alliances, let us consider the present state of affairs in Europe, let us observe the result of our negotiations. There is the Holy Alliance on one side, and the Scandinavian Union on the other. And what allies have we? Italy? France is her protector and ally. And France is falling into alliance with the liberals of Germany, against the German Courts and the Holy Alliance. But we have affronted the people of Germany, and they hate us. Would Scandinavia be our ally? Denmark, one leaf of the "Trefoil," we have disgusted. While we were using tall talk, doubtless France whispered to the descendant of Bernadotte, that if he would only wait quietly, Denmark would fall into his lap. France inspired him, and he is the ally of France. But I may be asked what I mean by the term alliance. It means self-interest. It is like friendship between men. There is no such thing as real friendship, such as is imagined by poets and philosophers. [*A laugh.*] The hon. Member for Honiton laughs, in order to remind us that he has acquired the title of poet. In spite of his sneer, however, I maintain that you are friendly with one man because he is amusing, and with another because he gives you information or assistance. Where interests coincide there States are in alliance, and individuals are friendly. This condition lasts, until the interests diverge; and no longer. It may, however, be destroyed by jealousy. But since the French Treaty has been ratified, the interests of the French and ours have been the same; and they have now no jealousy, I presume, of our maritime power. How is it then that France is estranged from us? The Chancellor of the Exchequer says that all their animosities and hatred towards us have ceased. Yes; because they have ceased to fear, not because they have begun to love. And why have they ceased to fear? because they have seen our weakness. Lord Russell sought the co-operation of others in all he did: he sued to France, he knocked humbly at the door of Russia. A State is weak only when it plays a subordinate part. When it fears to take a line of its own, it can never be sure what part it will have to play. Then it must dig and sow, for some other State to reap the fruits. The result is that smaller States will no longer seek your alliance, because of your weakness, but will ally themselves with your master, because he is strong. For hope and fear play their parts in the actions of States. In conclusion I will quote some memorable words from Ségur, merely substituting Denmark for Poland, England for France, and so forth. *Mutatis mutandis* he wrote—

> "England should at the first have declared boldly and firmly that she would support the weak against the strong, and always strengthen the cause of justice. Then all the weaker States would have looked up to England, and all the strong which had no ambitious schemes would have allied themselves with her. If Lord Palmerston had done this, France would have joined her; and Denmark would never have been partitioned. As he did not do this, the weaker States learnt, from the example of Denmark, that the timidity of England cut off all hopes of succour from her; so they ranged themselves either under Germany or France; and the credit of England is destroyed."

MR. WHALLEY said, he had failed to hear in the course of the discussion any practical course, other than that which they had pursued, pointed out as that which the Government ought to have adopted in relation to Denmark. As to the increase in our armaments, to which the noble Lord who had just spoken (Lord Robert Montagu) had alluded, they were in a great measure occasioned by the uncertainty which prevailed with regard to the policy of France, and until the key to that policy was discovered we should be more or less compelled to proceed in the same direction. The key to the policy of France was to be found in the fact that she wielded the power of the Pontifical Empire, and would have to pay the penalty of maintaining the brigand rule of Rome. Never had the French flag been so disgraced, so degraded and dragged in the mire as it had been in maintaining that brigand rule [*Laughter.*] Hon. Gentlemen might laugh, but was it altogether, he would ask, without precedent that the Emperor of the French might think there were other means of invading this country than by force of arms? ["Question," "Oh, oh!"] Had the extraordinary development of that most remarkable aggression of Cardinal Wiseman been forgotten? That aggression took place in 1851, and from that time up to the present there had been a constant endeavour to extend the Popish influence in this country. ["Oh, oh!"] The Ecclesiastical Titles Bill and the laws which had been passed prohibiting the settlement here of the Jesuits had been disregarded, and we had now no less than fifty-six monasteries and about 137 nunneries, and, if what he read were true, every priest belonging to the Church of Rome in England was under the control of the Pontifical authority, while that authority was under the control of the French Emperor. That was the key to the policy of the Emperor of the French. Upon former occasions he had told the Government that if they would grant him a Committee he would be able to show good grounds for alarm and apprehension. The outbreak of public indignation in 1851 was but the echo of our statute-book; and when they had before their eyes the mystery of the best relations with the French Emperor being accompanied by a large increase in our naval and military armaments he hoped he was under a delusion when he thought that some hon. Members showed surprise at the circumstance. As it was understood that the division upon the present occasion might be seriously affected by the passing over to the other side of certain Gentlemen who believed in the dictum of the Earl of Derby that the Conservative party were the natural allies of the Pope, he would remind them of a speech attributed to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bucks, in which the fatal effects of the Papal policy upon this country were pointed out. That right hon. Gentleman now proposed a Motion upon a question of policy, but refused to give any opinion of his own, or even to say that if he had been in office he would have pursued a different course from that pursued by the Government.

MR. ROEBUCK: Sir, I will endeavour to recall the House to the subject which we are here to consider; and at the commencement I must say that I feel almost terror when I approach this great subject. I feel that every word—every word of common sense I mean—I feel that every word uttered in this House may have its echo outside, may fright the nations, and may be productive of most serious consequences. But amid the multitude of words that have been published upon this matter, I have felt that there was a very small quantity of truth. A Conference has met together; a great ceremony has been performed; but every man has seemed to wear a mask. Every man wore the same sort of mask; it had a simpering smile of courtesy while deadly hatred was in the hearts of most of those who were thus met together. But although I have heard almost every word that has been spoken in this debate, I cannot but think that there exists a desire to avoid the real matter in dispute—men seem to shrink from touching the real question. I can understand the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman. It is a Motion directed against the front bench opposite, the real meaning being, "Get you out, and let us come in." It is a very natural Motion to make; I do not at all question the object, nor do I find fault with the Motion; although I may not think much of the wisdom of the proceeding. But still I would ask the House to consider whether the real question has been put before them. The hon. Member for Rochdale (Mr. Cobden) came very near it, but even he seemed to shrink from a statement of the real matter at issue. We are all wonderfully courteous; we speak ill apparently of no one but our political opponents, and the real culprits upon this occasion seem to escape animadversion. For my part, thoroughly understanding the responsibility under which I speak, that responsibility not being official but merely that of a Member of this House—I, feeling that responsibility, believe that I shall best act up to it by saying what I believe to be the truth upon this matter. What is this debate about? First and foremost, I will state the parties whom I conceive to be concerned in the matter. I take them to be five in number. There is first Denmark; next, the people of the small German States; then the Princes of those States; next Prussia, and then Austria. I leave out of consideration Schleswig and Holstein and the Duke of Augustenburg, because I take them to be merely pretexts in this matter. The real question is this—the people of the small States of Germany have gone mad upon the feeling of nationality. The people of Denmark, with the King at their head, have endeavoured to maintain what, for want of a better word, I will call their autonomy. They have endeavoured to hold together a nation composed of separate peoples; the people of the smaller German States have been impelled by the principle most mischievous in politics, the principle of nationality, to invade the rights of the Danish people. Their Princes, fearing that their people might turn against them, have been glad to divert the feelings and wishes of their people into a channel which would not affect their own interest and power. Then comes Prussia, and she has three objects in view. First, she wishes to obtain territorial aggrandizement—she wishes to get a port in the Baltic. Next, the Government of Prussia wish to divert the consideration of the people from their own internal affairs. And thirdly, their object is to fight for what the Germans, talking Greek, call the "hegemony"—the headship of Germany. These are the three objects which the Prussian Government pursue. On the other hand, Austria, fighting for one of these things, the headship of Germany, sees Prussia pursuing her own political aggrandizement, feels that she cannot allow Prussia to take that course without following her, and enters therefore into the contest. Now, the character of Prussia is a precious compound. It is a compound of a pedagogue, a drill-sergeant, and a highwayman. That has been her character from the beginning—from the very time that she became a kingdom, and during the reign of her next monarch whom some silly people call great. They have been robbers from the beginning, and they are only acting up to their original character now, when they are endeavouring to acquire from weak Denmark that port upon the Baltic which some day or other shall rise up to create what they call a German navy. Now, some months ago, when at Vienna, I talked with an illustrious statesman there about this matter of Denmark; and I said to him, "How can you, an Austrian Minister, take a lead in this crusade for nationalities? Had you no recollection of Hungary, of Transylvania, of Bohemia, and of Italy?" He looked at me and said, "What you say is true; but the Germans have gone mad." And he added, "I will tell you a saying that we have. When a Frenchman goes mad we say he becomes mischievous; when a German goes mad he becomes silly." I bowed to him, and said, "Sir, I think upon the present occasion Germany has succeeded in combining both characters." Well, then, the real matter in hand is this—that Prussia and Austria and the other States of Germany have interfered in the internal affairs of an independent nation. It is all very well for Gentlemen here to take what is called the German side of the question and talk about the oppression of Holstein and Schleswig by Denmark. But I want to know if there be a kingdom in Europe that is not composed of different, nay, of hostile nationalities. Look at our own country. We conquered Wales, and Welshmen hate Englishmen now. ["No!"] Yes, it is quite true. We conquered Ireland; we injured Ireland almost continuously from that time until 1830; and let me say, with all courtesy towards hon. Gentlemen from that country, that Ireland hates us now, and that if we were to adopt there what the Emperor of the French wishes to adopt now — namely, a *plébiscite* — we should be turned out of Ireland to-morrow. Now, I desire that the rule for ourselves should be the rule for others. When Napoleon interfered with the Irish people, what words in the language were strong enough to express our indignation? Did he not say, too, that England oppressed Ireland, and was it not true? I will go still further back. When England chose to get rid of the Stuarts, and to drive James II. from the throne, what happened in Ireland? Did we not by the strong hand put down the Irish people who wished to continue under the rule of that King? England, I say, has conquered Ireland, and has behaved unjustly towards her; but what should we say if anybody interfered between us and Ireland because of our injustice? Now, I will assume for a moment that Denmark was unjust to the Duchies? I do not believe it, but I will assume it. Denmark was an independent nation; and I want to know what right the German people had to interfere? I put it broadly — what right had they to interfere? The fact is that there is a great principle at the bottom of all this, and that to interfere with the internal concerns of a nation is to forfeit one of the great guarantees for the peace of the world. That is my rule, and I say that the German nation, headed by Austria and Prussia, have done a great deed of wrong by interfering with an independent nation, whatever may have been the conduct of that nation to any part of its dominions. I want somebody to answer me on this point. You talk of united nationalities. Look the world over, and if you find a nationality united I will give up the point at once. Take Germany. Where is the unity of Germany? I find every State struggling with every other State, and I find also that precious pretence of a Government, the Diet. What is the meaning of all that? The Germans do not go and wail over Strasburg. Why don't they? Because they are afraid. And then their great feeling for Fatherland bursts forth and is poured out upon the little nation of Denmark. Do the Germans say anything to Austria? Would they dare say anything to Austria, supposing that Austria to-morrow were to annihilate the constitution that the Emperor has given to his subjects? Would the Diet at Frankfort in that case dare to whisper one single word of disapprobation? The fact is it is all a farce — a mischievous farce — beginning in farce and ending in tragedy. These are what I call the real facts of the case. I will not now pretend to discuss what Denmark has done in Schleswig or Holstein. My own belief is that the Danes intended to do what every wise nation would attempt to do — unite the separate parts of that country into one. In the same way Scotland became united with this country, not by a merely personal connection through the Sovereign, but by a union of the people. We got Ireland to do the same; and will any man tell me that in the matter of the Union Mr. Pitt and his Government appealed to the Irish people? Was there any pretence for such a thing? Were the people of Ireland consulted? And yet I hear people talk as though we had done nothing like what the Danes have done! And what did Denmark do? She gave what I believe to be a really good constitution to Schleswig, and then you tell us that she endeavoured to change the language. If she did I think she did a very wise thing. There are silly people in this country who wish to continue the language of Wales. But any wise man would at once say, "If we can, let us put out that wonderful light called the Welsh language." A nation ought to be as much as possible homogeneous, and one of the great means of effecting this object is to make the language the same. I do not, therefore, blame the Danish Government for endeavouring to spread the Danish language over the whole kingdom. So much for the doings of Denmark. Then Germany steps in where she had no right to step in; and now I ask what ought England to do? We are told that we ought not to interfere. Now, I want to know, whether, in the history of Europe, from the time that Europe was a combination of States, it has been possible for us to insulate ourselves and declare we will take no care for what is going on? We are not here to talk about this in a huckster-like way, but as statesmen ought to talk about it. I am not going to take my statesmanship from those whose object is merely to make money. I do not think a counting-house the proper portico for a statesman. If, I say, we are to consider what the communities of Europe are, is there a more dangerous thing for us to permit than that a strong nation should interfere in the domestic concerns of a weak nation? I know it has been done; but it has been done in spite of the feelings of the English people. We have at times opposed it. We have done many silly things, but I think we did not do a silly thing in preventing Spain from overrunning Portugal. That was a case exactly analogous to the present. The hon. Member for Rochdale says it is impossible, with a great nationality like that of Germany, by the side of a small nationality like that of Denmark, to prevent the one from gravitating towards the other, until at last the great nationality overflows and overbears the small one. Again, I appeal for a parallel to our own country. Is the disproportion between the Danish and German nationalities greater than that between the nationalities of England and Wales? We have also what Germany has— a wonderful literature—we have a fine, comprehensive, and powerful language, we have a courageous and intelligent people; but from the time of Edward II. downwards have we been able to put down the nationality of Wales? No, we have not. And I say what has happened here may happen with regard to Denmark, and we have every right to suppose the nationality of Denmark will not be overrun by the greater nationality of Germany. Moreover, remember this, the Danes are only part of a large nationality—the Scandinavian—and in the multitude of the nationalities of Europe, who shall say which is to be predominant? The only wise rule is for each nation to make itself one, and for other nations to abstain from mingling in its domestic affairs. And it is the duty and interest of England to maintain as much as possible the adherence of all other nations to this great principle of peace. None of the words I have heard uttered in this House are too strong to express my utter disapprobation of the manner in which the foreign policy of this country has been conducted by Lord Russell. The noble Lord seems to me to have mistaken his vocation. Nature intended him for a schoolmaster; and Fortune made him a statesman. His great object seems to have been to read lectures to all Europe, and Europe very properly has said, "We don't intend to be lectured by you." I believe there is nobody feels that more than the noble Viscount opposite. [Viscount PALMERSTON intimated dissent.] Yes, I see the noble Lord shakes his head, but I know better. Lord Russell seems to me to have been like the Old Man of the Sea, sitting on the noble Lord's back. I have no doubt myself that if the foreign policy of the Government had been conducted according to the wishes of the noble Viscount, we should never have been in the position in which we now find ourselves. But there are exigencies in all parties. There may be people who are very disagreeable, but of whom it is impossible to get rid. That, I believe, is the exact state of the noble Lord's opinion on this matter. If Lord Russell had been sent to the other place with his Earldom only and nothing to do, I am sure the noble Viscount would have fancied himself a very happy man. That is my opinion with regard to Lord Russell. But then comes the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman. It is not enough to say that because I find fault with you I must love him. I honestly say that with all the fault I have to find with the present Administration, I prefer them to those who seek to supplant them. That is a plain and simple statement. I do not expect that it will be satisfactory to hon. Gentlemen on this (the Opposition) side of the House, but that is a fact. That is my feeling on the matter, and that is the reason why I mean to vote with the noble Viscount. I shall vote thus, not because I believe the present is the best Administration the country can afford, but because I think it is better than the one which will take its place if this Resolution is carried. That is a statement which all the world can understand. I find fault with much the present Government have done. I think they have come short in many things of what they might have done both in home and foreign policy, but I prefer them to those who wish to succeed them. I can see that I do not please hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House, and I certainly have not pleased hon. Gentlemen opposite, but still I feel that my country will go with me in what I have uttered. I feel that many things might have been done which would have prevented bloodshed in this matter. If the noble Lord had had power to do as he wished—if we had taken a firm stand at the beginning—we might have put an end to the arrogance and injustice of the German Confederation. I have heard a great deal said about peace, but those do not always maintain peace who say they will never go to war. My belief is, that if the Government had told the German people that the moment they attacked Denmark they must expect to have England for a foe, and if they had steadfastly acted on that principle, and sent a fleet to the Baltic, there would have been no trouble with Germany. You may talk about the effects of railroads, but is there any people, more especially the Germans, who can maintain themselves without foreign commerce? Our fleet would have swept from the sea the whole mercantile navy of Germany, and with that threat before them the Germans would have been wise in time, and they would have abstained from those acts of injustice which they are now perpetrating, and which they may live to deplore.

MR. HORSMAN: Sir, the House has now placed before it the case against the Government and the defence, in speeches of rare ability, which have left the partisans on either side little to desire as to the manner in which their respective champions have opened the battle on their behalf. With those who address themselves to this question merely in a spirit of partisanship—determined, as the right hon. Member for Bucks, to censure and eject a Government which has done nothing right; or, on the other hand, persuaded by the glowing speech of my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to applaud and support a Government which he has shown to have done nothing wrong—there may be little difficulty in deciding into which lobby they shall go. But, as my hon. Friend the Member for Rochdale truly stated at the beginning of this evening, there is a large section in this House, and I am sure there is a large section in the country, who are sufficiently impressed with the gravity of our position to be determined not to allow this to be made merely a question of the Treasury Bench; who are not so satisfied either of the entire justice of the attack on one side or with the sufficiency of the defence on the other, as to join upon this occasion in indiscrimate censure or any indiscriminate approval, and who are desirous, therefore, of looking further and deeper into the causes of a situation for which—painful and in many respects discreditable as it is —it is idle to say that Ministers alone are to blame. The Motion of the right hon. Gentleman may be said to affirm two propositions—first, that the policy of the Government has been a failure; secondly, that that failure has been so injurious to the national influence and the interests of peace that the Government ought to be censured and ejected. As to the first of these propositions, I believe there will be little difference of opinion among us. The policy of the Government has certainly failed to preserve peace between Denmark and Germany, and it has also failed to save Denmark from conquest and dismemberment. We have all watched with painful anxiety the unequal contest waged by a free, gallant, and virtuous little State, shedding its best blood drop by drop, against two gigantic Powers, who have been repeating in Denmark their robbers' crime of Poland. Twelve months ago we respected the Germans as our friends and allies; but now, such is the infamy with which they stand self-branded, that he would be a bold Minister who would come to the House of Commons to ask us to vote one shilling or one man to save them from any affliction which might threaten them. My hon. and learned Friend who has just sat down (Mr. Roebuck) has favoured us with a portrait of these two Powers, and he has enlarged rather more fully upon Prussia than upon Austria, which he has thrown somewhat in the background. The only distinction I can draw between the two Powers is this. It appears to me that, of the two, Prussia has been the greater madman and Austria the greater hypocrite. Prussia by its late audacious repudiation of the Treaty of Paris with respect to privateers has almost put herself without the pale of civilized nations; and Austria, the partner of her counsels and her crimes, must also, when the time arrives, be the partner of her punishment and disgrace. A day of reckoning is most certainly in store for both; and when the day does fall cruelly and crushingly upon them, the whole of civilized Europe, with one voice, will acknowledge that the heaviest calamities that can befall them will be but a righteous retribution for the blood of slaughtered Danes—blood that is even now crying to Heaven for vengeance. We have witnessed with indignation the perpetration of this crime, so revolting to humanity and justice, in Denmark, and we have felt humiliated by the contempt which has been shown towards England. Her counsels have been slighted, her warnings disregarded, her menaces derided, until Prussia, flushed with impunity, has mocked, bearded, and almost threatened us with an insolence which has left us almost cowering from the shame of misleading and abandoning a small and kindred State, which we were bound by the most solemn obligations to protect. ["Oh, oh!] All this is true. It is sad enough to reflect upon, and it insures for the first proposition of the right hon. Gentleman a pretty general and ready assent. But when he goes on to tell us that the Ministers are alone to blame for all this — that the House of Commons has been so mindful of its duty, to imply that it has been so far-sighted in its policy, so vigilant, so right-minded, so earnest, that it is justified —nay, more, that according to the right hon. Gentleman, it is bound to inflict justice on a delinquent Government that has not acted up to its standard of conduct and requirement, I venture to say that he has invited us to accept a conclusion which the facts will not bear out. Do not let us, in our desire to make a scapegoat of the Government, blink this fact—that for two years we have, one and all of us, on both sides of the House, been acquiescing in the policy we are now called upon to condemn. There are certain Parliamentary forms—there is a certain Parliamentary practice — by which the public outside these walls becomes acquainted with the opinions of the Members of the House of Commons. What is the record of our proceedings during these two years? Not only to the public of this country but to Europe have we shown our acquiescence in the policy of the Government. And I will say that not only have we been endorsing, but that we have also been directing that policy. Well, now the right hon. Gentleman and his friends have drawn up a long bill of indictment against the Government; but let me ask them and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Huntingdon (General Peel)—when did the perils attending the policy of the Government first strike them? Was it only lately that they forced themselves upon his conviction? No. Then I gather from the right hon. Gentleman that he has long felt and long foreseen the perils into which the weakness and incapacity of Government were hurrying us. Then why is it he has so long held his peace? Is it not in the very essence of Parliamentary Government that the Ministry should be watched and controlled? Is it not the first duty of my right hon. Friend as a national representative to raise the cry of alarm and save us from the abyss towards which he saw we were hurrying? "No," says my right hon. Friend, "that rule does not apply to foreign policy. The relations between Parliament and the Foreign Office are altogether exceptional." It is an entirely new and a strange doctrine that he has revived and promulgated, that the House of Commons has no alternative between giving to the Government free licence, unchecked and uncontrolled, to injure and disgrace the country, and punishing them when they have so injured and disgraced us. "But," says my right hon. Friend in this new and strange exposition of Parliamentary law, "Parliament must never prevent. That would be very wrong. It can only punish. There is no intermediate power. We must trust implicitly or eject penally and ignominiously; but we have no power to check, control, or restrain." Now this new and strange doctrine I utterly repudiate. I say it is as false as it is new. It may be well suited to the atmosphere of a despotism, but is utterly alien to the nature of a constitutional Government. Our Constitution knows no difference between Parliamentary supervision administered for our home and our foreign policy. It is our duty to scrutinize severely all the clauses of a Bill introduced by the Home Office; and it is equally our duty, in a case such as Gentlemen opposite have shown this to be, where they have the strongest misapprehension and distrust of the Government, without positive evidence to convict it—it is equally their duty in such a case, to watch vigilantly the tendency of every despatch as they would the clauses of every Bill. I say it is not true that the Government are raised above the capacity of the House and its controlling and correcting power by the possession of exclusive knowledge; and we know, moreover, that in these days they have little exclusive knowledge. Even in connection with the late Conference, we have seen that the transactions of that body have been telegraphed to Germany and telegraphed back to London almost before the Plenipotentiaries have had time to sit down to dinner; and the excuse is, therefore, too transparent to be urged as an excuse for the non-performance of duty. But admitting for the moment that the Government is exclusively informed of the details of current information, it argues a very superficial attention to the subject to imagine that great international questions turn upon details. There are great historical facts and high moral principles which dictate the policy of nations. The text and construction of treaties, the traditional designs of aggressive Powers, the judgment with which our foreign alliances have been cemented or dissolved, the means by which national influence abroad and its decline are brought about—these are subjects upon which any educated man is as capable of forming an opinion as a Government. These are the rudiments of political knowledge, and therefore every Member of this House who, like my hon. Friend, has mistrusted the Government, and has yet either designedly or timidly held his peace, has shared in the blame attaching to every act of the Government, and partakes of the responsibility, in consequence of his culpable acquiescence, which has rendered him one of the promoters of the very acts which he now censures. Well, Sir, that is my theory of the duty and responsibility of Parliament, which I confidently place before the House in antagonism to that brought forward by the other side. I say that the policy of the Government is exclusively Ministerial only until the materials for forming a judgment upon that policy have been given to the world. But I say the moment those materials have been made public property, then if the policy developed in them is not repudiated but is accepted by all sides in the House, if public mischief subsequently arise, that mischief lies not at the door of the Government but at the door of Parliament; and if the country has been dishonoured and humiliated, the result is not brought about by the Ministry but by Parliament itself.

Now, Sir, I will come to the facts upon which this discussion has been based; and I say that the principle which I have endeavoured to establish most peculiarly and forcibly applies to the case of Poland, to which the right hon. Gentleman had devoted so large a portion of his speech last night. The right hon. Gentleman very truly told us that our Danish difficulties did not begin with Denmark, and he drew our attention back to their true source. The Government did not come fresh to the Danish Question. The Danish Question came upon them when they were exhausted, debilitated, dissociated from every Continental ally, owing to that rash advance and ignominious retreat in connection with our Polish diplomacy of last year? Are the Ministry to be blamed for that? What are the facts? The right hon. Gentleman said last night that he would not weary the House by referring to details which were fresh in the recollection of all of us. But those facts were not fresh in the recollection of the House, and I will trouble the House by referring to them. Those facts bear a precious moral at the present moment, when our morality in foreign affairs is going astray, and the experience of their bitter fruits may serve as a salutary and much needed warning for the future. The right hon. Gentleman said last night there had been many revolts in Poland, that we had found our intervention had invariably increased the misfortunes of Poland; that the two Ministers who were in office at the time were fortunately aware of the calamitous results which had ensued upon our interference; and he left it to be inferred that, if the Government had resolved to intervene, he and his friends would have objected to such a course. Now, what are the facts? In February last year the hon. and learned Member for the King's County (Mr. Hennessy) set forth in elaborate details, and in terms exceedingly offensive to the Emperor of Russia, many instances of cruelty and bad conduct which had attended the conduct of that monarch towards Poland. The hon. Gentleman concluded by moving those words, which I can accurately repeat—

> "That these facts call for the interposition of England in vindication of her own public faith and solemn engagements."

Now, Sir, these were very strong words, and I wish the House to particularly attend to them, because the Resolution was one embarrassing to the Government, and it owed its success to the support of the right hon. Gentleman the member for Buckinghamshire. I beg the House to remember the words, "That these facts call for the interposition of England in vindication of her own public faith and solemn engagements." That was a very strong Motion, and the debate upon it was a very remarkable debate. The other side of the House absolutely ran riot on it, with the exception of my hon. Friend the Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), who repudiated any share in it. With this exception every hon. Gentleman on that side of the House was in favour of interposition. On the Government side of the House there was not the same unanimity. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Berkshire (Mr. Walter) was the first to raise the sound of alarm. My hon. Friend said the terms of that Motion meant war. What said the right hon. Gentleman opposite? "The terms of the Motion don't frighten me." And so said the hon. Gentleman the Member for Horsham (Mr. S. Fitzgerald). Both those Gentlemen threw their whole influence, exertions, and eloquence into a support of the Motion, and with such effect that the Polish current ran so high as to draw my right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Walpole) into the enthusiasm. He appealed to the Government to respond to the strong feeling of the House, and advised the hon. Member for the King's County not to divide, but only on the condition that the First Minister of the Crown should promise to give effect to the strongly expressed wishes of the House in favour of intervention. Therefore it was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire and his friends who committed the House, the Government, and the country to intervention in the affairs of Poland. They were far in advance of the noble Lord, whose language on that occasion was as guarded, and whose reluctance to move in the matter was as apparent as was consistent with the avoidance of a division which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire made very formidable and most embarrassing. But the sequel is still more surprising. The Government, in obedience to the will of the House of Commons, addressed themselves to the Powers of Europe with great skill, great courage, and great success, and formed a combination so complete that the Emperor of Russia, isolated and paralyzed by the combination, was absolutely at our mercy. If England only said one word, without moving a soldier or a ship, the independence of Poland was re-established. Why did England not say the word? Did the Gentlemen opposite ask the Government to say the word? Did they support the appeals which they themselves had directed to be made? Did they offer the noble Lord support when he was committed to intervention, in vindication of the public faith and the solemn engagements of England? No such thing. Putting forth that policy in February, they abandoned it in July; goading the Government to intervention in February, they thwarted them in July by proclaiming themselves the disciples of non-intervention. They started with intervention, and closed with non-intervention. And then followed the embarrassments and dangers of the intervention which had been undertaken at their request. And what is the real meaning of this principle of non-intervention which we have heard again laid down with so much zeal, ability, and earnestness to-night by my hon Friend the Member for Rochdale? How do we define this principle, which has now become almost a stereotyped phrase in our debates? I always thought that, as applied by statesmen, the well understood and well defined meaning of "non-intervention" is non-interference in the internal concerns—in the domestic affairs—of another State. The principle of non-intervention in that sense is a sound, right, and just principle. It is a principle first enunciated by England, to the honour of England, for the absolute exclusion of foreign influences must be the best security for the internal repose and good government of States. To the principle of non-intervention as so defined I am ready, and I believe every Gentleman in this House is ready, to give an unqualified acceptance. But that did not satisfy my hon. Friend the Member for Rochdale. As developed in his speech to-night, his idea of non-intervention would go much further, and would require that England should be withdrawn from all concern whatever in the international affairs of Europe—retiring in seclusion—continually abandoning her position, repudiating her obligations—absolving herself, as far as I understand, from obligations imposed upon her by treaties already entered into; refusing to enter into treaties hereafter; abjuring for the future all external duties and responsibilities. England would then have no further mission—since, as the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Huntingdon observed, she is too rich to be shot at—except to stand behind the shop-counter and serve all customers alike, enabling the shopkeeper to increase his gains and the taxpayer to save his pocket. That is a principle of non-intervention to which I cannot assent. I think it is a mistaken, mean, and mischievous doctrine. But there is another kind, a third form of non-intervention, which I think still more mistaken, mean, and mischievous. That is a policy which seeks to disturb by words, but shrinks from the responsibility of acts; which advances boldly, to retreat ignominiously—which signs treaties only to abandon them—which preaches morality that it tramples in the mire—which becomes the champion of the weak only to betray them—which lectures and threatens the wrongdoer, only to fall back and crouch before his defiant enmity. That is a species of non-intervention the most senseless and mischievous of all. Such an intervention exposes the Minister of a great nation to the character of a scold and an impostor at once. It incenses the strong Powers which it endeavours to control, and aggravates twentyfold every misery and mischief which it sets out with a pretended mission to remove. But that is the non-intervention forced on the Government last year by those who obliged them to advance at the beginning of the Session, and compelled them to retreat at the end. Your fever heat of February cooled to a very low temperature in July. When the critical moment arrived for determined action to be taken, then it was the changed mind of Parliament was perceived, and could not be mistaken by those who watched it. Then it was that Austria, always double-faced, combined in Poland then, as in Denmark now, with an hypocritical moderation, an ill-grounded sympathy towards every crime and cruelty of despotism—then it was that Austria, assured of the protection of one large party in this House, felt secure in carrying out her enterprise, and the Government of this country were forced to escape from an untenable position. They shrunk, and naturally and properly shrunk, from beginning an European war with an ally whom they could not control, and with a Parliament which they could not trust. And, Sir, the events now passing in Denmark, and the humiliation of England arising from those events, are naturally and logically the results of the inconsistency and crookedness of our proceedings last Session with respect to Poland. We failed to rescue one Poland from Russia, and our loss of influence has made another Poland of Denmark. What are the changes which have occurred since? This time last year we were the moving and guiding Power of Europe—the central Power in favour of liberty. We had entered into a great combination then. We were stronger in alliances than in recent times we had ever been; and we were stronger still in that moral influence derived from character. How is it that all is changed? Why is it that the Danish Question finds us without an ally? We had incensed Russia by our policy on the Polish Question; we had alienated France by abandoning that policy; and therefore Germany, having learnt to estimate our policy at its worth, knew that in this Danish Question we could not act. There is not now in Europe, in Asia, in the West, or in the East, one single Power, great or small, in which the lowered position and the lost influence of England is not painfully demonstrated to every English traveller—is not a cause of sorrow, derision, or contempt. In this position—this most dangerous position of our own creation, but for the creation of which I have shown the Government were not responsible ["Hear, hear!"]—I am only repeating now the same opinion that I expressed at the close of the Session in the month of July last—in this unfavourable state of things we had to rouse ourselves afresh to deal with the Danish difficulty. The question arising out of the Treaty of London divides itself into two parts. Those were the engagements contracted by the Treaty of London in 1852, and renewed by the present Cabinet in 1863 and 1864. By that treaty the Powers who were parties to it engaged themselves to one another to regulate the succession to the Danish Crown, to maintain the integrity of the kingdom and the peace of Europe, which might be endangered if no such regulation had taken place before the then existing dynasty became extinct. England, pledged with all the other Powers, undertook to uphold the succession of the present King of Denmark. The contingency to which the treaty referred occurred last year. The reigning branch of the Oldenburg dynasty became extinct, the succession was disputed, and the parties were called upon to act. Here was an occasion demanding the utmost circumspection on the part of the British Government. The Schleswig-Holstein Question was not a new one—it had not come upon them unawares. The differences between Denmark and Germany had been growing ever since the present Ministry was formed, and the death of the King of Denmark only aggravated the difficulty. The duty of England then came to be considered, and the task of the British Government was one of no ordinary difficulty. England could no longer be a friendly counsellor. She was called upon to act, and she could not act without a policy. To plunge into interference without due consideration was to plunge into difficulty and disaster; for, if the first step were a false one, every succeeding step would only increase the difficulty. Now, under these circumstances, what was the policy which Her Majesty's Government undertook to adopt? I think it was a fatal policy. With a want of caution and foresight which must now astonish themselves, they plunged into difficulties in which they have been floundering ever since. They, in a rash and unreflecting moment, hastened to adopt, without qualification or modification, the Treaty of 1852, which my hon. Friend behind me (Mr. Cobden) has shown to be a bad treaty. It was a treaty unsound in principle, vicious in policy, and at variance with every English notion of justice and morality. This was their first blunder, and it has since been proved to have been an irreparable one. They undertook to set aside the hereditary succession to the throne of Denmark. They chose to treat the heir presumptive of the Danish Crown as if he had an absolute right of property, and they allowed him to make merchandise of his title to the succession. I do not know whether the Danish Constitution allows that to be done any more than our Act of Settlement would allow the Prince of Wales to change the order of succession here. But I did not know that he had any succession to sell until the noble Lord stated he had forfeited it by rebellion and treason. The contracting parties, however, chose to treat with him as if he were the absolute owner in fee, and they bought him out for a smaller sum than we have seen given for an estate in England. In that respect it was an immoral transaction. A portion of his subjects came into a state of war with the King of Denmark, and the rebellion was successful until they were invaded and overpowered by a foreign army. They continued subjects of the King of Denmark, and also subjects of the Germanic Confederation, and thus they owned a divided allegiance, which is always a cause of quarrel. So that this treaty, by which Foreign Powers undertook to regulate the succession of the Danish Crown without consulting the people of Denmark, and the settlement of the Government of the Duchies without listening to the voice of the people of the Duchies, became the cause of injustice to Denmark, of reproach to England, and sooner or later of embroilment and war in Europe. What, then, ought the Government to have done? Ought we to have repudiated that treaty? By no means. They should have examined the obligations of that treaty, not to evade it, but to rectify and enlarge. Eleven years have passed since that treaty was framed. Since then England's objections to war, and to engagements that might lead to war, were continually increasing. We had engaged to regard the principle of non-intervention, and it was the duty of the Government to have said that the Treaty of London was a mistake—in the first place, because England was only remotely affected by the affairs of Denmark; and secondly, because the Danish succession was a matter which the Princes and people of Denmark should have been left to settle with themselves. It ought, therefore, to have been proposed to the contracting Powers, by common consent, to annul that treaty and to substitute for it a general declaration binding ourselves not to interfere in the internal affairs of Denmark, and to defend Denmark against all external aggression. If that proposal had been rejected, which was by no means certain, then Lord Russell might have said, "We have loyally fulfilled the obligations of the treaty since you hold us to them; we will carry them out; but England will decline to take a prominent part in a question that immediately affects Continental States." That declaration would have combined fidelity to engagements with the assertion of the soundest principles, and it would have left the peace of Europe not at the mercy of foreign dictation, but founded on the wise and valuable acceptance of the principle of non-intervention. Unfortunately the Government did not take that course. They took their stand on the treaty, and plunged headlong into intervention; and as the London Protocol and treaty were concocted in Downing Street, the English Minister undertook to mediate between Germany and Denmark. Hastily, unfortunately, and rashly setting the other Powers aside, he assumed the almost exclusive task of adjudicating upon these differences, and made England primarily and peculiarly responsible for the miscarriage of diplomacy that was equally unskilful and unsuccessful. I have said that the Danish Question is not a new one, and piles of papers have been laid before us. I shall only refer to the despatch read by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire, written in September, 1862, and written at Gotha, although dated from the Foreign Office. Everything which we are now discussing took its rise from that despatch. It gave judgment on all the questions that had been in dispute between Denmark and Germany, and decided every one of them against Denmark. By so doing Earl Russell reversed the judgment that had been given by the noble Lord at the head of the Government some time previously. That despatch was too good to be kept secret. It was instantly published in the German papers. The aggressive spirit of Germany took fire. It was the torch applied to a pile of combustibles. The petty Sovereigns of Germany were full of laudations of the English Foreign Secretary. Count Platen spoke of the noble Earl as a perspicuous statesman. Count Rechberg said that Lord Russell's was the first master mind that had conquered the question. A reference to that despatch was inserted in a preamble at a meeting of the German Diet. It gave the whole weight and authority of England to the dismemberment of Denmark. What was the effect of that despatch in Denmark? It created a feeling of despair. Sir Augustus Paget, our Minister at Copenhagen, writing a description of the scene to the Foreign Office, said that M. Hall, the Danish Prime Minister, was visibly agitated while he was reading it. He said he never had expected to receive such a despatch at the hands of the British Government, that it was the most disastrous blow that could be inflicted on Denmark, and was likely to lead to the dismemberment of the Danish monarchy. Why, Sir, that language of M. Hall is prophetic. The mistake that Earl Russell made in that despatch was made in the blindness, perhaps I may call it the extraordinary, and in a Foreign Secretary the almost incredible, ignorance which he showed of the real designs of Germany upon Denmark; and his treating the complaints of the Germans as to the grievances about population as the real and sole cause of quarrel. He ignored the notorious determination of the Germans to wrest the Duchies from Denmark, to get Kiel as a German port, and the views which M. Bismark so candidly stated to Lord Wodehouse when he said that the Germans would never be good friends with Denmark as long as the democratic institutions of Denmark were maintained. Not seeing that the German claims were only means to an end, Lord Russell gave that judgment, which was looked upon in Germany as making the attainment of the end the more certain, and as carrying with it a sure conviction that the writer of that despatch would never take up arms for Denmark. There was immediately a *furore* among the German nation, which could no longer be restrained; an invasion of Denmark was determined on; the nation of professors was, by one stroke of Earl Russell's pen, changed into an army of filibusters, and they marched into Holstein. Now, this invasion of the Danish territories by the German troops, made under various pretences, but with one common object—that of spoliation, formed a great crisis for Denmark, and in that crisis the English Minister again steps in to undertake fresh responsibility as a protector and guide of Denmark. Lord Wodehouse is sent on a special mission to Copenhagen, with instructions how to advise the Government. His arrival is welcomed warmly and gratefully as a carrying out of the promise that when their territory was attacked they would not be left without an ally. The revocation of the Patent of March was demanded. "Revoke it by all means," was the advice of the English Minister; and the revocation was, though reluctantly, conceded. Holstein had been invaded. "Withdraw your troops," said Lord Wodehouse; and the troops were withdrawn, burning, as we are told, with shame and mortification. "Cancel the Constitution" was the next advice. "Do what is right before the world. Do what England advises you, and you will see what England will do for you." The King consented to this act of humiliation, but his Ministers resisted and resigned. The King asks for time in order to cancel the Constitution in the only legal way, by the consent of the Chambers; but Austria and Prussia refuse that most reasonable request, and go forth to invade and seize Schleswig. The occupation of Schleswig is followed by the invasion of Denmark. The very existence of Denmark is now at stake, and the question can no longer be evaded, "What will England do now?" And in that critical and exciting moment, with that question in every mouth, the British Parliament assembles on 4th of February. Then came the proceedings of the present Session, and I am sorry to say the contributions of both sides of the House to the embarrassing position in which we now stand. Now I come to the events of the present Session. That meeting of Parliament was, for good or for evil, a great event for Denmark. All eyes both at home and abroad were turned to the British Parliament. As the policy of England was uncertain the counsels of foreign Cabinets were suspended, and even the march of German armies was in part arrested until the first utterances of the British Parliament were heard. But all parties except the Germans were doomed to bitter disappointment. The Government met us in the Queen's Speech, as it was said, in the posture of a mendicant asking us for Heaven's sake for a policy. "You have no policy," said the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire — "we are exactly in the same pitiable plight. We have no policy either." ["No, no!"] Yes, such was the meaning of the right hon. Gentleman's language. And so the House of Commons made no sign. The leaders on both sides manœuvred; the followers on both sides shirked the question. ["No, no!"] I say "Yes." ["No!"] Yes, Sir, and all of us confess it now with shame and with remorse [No, no!"], for England is now reaping the humiliation which we then sowed. If Prussia no longer condescending to hypocrisy is waxing more insolent, and sets no bounds to her aggression, it is because, if before she had to do with a weak Government, she was now assured of impunity by a spiritless Parliament and by a faithless ally and fallen people. ["Oh, oh!"] But it turned out that the Government at that time had a policy, although there were peculiar reasons—painful reasons of peculiar delicacy—which made the sympathy and support of their opponents at the time, not against foreign Cabinets, but against other influences nearer home, indispensable for its secure development and success. On the 26th of February, Lord Russell wrote to Lord Cowley at Paris, that the plan which was in contemplation by the German Powers would amount to the dismemberment of the Danish monarchy, and he asked for the concert and co-operation of France, Russia, and Sweden, in order to give material assistance to Denmark in resisting such a dismemberment; and two days afterwards he sent another similar despatch to St. Petersburg. My hon. Friend the Member for Rochdale criticized those despatches in language which was perfectly consistent in him, as it was consistent with the creed which he has always professed, and with the principles of the party with which he has always acted; and, therefore, I was prepared for his criticism. But I was not prepared for the condemnation which was expressed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire last night, when he fixed upon those despatches the blame of embroiling us in a long enduring European war. But a war against Germany, with France, Russia, and Sweden for our allies—was that an enterprise so immoral, so rash, and so Quixotic, that this House would be ready to condemn it? Sir, in my opinion, those two despatches are the redeeming features in this blue-book. Remember, that when these despatches were written the Eider was not crossed, and if France and Russia had responded as they ought, it never would have been crossed. There is not a political authority in Europe that does not think so; and we were reminded of it last night by the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn when he said, that as the Crimean war would never have broken out if the late Emperor of Russia had been informed beforehand that the passage of the Pruth by his troops would have been a *casus belli* with England, so the Danish war would never have broken out if the Germans had been warned that the moment their army crossed the Eider they should have to measure strength, not with Denmark alone, but with all the neutral Powers of Europe ranged by her side. I believe if such a warning had been given that the free soil of Denmark would never have been polluted by a German hoof, would never have been deluged as it has been by Danish blood. No doubt it might have been thought very weak—nay, even shabby, by some, to ask us in the Queen's Speech for a policy; but assuredly it was more weak and shabby in us not to have responded to that appeal. We knew that Denmark had acted upon the advice of England, because she felt that that advice would be supported by arms; we knew that we were bound by a solemn treaty to Denmark; and, I would ask, what call to war could be more urgent or more moral than a war to uphold the sanctity of treaties? The treaties of Europe are the public law of Europe; they test the morality of States; they are framed to restrain the strong and to protect the weak, to uphold justice, to promote peace; and as long as it is known that there is one great Power in Europe ready to put all at stake rather than participate in the crime and scandal of preferring material interest to moral obligation, so long will the work of demolition be incomplete and the ascendancy of wrong less certain. I think, therefore, that these despatches of the 24th and 26th of February were most creditable to the Government, and that they ought to have been supported by the House. They were known to the Cabinets both of Denmark and Germany, and they must have been known to parties in this House. ["No, no!"] I do not say they were known to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire, because he told us last night that they were not; but they must have been known to other hon. Members. ["No, no!"] I say, therefore, that the policy indicated in those despatches ought to have been supported. But the House shrank from any expression of opinion at that time; and the public, feeling that they had to deal with a Parliament that shrank from that expression of opinion, hung back; and thus a policy which ought to have been supported by a united Parliament and approved by the nation, was dropped, and instead of sending a fleet to the Baltic, Her Majesty's Government only sent round invitations to the European Powers to a Conference. Now, it must be admitted that the moment was singularly ill-chosen for England to propose a Conference. The success of a Conference must depend on France, and we had just rejected with some discourtesy the French Emperor's invitation to form a Congress, by which he endeavoured to cover the failure of his diplomacy in respect to Poland. The Emperor of the French cannot afford failures. In England they only damage the Government, but in France they imperil the dynasty. We did not, however, help him to cover his retreat, but with discourtesy rejected his invitation, though in the same despatch Lord Russell admitted that the state of Europe was very unsatisfactory; and we know that it is so unsatisfactory that it must come at least to a Congress or a general war. We said to the Emperor of the French in effect that we would not go to war, or to a Congress; that we would not fight or deliberate; but we would instruct our envoys to continue the task of intermeddling, by which we have become a nuisance to Cabinets and a bane to populations. On the first night of the Session the right hon.

Gentleman lost no time in actually applauding the error of the Government in rejecting that Congress. On the subject of the Congress, the Emperor of the French had very little to thank his uncourteous ally for—but he could not but be much interested in the mistake we made. He saw that Germany's folly was France's opportunity. If the Ministers of Austria and Prussia had been in the pay of the Emperor of the French they could not have played his game better than they have done. The two most unpopular and conservative of all the despotisms of Europe, at a time when his domestic difficulties were beginning to threaten, opened for him a safety-valve by setting the example that treaties on which the existence of nations depended were not to be regarded. This was a piece of good fortune which he could not have anticipated in his wildest dreams. Their excuse for invading Denmark was the rottenness of their own thrones. He saw the amount of odium which Austria and Prussia were bringing on themselves, and, assuming an action of indifference, but burnishing his arms and "keeping his powder dry," he left to England the hopeless task of terminating a state of things of which he did not complain, because it made him master of the situation. The Conference met and separated, and now we are told by Gentlemen who have brought forward this Motion that it was a failure. But did they not always know that it would be a failure? Did not they say formerly, as now, that the Conference was only proposed as a Ministerial device to put off the Parliamentary reckoning? Would it not, then, have been better to expose and denounce it at a previous time; to have taken the sense of Parliament on the subject, even to have courted a defeat in discharging courageously an indispensable and undeniable public service? The Conference ought never to have met; it was a failure before it met. The Ministers proposed an armistice and were refused. And entering on the business of a Conference without a basis, without an armistice, and without an ally, it was patent to all the world that they courted a succession of defeats which could only end in the mortification of England and the dismemberment of Denmark. I must say that I have perceived with regret a disposition to throw the failure of the Conference on Denmark. I think it impossible but that the case of the Government — though the attempt has not been made by them — must be seriously prejudiced by any such unworthy and ungenerous proceeding. It is impossible to speak too highly of the conduct of the Danes throughout all these nefarious transactions. Their moderation has been equal to their courage, and they have shown a spirit of concession and conciliation which is the more dignified because we know that it is not the result of fear. They have gone on from concession to concession at the urgent instance of the British Government, until it appeared that nothing was left to concede; and, then, when at last Lord Russell advised them to take one step more and accept the line of dismemberment, which he proposed as a final settlement, they accepted even that. Prussia, however, refused it; and then—only when another proposal was made for arbitration, from which the Danes would gain little but lose much, and when they had conclusive eidence that England would abide by nothing which she had herself proposed, and that the German Powers would be satisfied with nothing that was conceded—then, and then only, did they, in their despair, exclaim, "Murder us, if you are determined to do so; but do not under the guise of friendship ask us to be our own executioners, to save you from the shame and guilt of the crime which we see you are determined to uphold." That any attempt should be made to twist that answer of Denmark, dictated by common sense and a generous spirit, to the prejudice of Denmark, and into an apology for our Government, is so ungenerous, that it ought to be met with general reprobation. But though you all said that the Conference was likely to be a failure, and that humiliation was likely to accompany it, yet the right hon. Gentleman opposite not only originated no discussion on the subject, but he would not allow a discussion to be originated by others. When that Conference which we now stigmatize as a delusion was about to meet, the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Bernal Osborne) gave notice of a Motion which would have raised the whole Question and given the House an opportunity to comment on the contemptuous demeanour of the German Powers in refusing to enter the Conference until the Plenipotentiary of the Diet should be prepared to enter it. That was the moment to begin the discussion. It would then have been a seasonable discussion if it only brought to the attention of Parliament the indignity of allowing itself to be the willing victim or the accomplice of a transparent delusion. I do not think that the consequences of such a discussion could be overrated in warning to the German Powers, and strengthening the hands of the British Plenipotentiaries, and showing that there was a Power behind which would not be trifled with, and could not be ignored. But, "No," said the right hon. Gentleman opposite, "we will not allow discussion. The Government and the German Plenipotentiaries must be left alone to fight it out; and when the fight is over, and if the British Ministers are right well punished, I will come forward and ask you to punish them again;" and so in rather a marked and obstructive manner, the right hon. Gentleman gave notice that when the Motion of the hon. Member for Liskeard should be brought on, he, the leader of the Opposition, would strangle it with the "previous Question." I have no doubt that that course of proceeding was acceptable to the German Plenipotentiaries; but what was the position of the English Plenipotentiaries? They sat there the only representatives of a Constitutional Power, possessing the first and freest deliberative assembly in the world, but which had renounced its functions, and left the Government and their representatives at the Conference in the lurch, at a crisis when a discussion in Parliament would have tended to strengthen their hands. The commencement of that Conference was a mistake, and its termination was a failure. I have now brought the question to this point—that between the Government and their opponents there was previous to the Conference but little to choose. The Government had made some mistakes which their opponents had invariably endorsed. ["No, no!"] Well, I will enumerate them. The intervention in Poland last year was a mistake—but that was forced on them by the other side of the House. Their rejection of the French Emperor's invitation to a Congress was a mistake—but that was approved on the other side of the House. The determination to uphold the Treaty of 1852 in all its strictness was a mistake—but that course was concurred in by the other side—and the Conference now admitted to be a failure was acquiesced in without a murmur on the other side. I fear the Government and their opponents are pretty much on an equality; but, in one respect, the balance must be admitted to be in favour of the Government. The position of the Government throughout has been one of great responsibility and difficulty; while the Opposition, with more freedom and fuller opportunities, have in the suppression of debate, and in the early and ill-timed deprecation of war with Germany, perpetrated some blunders peculiarly their own. I will dismiss the past and come to the practical question of the present and the future. Our present situation is, as all admit, very bad. By what policy is it to be amended? Down to the termination of the Conference, the policy of the Government was the policy of Parliament and of the nation; but the failure of the Conference opened new ground for a clear, direct, and unmistakeable issue between the two sides of the House. At the close of the Conference there was one practical question—What is England now to do? Are we to accept that which you very properly brand as a dishonourable defeat, or are we to turn to the alternative of war? That is to say, are we to abandon Denmark to the designs of Germany, or are we to send material aid to Denmark to save her from destruction? That is the only question which the nation cares to ask; but on that question neither in his speech nor in his Motion does the right hon. Gentleman shed a ray of light. Therefore, I say that it is a Motion utterly unsuitable to the occasion, and its double purpose is so apparent that its success will be little short of an affront to the country. On the face of it the Motion bears what I have no doubt is a well-considered determination, to keep two objects inseparably connected, because the success of the one would be embarrassing without the success of the other; it is intended to condemn the Government as much as possible, and to commit the Opposition as little as possible. It aims, therefore—and in this it succeeds—at affirming no principle, it commits its supporters to no policy, it is meant to enable them to obtain power unaccompanied by responsibility. I say that betrays a lamentable and fatal misconception of the very first principle of our political life. Responsibility is the first duty of a statesman, and no political party can ever achieve anything great which shrinks from a declaration of its views. Therefore, I say, the Motion is below the occasion and unworthy of a great party. The time has come when on both sides ambiguous policy should be discarded.

We have been too long given over to dexterous phrases and ambiguities. The time has come when we must look our duty and position fairly in the face. What is to be the foreign policy of England? That is the issue raised—or rather evaded—by the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman. I put it to the candour of any man here, whether such a question should be evaded at such a moment as this? Do we not see the clouds gathering over Europe? The war of the nationalities may not be long delayed. The contest in Denmark is but a skirmish of outposts. The Holy Alliance revived is on the one side sounding the trumpet of alarm; while, on the other, the cry of the nationalities, which the German despots so madly roused, will before long be echoed to their destruction. How is England to prepare for the coming storm? At such a crisis we cannot endorse a vague Motion ingeniously framed so as to keep the country in the dark. This is, apart from all political considerations, a plain, business question affecting the country, and the considerations which should guide us in voting are very simple. We have to consider the position, first, of the Government that is, and next of the Government that claims to be, and then to perform the duty of adjudicating between them. As to the existing Government it was impossible to say that, during these transactions, they have not exhibited a weakness, blindness, and ill-success, that I do not think any one remembers to have seen surpassed. They have established no claim on our confidence, and not very much even on our forbearance. Indeed, had the Motion of the other side combined censure with sound policy, I do not think there would have been any very great difficulty in inflicting on the Government the condemnation which many on this side of the House, and myself among the number, believe they have deserved. On the other hand, what is the position of the Opposition? I must subject to the same ordeal the aspirants to as well as the occupants of office. If the Government have merited censure, where have they merited reward? If the Government have been weak, when have they shown strength? If the Government have been "intensely incapable," where have the Opposition proved their intense capacity? Hitherto, it has been the safety of England that she had a choice of Ministers and of parties, so that if she were threatened with ruin by one, she could always be saved by another. It was impossible, therefore, that any one set of men could inflict on her more than a certain amount of degradation. But the very abyss into which, according to the right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire, we are engulfed, proves that there must have been two contending parties. But there is now no preference. For the mistakes of the Government there is always some excuse. Every step in the path is beset with thorns, and at times a sense of overwhelming responsibility may unsettle the firmest nerves and obscure the clearest judgment. The Opposition, however, with heavy responsibility too, have a far lighter duty to discharge. Their duty is to sound the alarm, to proclaim dangers, to rouse the nation, and to arrest the mischief. The right hon. Gentleman need not have devoted so large a portion of his speech to refuting what no man here would seriously allege, and which the noble Lord at the head of the Government has never alleged, except to amuse the House—that the Opposition are not bound to provide the country with a policy. The nation does not expect the Opposition to proclaim a policy. No; but it does demand, and it has a right to demand, that you should exhibit the qualities by which a policy should be constructed—enunciation of principles, display of knowledge, proofs of earnestness, the acknowledgment and acceptance of responsibility. And you cannot ride off on that plea of forbearance by which a good deal of capital has been made during the past and present Sessions. Are we to be told that forbearance to a weak and mischievous Government is a virtue in an Opposition? I have always understood that it was the nation, and not the Ministry, that had the first claim to a statesman's consideration. After all, what does this forbearance amount to? There are different kinds of forbearance. There is the forbearance which arises from a hope which hon. Gentlemen opposite may candidly own they never entertained, that the Government might be able to extricate themselves from their difficulties, and that any intermeddling would only increase them. There is the forbearance which is the main strength of a constitutional Government—the guiding and supporting voice of Parliament, which when speaking earnestly to Europe never speaks in vain. There is a third kind of forbearance which cannot be too highly applauded. We do not much praise the forbearance of the man who will not pluck a pear because he thinks it is not quite ripe, for we know his forbearance arises from his love of the fruit, and that he means to snatch at it when it is more mature.

In conclusion, I will state the grounds of the vote I intend to give. We have had in this country many instances of weak Governments; but we have never in the history of Parliament had an instance before, and I trust we shall never see one again, of an Opposition who from year to year have disapproved the whole policy of the Government, and yet, without resistance, or even remonstrance, have suffered the country to go on from disaster to disgrace, raising no warning voice, and outstretching no helping hand. That is bad enough; but surely it is far worse when the catastrophe had arrived, that those who tell us they foresaw but did nothing to avert should seek to use it as a stepping-stone to power, and turn the misfortunes of the nation into the triumph of party. Even to this moment the right hon. Gentleman has not pronounced on the Dano-German question. Even after his comprehensive and exhausting speech, we are left in doubt whether he is a Dane or a German—whether he is for peace or for war. Under such circumstances, and with a European crisis impending, to transfer the destinies of England to the hands of men who have yet a policy to seek would be a gambler's throw. This is not a question of confidence in the Government or in their opponents. Smarting as we do from the mistakes of both, there is no large section of the House overflowing with confidence in either side. My confidence is that the honesty, the good sense, and the judgment of this country will enable it to right itself at last. In the meantime we must deal with plain practical questions as practical men, and accept this not as a question of confidence, but, as my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck) put it, as a question of preference. Some even have placed it on the low ground, until we can see our way out of our difficulties, as a question of endurance. On whatever ground it may be put, I have no hesitation in affirming that, in my opinion, public policy does not require that, at this critical moment, a Government which has laboured so earnestly and constitutionally, though unsuccessfully, to preserve peace in a manner compatible with the national honour, should be displaced to make way for those who have shown more weakness and less courage during the prolonged and painful crisis, and who have in a manner equally unprecedented and unconstitutional abdicated the highest functions of Opposition and stifled the voice of Parliament.

MR. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD: Sir, late as the hour is, I trust the House, after the somewhat personal allusions of the right hon. Gentleman, will permit me to address a few words to them this evening. I must confess that among the many remarkable speeches I have heard the right hon. Gentleman deliver, that which he has made to-night has been the most extraordinary. For nearly two hours he has addressed the House, and until the last concluding sentences of his speech there must have been many Members who were perfectly in doubt as to the nature of the vote which the right hon. Gentleman was about to give; because, with singular impartiality, he first blamed the Government, told them their Administration was disastrous, and that their conduct had humiliated England; and then he turned round on the Opposition and said, "True, you have no responsibilities; but you are just as bad, and I have no confidence in you." But if the right hon. Gentleman's speech was singular in this respect, it was even more so by reason of the very novel theory which he broached as to the conduct of the foreign policy of the country. He told us — and I paid particular attention to his words—that in questions of foreign politics the office of the Government was merely Ministerial, until the House of Commons was possessed of the facts with which the Government had to deal. In seeking thus to convert the House of Commons into a Foreign Office, and to transfer to it the conduct of foreign affairs, I think the right hon. Gentleman, as well as the hon. and learned Gentleman the hon. Member for Sheffield, who went before him, have shown what the effect of such a transfer would be. What according to the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Roebuck) is to be the nature of the diplomatic language of this country? The hon. and learned Gentleman thinks that in transacting business of such a character in this House we should best conciliate Foreign Powers, and best consult the dignity of this country by applying to other nations such terms as "highwaymen" and "swindlers," while the right hon. Gentleman designated the parties with whom we had to deal as "robbers," and either as "hypocrites" or "filibusters." The right hon. Gentleman's theory of the administration of foreign politics is both novel and unconstitutional; and I venture to think that an Administration such as he would like to see established would be most unsatisfactory, and dangerous to the interests of this country. Before coming to the question more directly under our consideration, I should also like to set the right hon. Gentleman right as to the course attributed by him to this side of the House on the question of Poland last year. The right hon. Gentleman says the course pursued by the Government was forced on them by the Opposition. Is that so? The dates prove that he is wrong. And when the right hon. Gentleman assumes to be the censor and Mentor of the whole House of Commons, he ought at least to make himself acquainted with the facts and dates necessary to his discourses. First, as to dates. The Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for the King's County took place on the 27th of February. [Mr. HORSMAN: I said so.] But what was the date of Lord Russell's condemnation of the conduct of Russia? Why, the 21st of February. What was the date of the letter which has been so much complained of with reference to the conduct of Prussia? The 18th of February. What was the date of Lord Russell's despatch seeking for concert and harmonious action with the Emperor of the French? The 27th of February—the very day of the debate. When the right hon. Gentleman again attempts to defend a Government on the ground that a course of policy has been forced upon them by the Opposition, I hope he will take care to be more accurate in his dates. The right hon. Gentleman is equally wrong as to the course that was taken by the Opposition. He says that I, as one of those who spoke, forced on the Government the line of conduct which afterwards proved so disastrous and unsuccessful. I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon. I certainly spoke in the debate, and I hope I shall never hold my tongue in this House when I think I am called on to speak. I did speak my true and honest sentiments with reference to the cause of Poland, and I urged the House strongly to adopt the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for the King's County, thinking that while it offered one mode of avoiding war, it might lead to a movement in favour of Poland, and possibly to successful diplomatic action on the part of Austria, France, and England. But, because we recommended a particular course to the Government, are we to be held responsible for the bungling and incapable manner in which they carried out that policy? The fault that we find with the Government is not that they gave expression to the honest sentiments of the country in favour of Poland, not that they induced foreign countries to join in their representations, but it is that, having used language more violent than that of France, more violent than that of Austria, in the very middle of the negotiation, and before that language was allowed to have its weight, the announcement was suddenly made by the Foreign Secretary, that whatever happened England would never draw the sword. I do not find fault with the decision which the noble Earl thus expressed; but I do complain that having used language so violent and so extravagant, having induced allies to join with him, he should, in the middle of the transaction, suddenly paralyze all their efforts. Turning now to the more immediate subject of debate, I must say that in some respects the discussion has been instructive. I have often known Members to denounce a Government, and afterwards be found voting with and supporting it; but this is the first time in a debate of such length that, with the single exception of the noble Lord the Member for Hastings (Lord Harry Vane)—and he spoke in very faltering and hesitating tones—I have heard hon. Members from both sides of the House get up and make speeches, not a single one of them, except official Members of the Government, venturing to say one word in defence of its policy. From one and all of them there has been a chorus of censure, and it seemed to me as if hon. Members were trying to rival one another in applying the strongest language of censure to a Government which at the same time many of them meant to support. I beg the House to remark that this question on the footing put by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, has regard not merely to the conduct of a particular negotiation, but is one of confidence in the general foreign policy of the Government. And what astonishes me is, not that those who are the regular supporters of the Government, but that Members calling themselves independent, who are often the first to denounce the Government, and who on this occasion, when a question is brought forward involving the question of confidence in the Government, make speeches, saying that they have not the slightest confidence in the Government, and that there is no reason why they should feel confidence in men who have disgraced and humiliated the country, and brought us to the very point of war, should yet be the men, headed by the hon. Member for Rochdale, to give a general Vote of Confidence in the Government. Well, I see opposite the hon. Member for Bridgewater (Mr. Kinglake), who assumes, and I believe justly, the position of an independent Member, and he would have the House believe that he has given notice of his Motion solely to express his own individual opinions. He blames the Resolution of my right hon. Friend, because he says that it is full of reserve; but what is the Amendment of the hon. Member for Bridgewater? It is one by which he asks the House to maintain the most remarkable reserve, because it passes by the whole of the transactions of the last few months, and when the decision of the House is challenged in reference to those transactions, he says the House is not to give an opinion upon them at all. [Mr. KINGLAKE: I object to censure.] I will not say that the object of the hon. Gentleman's Amendment is to save the Government, but the effect of it will be to enable the hon. Gentleman to catch votes on both sides of the House from hon. Members who are diametrically opposed to each other on the question of peace and war. The hon. Member for Rochdale (Mr. Cobden) says, "I will not vote with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire, because I can adopt the words of the hon. Member for Bridgewater. They announce peace, and I am sure that that is an object which we all desire." But behind us is the hon. Member for North Warwickshire; and that hon. Gentleman tells us that he intends to vote against the Resolution of my right hon. Friend. And why? Not on the ground of peace, but because the noble Lord opposite has still—as the hon. Member for Warwickshire says—left the door open for war. He justifies that vote upon the speech which the noble Lord made the other night, although I believe there is scarcely a man in the country, whether he be a friend or opponent, who does not regret that the noble Lord ever made such a speech. And thus it is that the hon. Member for Bridgewater will perhaps be able to obtain from both sides of the House some support, or rather that he will induce a few hon. Members to oppose the third paragraph of my right hon. Friend's Resolution.

Sir, perhaps among the many speeches which have been delivered in the course of this debate there is none more remarkable than the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I must confess that in nine cases out of ten, when the right hon. Gentleman addresses the House, he fairly puzzles it. Let the right hon. Gentleman address us upon a question of finance or commercial interest and all will admit the lucidity and ability of his arguments; but if he addresses us upon any other question, whether it be of foreign or domestic policy, the mind of the right hon. Gentleman seems to be so subtle, and he is able to draw such fine distinctions, that I am always in doubt whether he is deceiving himself, or whether he believes that the ingenious arguments he advances will deceive others. We have had no more remarkable instance of that faculty than in the speech which the right hon. Gentleman addressed to us last night. He took objection to portions of the speech of my right hon. Friend the Member for Bucks, because he said that it did not put before the House the real and correct state of the case, and using language somewhat more forceable than courteous, he said that he found fault with the right hon. Gentleman because his quotations were not true. [Mr. LAYARD: Hear, hear!] The hon. Member for Southwark endorses that opinion, and, taking the obvious part he does in cheering that sentiment, we may naturally conceive that he also endorses the temper and style in which it was conveyed. The right hon. Gentleman commenced his speech by an attempt to explain away the famous words used by the noble Lord in the answer he gave to a question from me at the end of last July. The right hon. Gentleman said that up to that time France and Russia were in accord in opinion with us, and he tried to explain the words that "Germany would find that Denmark did not stand alone," by stating that the noble Lord meant to tell Denmark that France and Russia held the same sentiments that we did. Does the hon. Member for Southwark, as a candid man, mean to say for one moment that that was the sense in which the words were used. [Mr. LAYARD: Yes.] I will undertake to say that if those words were put before any number of plain-spoken

Englishmen they would not interpret them in the same non-natural sense of the right hon. Gentleman and his Friend the Under Secretary. On the contrary, I believe they were spoken in that spirit which has always distinguished the noble Lord — a spirit leading him to express generous feelings towards the weak when beaten down by the strong, and that that spirit could only be beaten down by events over which he had no control. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer charged my right hon. Friend the Member for Bucks with omitting to quote, or not quoting correctly, Mr. Grey's despatch as to his conversation with M. Drouyn de Lhuys. My right hon. Friend said that he omitted that part of the despatch in which M. Drouyn de Lhuys said, that in declining to accede to the proposals which had been made, it was from no indifference to the cause of Denmark. My right hon. Friend also said, that after the experience which France had had in the case of Poland, she declined to take the course suggested. The right hon. Gentleman opposite does not see that that part which he says my right hon. Friend omitted, makes the case much stronger against the Government. What M. Drouyn de Lhuys said was—

> "Notwithstanding my opinions being so strong in favour of such a course as you suggest, if I take it, I will take it alone. I will not accede to your suggestion that I should act with you, because you have already led the French Government into embarrassment, and placed the Emperor in a position incompatible with his dignity."

Therefore, when my right hon. Friend referred to that despatch, the part which he refrained from quoting was the part which made the refusal of France to act in accord with Her Majesty's Government a more remarkable and stronger case against the Government. There is another point which I wish to refer to. The right hon. Gentleman has said that in everything that was done we acted cordially with the neutral Powers, and he went so far as to say that we had held exactly that position which my right hon. Friend had declared, in reference to the French Government, to be a position of dignity. He said that at the earliest moment we gave notice to Denmark that she was not to expect material assistance from us, and he quoted a despatch of Lord Wodehouse in confirmation of that, in which Lord Wodehouse writes —

> "General Fleury had informed M. d'Ewers and me that he was instructed to tell the Danish Government that France would not go to war to support Denmark against Germany. It was my duty to declare to him, that if the Danish Government rejected our advice, Her Majesty's Government must leave Denmark to encounter Germany on her own responsibility."

The right hon. Gentleman tries to make out that these two declarations are conceived in the same spirit, and that they must have had the same effect upon the Danish Government; whereas France says, "Under no circumstances will I give you material assistance;" while the English Government says, "If you do not follow our advice we will not give you assistance,'' which was equivalent to saying, "If you do follow our advice, we are prepared to lend you assistance." There are several other points on which the right hon. Gentleman misrepresented my right hon. Friend and the real state of the case; but I am aware that at this hour of the night it would be irksome to the House if I were to follow him through all of them. There is, however, one which it is desirable to notice. Through the whole course of his speech, the right hon. Gentleman took this line—"True, we have failed; true, we have interfered in season and out of season: we have given advice that has not been taken; we have given advice that, when taken by Denmark, has proved to be disastrous. But, for all this, we have only to bear our share of the blame, because everything that we have done we have done in concert with the other neutral Powers." Is that so? Is our position with reference to Denmark the same as that of France or Russia? Did Prince Gortschakoff and M. Drouyn de Lhuys ever tell Denmark that she would not stand alone? Did the French or Russian Minister ever make such a promise as I say was made by Lord Wodehouse to the Danish Government when he was at Copenhagen? Did the Russian or French Minister ever tell the Prussian Minister, as Lord Russell did, that he thought it highly probable that this country might be called upon to interfere? Or did the Russian or French Minister, speaking for the other neutral Powers, ever tell the Prussian Minister, as Lord Russell told the Prussian Minister here, that he thought it highly probable that the other Powers of Europe would interfere for Denmark? No, Sir; from the beginning to the end it was our treaty, these were our promises, it was our Conference, and I will presently take leave to show that during the whole course of the Conference, although the neutral Powers might assent to the various propositions that were made, they were English propositions; and, consequently, I say that Denmark having acted upon our advice, having made the concessions which we suggested, it is idle to attempt to put the responsibility upon the other neutral Powers, and it is us that Denmark must thank for the position in which she is now placed. This is the inaccuracy which I must point out. The right hon. Gentleman said that the proposal of the line of the Schlei and the Dannewerke as brought forward by Lord Russell was in every respect the proposal of the neutral Powers. He cannot have read the papers. It is true that with reference to this as to other propositions communications passed between the neutral Powers; but when the proposal was made Russia refused to give her opinion upon it. And yet the right hon. Gentleman says that it was as much the line of Russia as of England. But more than that. What was the conduct of Sweden, another neutral Power, whom the right hon. Gentleman would make as much responsible for this proposition as England? Sweden certainly gave her assent to it when it was made, but she said that she did not think that the line of the Schlei was the best that could be proposed, and that she would rather have the line of the Eider. And now, take the second proposal, which I suppose the right hon. Gentleman would equally attribute to the neutral Powers. And here I must say, as regards that second proposal, that I do not think that any one who has read the statement made by the Prime Minister of Denmark in his place, and who has heard the statement made by the noble Lord the Secretary for Foreign Affairs in his place in the other House of Parliament, can look back to the course pursued by our Plenipotentiaries in that Conference without feeling that they were guilty of a great breach of faith, and that they betrayed the Danish Plenipotentiaries into the most unfavourable position possible, in consequence of their not having kept their engagements with them. What was the position of affairs? The Danish Plenipotentiaries, according to the statement of the noble Lord, informed him that they were willing to accept the line of the Schlei and the Dannewerke without qualification, but that they were not willing to accede to the prolongation of the suspension of hostilities unless Lord Russell undertook, on the part of the English Government, that he would not either himself propose or support any other line of frontier whatever. Well, how was that engagement evaded? The noble Lord says, "I did not propose another line; but what I did propose was, that somebody else should be named who should fix another line." Now, I ask any Gentleman who listens to this statement, whether that was in accordance with the spirit of the engagement entered into by Lord Russell with the Danish Plenipotentiaries? And what is the consequence? Why, at the time the Danish Plenipotentiaries made that arrangement the position of affairs was this—that the English Government had made a proposition and that the Danish Plenipotentiaries had accepted it without any modification, and if the Conference then broke up who was to blame? Why, clearly the German Powers, who refused to accept the line proposed by the British Government. But that would not have suited Her Majesty's Government. They wanted to have it in their power to say, "Oh, we can't assist the Danes, because it is owing to their obstinacy and their refusal of this new line that these negotiations have fallen through;" when the fact was that the British Government had distinctly pledged themselves that no other line of frontier should be proposed by them, and that if one was proposed by any one else they would not support it. But that proposition was not agreed to by Prussia; and therefore the right hon. Gentleman's statement, that the English Government are not more responsible for these proposals than the neutral Powers, and that through the whole course of the negotiations we have only gone hand in hand with those Powers, who are therefore as much to blame for the failure as we are, is totally devoid of foundation, and the right hon. Gentleman has—unintentionally I do not doubt—misled the House. The right hon. Gentleman has made a curious objection to the Resolution of my right hon. Friend. He says that it is an unpatriotic Resolution; and I was struck to hear how, immediately he made that statement, some of the Members who occupy the bench behind him began to cheer. Even in the depth of their abasement they were glad to find something like an excuse which they thought would appeal to English hearts and English pride, and therefore as soon as they heard the charge—though there is not the slightest foundation for it—that the Motion of my right hon. Friend is unpatriotic, they began to cheer. But how does the matter stand? I have yet to learn that a statement by this House, that the conduct of the Government has injured the influence of this country, is one that we are to be debarred from making. I doubt very much whether if you refer to the annals of Parliament in the great and glorious days of Parliament you will not find language much stronger than that. But I beg to point out to the right hon. Gentleman that my right hon. Friend's Resolution is not confined to the statement that the influence of this country has been lowered. It also calls upon Parliament to censure and condemn those who have reduced the country to that position. It is at the very earliest minute to separate the Parliament of England from the conduct of the Government, and to brand as far as we can with our censure the action of those who have contributed to lower the influence of England, and thereby to diminish the chances of peace. But it seems to me that the conduct of those who object to this Resolution is far more open to the charge of want of patriotism than is the Resolution itself. What is the proposition of the hon. Member for Bridgewater? It is that although, as is the opinion of nearly all who have spoken in this debate, the Government have lowered the influence of England, have injured our position, and humiliated us before Europe, that is a thing which the House of Commons should pass over in silence and which is not worthy of their discussion or censure. Certainly, Sir, if anything is unpatriotic, I think it would be when the influence of England has been diminished and her position humiliated; and when that is stated in the House of Commons, that this House should not have the spirit to condemn the conduct of those who have produced such results. That would be a want of patriotism of which I hope in this case as in others the House of Commons will not be guilty.

There is only one other subject upon which I wish to address the House. When notice was first given of this Resolution there were Friends of mine on the other side of the House who said pleasantly, "You won't carry their Motion; and even if you do you won't have any chance when you go to the constituencies, because we shall easily fix upon you a desire for war, and to take to ourselves the credit of peace." My answer to that was that I did not think that when they came to hear the discussion they would find that so easy, and that I thought that such a cry would be objectionable, in the first place, because it would be false, and in the next because it would be intended to mislead. I also said that if the cry was to be "Palmerston and peace," I did not think that the noble Lord would thank those who should couple those two words. But what I want to know is—are you a peace Government, and on what grounds are you to claim that title? Why, three several times you have invited foreign countries to join you in going to war. Is that the mark of a peace Government? In the course of these very discussions the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary in another place has told us that within even these few days he has again renewed that application to the Government of France. ["No!"] I beg to say that I myself heard the speech in which the noble Lord said, that within twenty-four hours he had received from the Government of France the reasons why France would not join us in going to war, and it is trifling with the matter to suppose that such a communication is made to this country by the French Government, except in reply to such an application on our part. But, moreover, in the course of all these discussions, what has been the principal excuse of the Government? Is it that they love peace—is it that from the beginning they have never meditated war? They have never made any excuse of the kind; but they urge that, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, they are so utterly devoid of any sympathy and alliance abroad, that they dare not go to war. And yet we are to accept that as a peace Government, which, having done its best to induce other Powers to go to war along with it, now candidly tells us that it would go to war in a minute if it could only get an ally to join it! But I come to the other alternative—that, namely, of those who calculated on going to the hustings attempting to fix on us the character of a war Opposition. What did the right hon. Gentleman who spoke last say? Why, that he could not get anything out of us—not that we had done anything to encourage the war feeling of the country, but that, on the contrary, we had held our peace. What is there that would justify the imputation against this side of the House of being more anxious for war than those on the other side? The hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) did his best, as the learned Lord Advocate had done, to follow out this line of argument. The hon. Gentleman said he had listened with the greatest pleasure to the speeches made on this side last night by the right hon. and gallant Member for Huntingdon (General Peel), and the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley). He agreed, he said, with every syllable that fell from the gallant General, who, however, used two words which he did not like, because he gathered from them that the gallant General thought we were bound by treaty to defend Denmark! And that is really the only ground on which the hon. Member for Bradford sought to fasten a war policy on my right hon. and gallant Friend. Why, it is ridiculous to imagine that that is an accurate inference from what my right hon. and gallant Friend said; for not a single man who has addressed this House, and not a single man that I have heard elsewhere, expresses the opinion that we are bound by treaty to defend Denmark. It was distinctly repudiated last night by my right hon. Friend (Mr. Disraeli); it has not been asserted by any hon. Gentleman who has spoken in this debate; and yet, in sheer despair, the hon. Member for Bradford, approving of my right hon. and gallant Friend's speech, deduces from these two horrible words that the Opposition have bound themselves to a war policy. But see how that hon. Gentleman dealt with the speech of the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn. Two single words from my right hon. and gallant Friend made him suspect that the Opposition were committed to war; but he said he had listened also with pleasure to the speech of my noble Friend, and that he agreed in every syllable of it, being unable even to find two words in it to object to. Well, is any statement of opinion on the part of my noble Friend, who would hold in any future Government that position which his abilities and past services entitle him to, to be wholly passed by by the hon. Gentleman as of no weight or importance in indicating the policy of the Opposition? I say, then, that neither do the Government deserve the character of a peace Government, nor can you for a moment pretend to fix on the Opposition the character of a war party. We are told that this Resolution ought to have pointed out a policy. I think that has been sufficiently answered by those who have preceded me; and it might have been tolerably well answered by the last speaker, who joined in that accusation. He said—

> "You are without a policy. Here, at the meeting of Parliament, you had the opportunity of challenging the conduct of the Government. A very few days before the Government had made overtures to the French Government to go to war, and yet, on the assembling of Parliament, you, the Opposition, did not dare to challenge the policy of the Government and say whether you were for war or not."

But although overtures were made to France in January, it was not till the end of March that any single Member on this side of the House was in possession of the information. And is that not the best proof that although we may exercise our strictly constitutional function of criticizing the conduct of the Government, and of asking the opinion of the House if we think they have failed in their duty to the country, it is not and never has been, the practice, and would be an unconstitutional proceeding on the part of the Opposition, to indicate a line of policy even if they could, beyond the existence of the fact which I have pointed out—that weeks and even months must have elapsed before we were in possession of the information that would enable us even to form an opinion on the past conduct of the Government, and it was utterly out of our power to indicate what the future policy of the country ought to be? I think, then, that we have strictly performed our duty in challenging the verdict of the House upon the conduct of the Government. I believe that nine out of ten men in this House cordially agree in the words of the Resolution. But of this I am sure, that if we go to the hustings, as is threatened, to appear before our constituents, they will say that we have only discharged our duty in inviting the verdict of the House of Commons, and in asking its censure upon those whom we believe to have lowered the influence of England and diminished the chances of peace.

MR. LAYARD moved the adjournment of the debate.

Debate *further adjourned* till *Thursday.*

POISONED GRAIN, ETC., PROHIBITION ACT (1863) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. BERKELEY, Bill to alter and amend the "Poisoned Grain, &c., Prohibition Act, 1863," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. BERKELEY, Mr. WYKEHAM MARTIN, and Lord FERMOY.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°. [Bill 192.]

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. BARING, Bill for continuing various Expiring Acts, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. BARING and Mr. PEEL.

Bill *presented*, and read 1°. [Bill 193.]

House adjourned at One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, July 6, 1864.

Their Lordships met; and having gone through the business on the paper, without debate,

House adjourned at half past Two o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, July 6, 1864.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Committee*—Trespass (Ireland) [Bill 13]; Punishment of Rape [Bill 157], *negatived;* Insolvent Debtors [Bill 20]—R.P.

Report—Trespass (Ireland) [Bill 13].

Considered as amended—Judgments Law Amendment* [Bill 160].

Withdrawn—Municipal Corporations (Ireland)* [Bill 139]; Fisheries (Freshwater)* [Bill 130].

TRESPASS (IRELAND) BILL—[BILL 13.]

COMMITTEE.

[*Progress, 27th April.*]

Order for Committee read.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Question again proposed.

Clause 1 (Repeal of 10th Section of 27 *Geo.* III.).

MR. BAGWELL said, he had opposed this Bill in every stage, and intended to continue his opposition, believing as he did that the measure was both unjust and impolitic: it was unjust because it gave to the landlord what was now the property of the occupier; and it was impolitic because it would create another incentive to crime in a country where agrarian crime was already too prevalent. By the existing law the power of prosecuting for trespass in pursuit of game was in the occupier, and this Bill would transfer it to the landlord—and this was virtually to introduce the English Game Law into Ireland. He believed the Irish people were not awake to the serious consequences of the Bill. The evil effects of the Game Laws were clearly shown by the evidence given before Mr. Bright's Committee. Sir Harry Verney and Mr. Pusey declared that game preserving was a serious evil; Lord Hatherton expressed an opinion that game preserving and profitable farming were incompatible. Now, the present Bill was calculated to bring upon Ireland the evils which arose from the Game Laws in England, and to render that country a game preserving country, with all its attendant consequences of crime and misery. The Returns of convictions under the Game Laws which had been presented to the House made a folio volume of 481 pages. The number of convictions in England and Wales was 30,673, and in Scotland 3,226. Supposing the Amendments on the paper to be carried, they would very slightly mitigate the evils which he apprehended from the Bill, and entertaining this opinion he begged to move that the Chairman leave the chair.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Bagwell.*)

MR. DAWSON said, that a very erroneous impression prevailed with regard to the Bill. It was thought that if it passed into law, all the powers and concomitant consequences of the English Game Laws would be thrust upon the people of Ireland. But he asserted nothing of the kind would be the case. The Bill only gave to the landlord a power which it was very extraordinary that he did not already possess—the power of preventing trespass in pursuit of game. He thought the Bill would be acceptable to both parties. The tenant was often unwilling to appear in court to prosecute a trespass in pursuit of game, and he would be glad to be relieved from the necessity of being a party to the prosecution. The present Bill was a measure of relief to the tenant, and was, he believed, so considered by the occupiers.

MR. M'CANN believed the Bill would be productive of great evil and mischief in Ireland. It was the introduction, with additions, of the English system of Game Laws into that country. It was quite true that no petitions had been presented against the Bill, but the fact was that the Irish people had given up petitioning, and were indifferent to what was going on in that House. Looking at the benches near him, he could not help expressing his astonishment at the scanty attendance of Liberal Members. Where were they? ["Oh, oh!"] He did not deny that there were some Liberal Members on the other side; perhaps they were in reality more liberal than the Members on the Liberal side. But, as to the English Liberal Members, they were calling for the support of the Irish Liberals in the division that was to take place on Friday; but now, where—["Order!"]

Mr. M'MAHON said, he did not quite see how the hon. Member for Drogheda was out of order, for in arguing against the progress of a Bill he had a right to show how seriously it would affect the great bulk of the tenantry of Ireland. Every tenant in Ireland who happened not to have a lease—and they were the great bulk of the agricultural population—would be seriously affected by the Bill, and an opportunity ought to be given for more fully considering it. The Bill was said to be for the protection of the tenantry, but it was strange that they had never asked for it. He thought, therefore, that the Bill should be printed and circulated, so that the opinion of the country might be ascertained with respect to it. If it were true that the tenants in cases where prosecutions were required were unwilling or afraid to undertake those prosecutions, there might be some ground for the Bill; but there was no evidence that such was the case. If passed, it would make the law of Ireland more stringent than it was at present, and even more stringent than that of England. He had always contended for the assimilation of the laws of the two countries; but in the present case the worst parts of the law of both countries were picked out and embodied in the Bill. If anything was done in the matter, it ought to be done not by a private Member, but by the Government upon their own responsibility.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he was in favour of the principle of the Bill, which was to enable a landlord to proceed for trespass when the game belonged to him, but he did not desire to see the English Game Laws introduced into Ireland. He would suggest, however, that it would be better at this late period of the Session to withdraw the Bill, and introduce a new one next year.

Mr. W. R. ORMSBY GORE said, he certainly would not accede to the suggestion to withdraw the Bill, as he believed it would be a great relief to the tenant.

Mr. O'HAGAN (The Attorney General for Ireland) said, that the second clause would, by a side wind, displace the old law of the country, which required that where the landlord reserved the game to himself it should be done by a regular, written instrument. This was a serious innovation on the law, and he did not think it should be done by a side wind and without due consideration.

Mr. W. R. ORMSBY GORE said, no doubt the proposed change in the law was a great alteration, but what were Members sent to that House for unless it was to alter the law? The game on land held from year to year was now virtually the landlord's property, yet if he wished to punish a trespasser he must go and ask the permission of the tenant; and if the latter gave his consent, he subjected himself to the ill-will of the person prosecuted. That was a position from which the tenant would be very glad to be freed.

Mr. MONSELL said, that in certain instances the Bill as it stood would transfer the property in game from the tenant to the landlord, and that undoubtedly would be a great change; but he thought if the Amendment of which his hon. Friend the Member for Youghal (Mr. Butt) had given notice was adopted, it would remove all objections. Under that clause the landlord who retained his right to the game, would be enabled to vindicate his right himself. This would give him all the power that was necessary, without introducing any fundamental alteration in the existing law.

Mr. LONGFIELD said, that the Game Laws in England and Ireland thirty-five years ago were the same; but by the 1st William IV. not only was that right given to the landlord, which his hon. Friend by this Bill intended to give, but by retrospective legislation even existing contracts were altered, and that was going much further than it was now proposed to do. The Irish tenant was well disposed to preserve his landlord's game, but he complained that the present state of the law took from him both time and labour, and placed him in an invidious position towards his neighbour. The landlord had the beneficial ownership of the game at present, and this alteration of the law would merely enable him to enforce his right. He protested against a small portion of Gentlemen in that House setting themselves up as the exclusive champions of the Irish tenant.

Mr. M'MAHON said, that as in a few months they would be probably sent before their constituents, if the hon. Member thought his Bill was so much desired by the Irish tenants, he could not do better than go before them with the cry of "My Game Bill."

Mr. W. R. ORMSBY GORE said, it would be seen from the Amendment which he had put upon the paper, that he did not propose to take away any existing right. He went so far as to require that no prosecution should be instituted by any person except he had an exclusive right to the game.

Sir GEORGE GREY said, it was difficult to know what they were discussing. As the hon. Gentleman had himself put an Amendment of an important character upon the paper, he would suggest that the hon. Gentleman would do well to commit the Bill *pro formâ*, and have it printed, and then the House would see what their real position with respect to the Bill was.

Mr. W. R. ORMSBY GORE said, there was no difficulty in ascertaining what the nature of the Bill was. He was ready to maintain every existing right except that of prosecuting in the name of the tenants at will.

Lord NAAS said, that there was really but one clause in the Bill, and his hon. Friend proposed to substitute another which had been before the House for the last two months. The House, therefore, would gain nothing by committing the Bill *pro forma*.

Mr. LONGFIELD said, that where a landlord had reserved to himself the right to game it was in every instance an exclusive right. The Attorney General for Ireland would tell them that such was the case. It might, however, be better to insert a word which would make that clear, and his hon. Friend had no objection to do so.

Mr. O'HAGAN (The Attorney General for Ireland) said, that there was not the slightest doubt that so far the law, as stated by the hon. and learned Gentleman, was correct.

Colonel DUNNE said, that hon. Members who had no interest in land in Ireland were very liberal in dealing with other people's property; he should be very sorry if it were supposed that Ireland was represented by a few Gentlemen who came there and made speeches as an easy means of raising political capital. He did not think the Bill would be of much use; however, he should support it because there was nothing misleading about it. Every landed proprietor now put more stringent conditions as to game into his leases than the Bill provided for him.

Mr. BAGWELL said, he would put it to the House whether it was more vulgar to impute motives of the vilest kind to Gentlemen who were equal in social position to the hon. and gallant Member, or to do what hon. Gentlemen conceived to be their duty in that House.

Mr. M'CANN said, they had heard a good many legal opinions, but the legal Gentlemen had not made the matter much clearer. The Bill gave no definition of game, which was an essential point, and he should therefore support the proposition of the Home Secretary.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:— Ayes 29; Noes 73: Majority, 44.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN, on behalf of the hon. and learned Member for Youghal (Mr. Butt), who was unavoidably absent, moved the following Amendment:

"In line 11, after blank, insert, 'whenever any proceeding shall be instituted against any person to recover the penalty imposed by—." In line 15 to leave out, "shall be, and is hereby repealed," and insert, "it shall not be necessary to institute such proceeding, in the name or by the authority of the occupier of the land, upon which such person has entered, but same may be instituted by any persons legally entitled to the exclusive right of killing game upon such land; and in such case the leave and licence of the occupier or person entitled to the possession of such land shall not be a sufficient defence, but for the purpose of such proceeding the person entitled to the exclusive right of killing game shall be deemed the legal occupier of the land; but, in all other respects, the person charged with such trespass shall be at liberty to prove, by way of defence, any matter which would have been a defence to an action at law for such trespass, and no person shall be convicted of such offence who shall have entered upon such lands by leave and licence of the actual occupier in case it shall appear he had reasonable cause to believe that such occupier was entitled to authorise him to kill game on such land."

Amendment proposed, in page 1, line 11, after the words "sixty-four," to insert the words "whenever any proceeding shall be instituted against any person to recover the penalty imposed by."—(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. W. R. ORSMBY GORE said, he approved the principle of the Amendment, which he had adopted in a new clause he intended to substitute for Clause 2; but there were words in the latter part of the Amendment which he objected to. The hon. Member for Youghal (Mr. Butt) was satisfied with the new clause to be proposed in lieu of Clause 2.

MR. BAGWELL wished to know whether the hon. Gentleman would give a landlord who had the exclusive right of killing game the power of prosecuting trespassers or not.

MR. ROEBUCK suggested that it would be much better for the Committee to have the whole matter before them before they were called on for a decision. He defied any one to understand what was before the Committee. He would pass the Bill through Committee *pro forma*, and have it reprinted.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, that he had recommended the same thing half an hour ago.

MR. W. R. ORSMBY GORE observed, that there could be no difficulty in understanding what was intended, as the new clause had been before the House for two months.

MR. ROEBUCK moved that the Chairman report Progress.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again.—(*Mr. Roebuck.*)

The Committee *divided* :— Ayes 43; Noes 60: Majority 17.

MR. LONGFIELD then said, that if the Amendment moved by the hon. Baronet the Member for Clare (Sir Colman O'Loghlen) were withdrawn, the promoters of the Bill were ready, when the Committee came to the consideration of the new clause in lieu of Clause 2, to alter it in a way which would be satisfactory to hon. Members on both sides of the House.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Penalty for trespassing in pursuit of Game, or of Woodcocks, Snipes, &c.), *struck out.*

Clause 3 (Interpretation of the word "Game.")

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN moved the omission of the word "rabbits" from the clause.

Amendment proposed, in line 23, to leave out the word "rabbits."—(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen.*)

Question, "That the word 'rabbits' stand part of the Clause," put, and *negatived.*

MR. W. R. ORMSBY GORE moved the insertion of the word "woodcocks."

MR. M'MAHON objected to the insertion of "woodcock" and the other words which the hon. Gentleman had put on the paper —"snipes, quails, landrails, wild ducks, widgeon, and teal." Those did not constitute "game" in the true sense of the term. There could be no right of property in migratory birds, which were not bred under the care of keepers. They were not "game" under the law of England. If it was desired to assimilate the laws of the two countries, why should they be inserted? "Wild ducks, teal, and widgeon" were found in the Irish Act of 1787, but that was no reason why they should be inserted in the Irish Game Act of 1864.

COLONEL SYKES said, a man could not have property in migratory birds. Wild ducks, widgeon, and teal were the property of the Esquimaux for half the year.

MR. W. R. ORSMBY GORE said, that if the hon. and gallant Gentleman would accompany him to Ireland, he would show him twenty nests of wild ducks within a space not larger than that House.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the word 'woodcocks' be added."

The Committee *divided:*— Ayes 81; Noes 28: Majority 53.

MR. M'MAHON objected to the insertion of "wild ducks, widgeon, and teal." They were not game, and he hoped the Committee would not make them so.

MR. W. R. ORSMBY GORE said, wild ducks were included in the early part of the Bill, and by two Acts their eggs were made game.

MR. BAGWELL reminded the Committee that on some of the shores of Ireland, wild ducks formed a great resource for poor people.

MR. LONGFIELD explained that the Bill referred only to private property.

SIR GEORGE GREY understood that wild duck was included in the Bill only in connection with penalties for trespass.

MR. ROEBUCK asked why, in that case, they did not include all birds—a swallow for instance. [*A laugh, and* "Hear, hear!"]

MR. M'MAHON said, that if the Committee agreed to the introduction of wild ducks, it would deprive a large number of people in Ireland of a portion of their means of subsistence. A man shooting a wild duck on the seashore would be liable to the penalties of this Bill.

Mr. LONGFIELD said, the Bill did not apply to the sea but to the land, which was private property.

Mr. M'CANN said, there were landowners in Ireland who not only claimed a right to the seashore, but who also prevented persons from fishing at high water up to their land. Was it likely they would permit the poor to shoot wild ducks on the seashore if this Bill passed?

Mr. LONGFIELD hoped the Committee would not suppose the Irish people lived on wild ducks.

Sir GEORGE GREY observed that, although wild ducks were included in the existing Irish law, they were not in the English law.

Amendment proposed, at the end of the Clause, to add the words "wild ducks."—(*Mr. William Ormsby Gore.*)

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 64; Noes 53: Majority 11.

Mr. W. R. ORMSBY GORE proposed that the word "deer" should be included in the clause.

Mr. BAGSHAW objected. In some parts deer ran wild over the country, and often did great damage to the crops of poor people.

Mr. M'MAHON asked if deer were not already sufficiently protected?

Mr. O'HAGAN said, that deer in a gentleman's park were protected.

Mr. W. R. ORMSBY GORE, in referring to the Act of William III., found that deer were sufficiently protected. He would, therefore, withdraw his proposal.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Act to extend to Ireland only) also *agreed to.*

Mr. W. R. ORMSBY GORE moved the following clause in lieu of Clause 2:—

"Where the landlord or lessor of any land has reserved to himself the right to the game on such land, or where the occupier of any land shall hold the same as tenant from year to year, without a right to the game having been duly given to him by some writing, then such landlord or lessor for the purpose of prosecuting all persons for trespassing in pursuit of game on such land without his consent, shall be deemed the legal occupier of the said land; and any person who shall enter or be upon said land in search of or in pursuit of game without the consent of such landlord or lessor, shall be deemed a trespasser, and shall on conviction thereof before one or more justices of the peace, sitting in petty sessions, forfeit and pay such sum not exceeding 40*s.*, together with the costs, as the said justice or justices shall think fit; and such penalty and costs shall be recovered and levied in the same mode, and with the same power of appeal, as are provided for the recovering and levying of any penalties under the Petty Sessions Act of the 14 & 15 *Vict.* c. 93, and the Petty Sessions Act of the 21 & 22 *Vict.* c. 100, and as if the provisions in said acts relating to the recovery of penalties were herein expressly repeated."

Clause (Definitions of "legal occupier" and "trespasser." — Penalties for such trespass,"—(*Mr. William Ormsby Gore,*) —*brought up,* and read 1°; 2°.

Mr. BAGWELL opposed the clause, on the ground that there might be more than one person interested in the property who ought to have equal rights.

Mr. O'HAGAN apprehended that, in such a case, the clause would not apply. It could only be brought into operation in cases where the landlord or lessor possessed an exclusive right.

Major STUART KNOX asked if the clause would affect Church property.

Mr. O'HAGAN thought that it would not apply to property of that description.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Clause be added to the Bill."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 103; Noes 27: Majority 76.

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered on *Friday.* [Bill 195.]

PUNISHMENT OF RAPE BILL—(*Lords.*) (No. 157.) COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, in moving that the House go into Committee upon this Bill, said, he was anxious to explain that he did not hold himself responsible for all the details of the Bill; but, considering that the measure was one which deserved the attention of the House, he had consented to take charge of it. The Bill came down from the House of Lords. The crime of rape, they all knew, had recently been committed in a very aggravated manner in several instances, and a feeling had prevailed in many parts of the country that the offence had not been punished with due severity. He did not say that whipping would be a suitable punishment for all persons convicted of that crime; but there were cases, and among them those where several persons had acted in concert, in which it might very properly be administered. It was sometimes alleged that flogging was brutalizing; but in the class of cases to which he referred it could hardly be said that its infliction would be brutalizing. The same kind of punishment might be advantageously extended to criminal assaults upon girls of tender age. These offences were frequently not committed in moments of passion, but wilfully and deliberately. He intended to propose in Committee a clause by which whipping was added to any other sentence provided by law, on any person convicted of abusing any girl under twelve years of age.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair."

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN thought that such a Bill ought not to pass without grave consideration, even though it had come down from the other House. He did not think there had been such an expression of public opinion as justified such a measure. There had been no petitions praying for an alteration of the law; there had been no complaint on the part of the Judges that the existing law was not sufficiently stringent; nor had there been any increase of this crime since the law was last altered, that showed that such a measure was required. In 1861, after due consideration, the Legislature instead of increasing the punishment for rape gave the Judge power to reduce it by substituting three years of penal servitude or imprisonment in place of penal servitude for life. The official Returns showed that there had been no increase in crimes of that nature. Indeed, they were almost stationary, notwithstanding the increase of population. The number of persons charged with rape in 1853 was 136; in 1858 it was again 136; and in 1862 it was 131. In 1853 the assaults with intent to commit rape were 150; in 1858 they were 161; and in 1862 they were 157. That showed there was no necessity for this Bill, and no justification for altering their existing legislation, which had been settled after full consideration. Moreover, it should be remembered, that a charge of rape or attempt at rape was easily made, and often difficult to be disproved, and the enormous proportion of acquittals to convictions in these cases showed that the charge was frequently made to extort money, or for other improper purposes. But even had there been an increase in the crime he did not think they ought to revert to the penalty of flogging without the most deliberate consideration. There had been only two instances in which of late years offences against the person had been punished with flogging—the one was with regard to assaults on Her Majesty, and the other, the measure of the right hon. Member for Staffordshire (Mr. Adderley), with reference to garotting, which crime had at that time suddenly become very prevalent. In the latter case, if he had been a Member of the House at the time, he should have opposed such an alteration of the law. In 1853 an attempt had been made to extend the penalty of flogging to cases of aggravated assaults on women. The question was then fully discussed, and the House, by a large majority, refused to annex the punishment of flogging to cases of that kind; and yet if any crime deserved flogging it was a crime of that nature. The House, under all the circumstances, ought not to proceed further with this Bill. It was a Bill which contained provisions contrary to modern legislation; no mention was made of the number of lashes, the instrument to be used, or how many times the punishment should be inflicted. The Mutiny Act limited the number of lashes.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, the fourth clause met that objection.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he perceived that was so; but he grounded his objection to the Bill on the barbarous and retrograde principle which the Bill wished to introduce. No case had been made out for a change of the law. He moved that the Bill be committed that day three months.

MR. ROEBUCK seconded the Amendment. This Bill proposed to introduce a very important alteration in our criminal code, and should not have been undertaken by a private Member without at least the co-operation of the Government; yet the House would observe that both the Home Secretary and the Attorney General, the two officials chiefly charged with the guardianship of our criminal law, were both absent. When the hon. Gentleman who had charge of the Bill talked of the enormity of the offence under consideration as justifying the infliction of a brutalizing punishment, he showed how totally ignorant he was of the principles of criminal legislation, and of the writings of our great jurists on such subjects. Jeremy Bentham laid it down that if the penalty of one penny would put an end to murder, all punishment beyond that was so much mischief done. That might be a new idea to the hon. Baronet, but that only showed how utterly incompetent he was to deal with such a question. Violence had always been the resource of incompetent legislators; and he was ashamed of the House of Lords, in which sat the sages of the law, for passing such a Bill. Could anybody say that England was more criminal now than she was before the reforms advocated by Sir Samuel Romilly were adopted? The prevention of crime was the true aim of the wise legislator. It was said they could not by flogging brutalize the man who was brutal enough to commit that offence; but would they not thereby help to brutalize society? One of the worst blots in our system was the vile habit of flogging, and he regretted that men who deemed themselves the most advanced lights of the age should endeavour to persuade the House to retrace its steps in the path of civilization, and should do their small best to barbarize the people.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen,*)

—instead thereof.

MR. ADDERLEY said, the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield appeared to have a ready mode of settling in his own mind what he thought was good or bad, and of condemning what did not exactly suit his views. He had known the hon. and learned Member sufficiently long to know that he considered every one hopelessly incompetent to understand a subject but himself, and everybody who did not fall in with his peculiar views of jurisprudence must expect to be denounced as seeking to brutalize society. According to the hon. and learned Gentleman nobody has studied Bentham but himself; yet it was plain that the hon. and learned Gentleman was himself but imperfectly acquainted with the principles of that jurist. His hon. Friend (Sir Stafford Northcote) had not advocated that form of punishment for the crimes in question, namely, rapes with conspiracy and violence, merely on account of their enormity, but rather on account of its suitableness to check so aggravated and peculiar a kind of crime. Certain crimes implied motives in the criminal which they could not appeal to except by the terrors of corporal punishment. That was the argument of Bentham himself, although the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield did not appear to be aware of it. If a mild preventive punishment was shown not to be suitable to that particular crime, and not to check it, whereas a coarser punishment was better adapted to put it down, were they in the name of refinement and humanity to let such crimes go on, accompanied by an endless series of ineffectual punishments? The hon. Member for Clare (Sir Colman O'Loghlen) had made a *prima facie* case against the Bill in saying that no increase of the crime of rape had been made out; but though the crime might not be increasing, yet he was sure the hon. and learned Baronet would allow that the crime was far too common. As an inhabitant of Staffordshire he (Mr. Adderly) confessed he was horrified at the number of these offences which always appeared in the calendars for trial at the assizes for that county; and if they could do anything that would tend to diminish the crime, they ought not to be discouraged in the attempt by any imputation of ignorance from the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield. He looked upon the absence of the Home Secretary and the Attorney General as an indication of their approval of the Bill, the Lord Chancellor having supported it, on the part of the Government, in the House of Lords. This Bill proposed to extend the application of the Bill which he (Mr. Adderley) succeeded in passing last year by a large majority, in spite of the determined opposition of the Government. Perhaps it was owing to his having been beaten last year by a majority of three to one that the Home Secretary very wisely staid away on this occasion. The punishment was urged, not on account of its severity but its adaptation to this peculiar kind of crime, which was in accordance with the principles laid down by Bentham. It is one of his maxims that the punishment should correspond with the motives to the crime. The simple question before the House was, whether this was a crime which made corporal punishment a suitable penalty. He contended that the grossness of the offence, and the ruffianly perpetrators of it they had to deal with, showed that it was. The fact that the law on the subject had been altered twice during the last twenty years, showed that the Legislature had not made up its mind as to the proper mode of dealing with it. So far from the Bill being a retrograde step, the retrogression was on the side of the humanitarians, who made the absurd mistake of judging of the feelings of all sorts of criminals by their own, and, there fore, wished to treat brutal offenders as though they were persons of refined sensibilities. In this particular there was a marked retrogression from the common sense of our predecessors, both of more recent and of long past ages. Deterrence from crime is the main object of punishment, and that which does not appeal to the motives cannot be deterrent.

MR. O'HAGAN (THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND) said, that the absence of the Secretary of State was on public business, but he was authorized to speak the sentiments of his right hon. Friend as well as his own. They both concurred in the Amendment of the hon. and learned Baronet the Member for Clare (Sir Colman O'Loghlen). He considered sufficient grounds had not been shown for making the proposed change. The established principles of the criminal law should not be disturbed lightly and on temporary grounds; if altered, it should be altered in accordance with recognized and permanent principles. The object of punishment was simply the reformation of the criminal and the prevention of crime. Beccaria said long ago that certainty in regard to punishments was of more importance than severity; and that doctrine had been confirmed by experience in this very case. He agreed with the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield, that wherever there was excess of punishment there was injustice in proportion to the excess. The hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir Stafford Northcote) had been guilty in this case of a *petitio principii.* He said that the offence was brutal, and that the punishment proposed was brutal; but it did not follow that a brutal offence would be prevented or diminished by a brutal punishment. The punishment of whipping was now considered as not a wise punishment, but was now the exception. Nothing had been said to show that this particular punishment would be effective as regarded the particular offence referred to. If it had been proved that whipping would diminish the scandalous offence in question, he should have supported the Bill; but as no such case had been made out, he must resist any departure from the established system.

MR. HUNT said, he had supported the Bill of his right hon. Friend the Member for Staffordshire last year; but this Bill stood on an entirely different footing. He agreed that it was undesirable to inflict greater punishment than was sufficient; and if the existing punishment was proved to be insufficient, he should not be afraid to vote for additional punishment; but he did not think that additional punishment in this case would have the slightest deterring effect. The offence in question in ordinary cases was an offence of impulse, not of deliberation. If the hon. Gentleman would limit his Bill to cases where more than one person was concerned in the commission of the offence he should vote for it; but if he declined to do that, he must oppose it.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE was prepared to say at once that he should accept the vote of the hon. Member for Northamptonshire (Mr. Hunt) on the condition he annexed to it, namely, that the operation of the Bill should be confined to cases in which more than one person was concerned in the commission of the crime. He was not answerable for the details of the Bill which was introduced into the other House, and had passed with the consent of the Lord Chancellor, and with the approval of several of the law Lords. He had taken charge of it, and had been led to believe that the Government were not unwilling that the subject should be considered. In fact, the Solicitor General, whose absence he regretted, had given him distinctly to understand that the Government did not disapprove but rather approved of its principle, though he thought Amendments were necessary. He was sorry to hear now from the Gentleman who spoke on behalf of the Home Secretary, that he was determined to oppose the Bill. He hoped, however, the House would support it. With regard to the severe criticism which had been made on the Bill by the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield, he begged to say that he was not by any means certain that he had used the expression to which he alluded; but, in spite of his opinion and criticism, he maintained that they ought to take into consideration the enormity of the offence committed when they were apportioning punishment; and he believed that the proposed punishment in this case, while it would not be too severe, would produce certainty in its infliction, which would be a great advantage gained. He did not think that in aggravated cases of rape there would be any inclination on the part of juries to convict on account of the severity of the punishment. The course of mitigation of punishment of late years had been such that in many cases punishment was most disproportionate to the offence. In the cases of assaults upon young children, the offence was treated at present only as a misdemeanour. Now, could any one doubt that in such cases as those it would not be just to inflict the punishment of whipping? He had, therefore, put a notice on the paper for the purpose of meeting such cases.

Mr. AYRTON would appeal to his hon. and learned Friend (Sir Colman O'Loghlen) not to accept the compromise which had been proposed to him by the hon. Member for Northamptonshire (Mr. Hunt). There was no objection on the part of those who opposed the Bill to increase punishment where such an increase was calculated to repress crime: that, however, was not the question before the House, but whether the punishment of flogging should be inflicted. Why, flogging was a mere kind of torture, and if the object was to torture, besides flogging they might just as well introduce the thumbscrew and scarification. The object of punishment was prevention of crime and not torture of the criminal. Believing this Bill to be a proceeding in the wrong direction, he hoped the House would stop it, in order that those who took an interest in the matter might proceed in a right direction to remedy the evils complained of. He did not see any necessity for plunging into this sort of legislation, which was calculated to brutalize the people and render them, in consequence of that brutalization, more likely to give way to their passions. He hoped the House would maintain the consistency of our criminal law, and not allow it to be frittered away by hasty and inconsiderate legislation.

Mr. PACKE said, that the whole subject should be taken up by Government. There were other crimes of a brutal and disgusting character, that required to be dealt with in any Bill that might be introduced. He should support the Motion for going into Committee.

Mr. CLAY said, he believed this was the first time that any proposition had been made to increase the measure of punishment without showing that the crime for which the punishment was intended had increased.

Sir JOHN TRELAWNY would deprecate precipitate legislation on such a subject even if the crime were on the increase, which it was not. There were many cases in which great injustice might be done if this Bill were passed, and therefore he urged upon the House to consider the subject more fully before legislating upon it.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he thought persons who committed this crime deserved flogging and something more, but he did not think the punishment of flogging should be introduced in this piecemeal fashion, and he would suggest that the Government should issue a Commission to consider the subject generally. He thought the better course would be not to proceed with this Bill, and that the Government should consider before next Session the best means of dealing with this and analogous offences.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 78; Noes 84: Majority 6.

Words *added*.

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to*.

Bill *put off* for three months.

INSOLVENT DEBTORS BILL—[Bill 20.]

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Mr. PAULL moved that the House go into Committee upon this Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Mr. PAGET appealed to the hon. Member not to press the Bill. The Lord Chancellor had introduced a somewhat analogous measure into the other House, but owing to representations that were made, and opposition that was offered, that Bill had been withdrawn.

Mr. PAULL said, he had abstained from pressing this Bill until now, because it was understood that the Lord Chancellor intended to deal with the subject to which it related. As the measure proposed by the Lord Chancellor had been withdrawn, he knew no reason why the Bill should not be proceeded with.

Mr. BAINES said, that a large Trade Protection Society in the town he represented objected to the Bill, which would destroy a system of credit most essential to the comfort of the working classes in time of pressure.

Colonel FRENCH did not think the opposition of a combination of Trade Protection Societies should prevail against the Bill.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

House *resumed*.

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow*.

House adjourned at a quarter before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, July 7, 1864.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland)* (No. 189); Local Government Act (1858) Amendment* (No. 190); India Office* (No. 191).

Second Reading—Life Annuities and Life Assurances* (No. 116); Factory Acts Extension* (No. 176); Railway Construction Facilities (No. 160), and Railway Companies Powers* (No. 121), and *referred* to same Select Committee; Lunacy (Scotland)* (No. 172); Burials Registration* (No. 144).

Committee—Civil Bill Courts (Ireland)* (No. 67); Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment* (No. 167).

Report—Facilities for Divine Service in Collegiate Schools* (No. 183).

Select Committee—Local Government Supplemental (No. 2)* (No. 174), *referred.*

Third Reading—Clerks of the Peace Removal* (No. 179); Greek Loan* (No. 171); Pilotage Order Confirmation* (No. 180).

RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION FACILITIES BILL—(No. 160.)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said, that the Bill had been brought into the House of Commons on the recommendation of a Select Committee. It proposed to give power to the Board of Trade in cases where parties wished to make a railway through lands about which the promoters and the landowners had come to terms, to issue a certificate, which would be laid upon the table of the House of Commons, and, if not objected to, would become law. It would be open to Railway and Canal Companies to object to the certificate, and if they did so, the Bill would then come before Parliament in the usual way.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2^a.

THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM AND CHANDOS said, he could not approve of the principle of the Bill. If it passed into law, the power of landowners to object to a Bill for the construction of a railway would be limited. He objected to the Bill because it appeared to him most objectionable to set up the principle of handing over to a Department of the Government a legislative jurisdiction which appeared to him could only be properly exercised by Parliament itself; and he moreover objected to the power given to the Board of Trade of fixing and altering tolls, and other powers placed in their hands by the Bill. He begged to move that the Bill be read a second time that day three months.

Amendment moved, to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Six Months").

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said, the Bill had passed through the other House without any opposition. The only power given in the Bill could only come into operation under special circumstances—namely, where the landowners wished to have a railway through their lands, and a company was ready to construct it. It could only take effect where all the parties were agreed; and he trusted the noble Duke would hesitate before he placed any obstacles in the way of such a useful measure. The noble Duke might perhaps allow the Bill to be read a second time, and give an opportunity for a discussion when a larger number of Peers were present.

LORD REDESDALE expressed a wish that the noble Duke would not press his Motion in that state of the House. The step which he had taken would enable him to avail himself of his opposition at any future stage of the Bill. There was much in the measure which required consideration, and he thought it ought to be referred to a Select Cammittee. With regard to the schedule of tolls, he (Lord Redesdale) thought that they should be introduced in a general Bill, and not one of this nature, for there ought not to be a discretionary power given to the Board of Trade.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said, that if the Bill were referred to a Select Committee, it could be disposed of at one sitting.

Amendment (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn*: then the original Motion was *agreed to*: Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *referred* to a Select Committee.

And on *Friday* the 8th inst., Committee *nominated* as follows:

D. Devonshire, D. Buckingham and Chandos, E. Devon, E. Romney, E. Grey, E. Stradbroke, V. Hutchinson, L. Camoys, L. Wodehouse, L. Redesdale, L. Stanley of Alderley, L. Belper, L. Lyveden, L. Taunton.

RAILWAY COMPANIES POWERS BILL.

Bill read 2^a (according to Order); and referred to the same Select Committee.

House adjourned at a quarter-past Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, July 7, 1864.

MINUTES]—Public Bills — *Ordered* — Turnpike Trusts Arrangements*; Ionian Islands Commissions Act Repeal, &c.*

First Reading—Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* [Bill 196]; Ionian Islands Commissions Act Repeal, &c.* [Bill 197].

Second Reading—Courts of Justice Site* [Bill 189], and *committed* to a Select Committee; Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* [Bill 194]; Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c.* [Bill 192].

Committee — Cranbourne Street* [Bill 154]; Pilotage Order Confirmation (No.2)* [Bill 184], Order *discharged*, Bill *committed* to a Select Committee (*List of Committee*); Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment (Deficiency of Dues)* [Bill 185]; Public Schools* [Bill 168] (*Lords*); Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland)* [Bill 174] (*Lords*).

Report—Cranbourne Street* [Bill 154]; Public Schools* [Bill 168] (*Lords*); Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland)* [Bill 174] (*Lords*).

Considered as amended—Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers)* [Bill 62].

Third Reading—Indemnity* [Bill 97]; India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment* [Bill 183]; Judgments, &c., Law Amendment* [Bill 160]; Street Music (Metropolis) [Bill 186], and *passed.*

TURNPIKE GATES.—QUESTION.

Mr. SUTTON WESTERN said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is his intention to introduce a measure founded upon the recommendations contained in the Report of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the expediency and practicability of abolishing Turnpike Gates; and, if not, whether he will consent to leave out of the Continuance Act those Trusts that are free from debt?

Mr. T. G. BARING said, in reply, that although there was a general concurrence in the advantages which the public would derive from the abolition of turnpike gates, there was great difficulty in the way of carrying the object into effect. The Committee had recommended an extended area of rating, considering that the maintenance of the turnpike roads when thrown upon certain parishes would be very hard. Government, however, were not prepared to introduce any measure on the subject during the present Session. With regard to the second question—namely, whether all Trusts free from debt should cease to be continued in the annual Continuance Act, the Committee declined giving any recommendation of that kind. It was at the same time certain that wherever there was a real injustice in the case, it would be of advantage to the public that the trusts free from debt should be abolished, and where any strong case could be made out for their continuance, that they should be continued in the annual Continuance Act.

THE ROYAL HORTICULTURAL SOCIETY.

QUESTION.

Sir WILLIAM GALLWEY said, he would beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Whether certain Arcades and Galleries, until lately in the possession of the Kensington Royal Horticultural Society, have or are about to become the property of the State?

Mr. COWPER said, in reply, that the Arcades, which were to be purchased by the Government in pursuance of a Vote of the House, were the subject of a deed which was not yet finally executed. Those Arcades were the property of the persons who sold them to the public; they were never the property of the Horticultural Society, nor were they included in their lease, but were portions of the buildings of the International Exhibition Building.

Sir WILLIAM GALLWEY said, he must beg to repeat his question with reference to the buildings which were portions of the Exhibition Building of 1862.

Mr. COWPER replied that those buildings had always been intended to be purchased, and had been purchased.

DENMARK AND GERMANY—VOTE OF CENSURE.

RESOLUTION—(MR. DISRAELI.)

ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [THIRD NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [4th July],

> "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to thank Her Majesty for directing the Correspondence on Denmark and Germany, and the Protocols of the Conference recently held in London, to be laid before Parliament:
>
> "To assure Her Majesty, that we have heard with deep concern, that the sittings of that Conference have been brought to a close without accomplishing the important purposes for which it was convened:
>
> "To express to Her Majesty our great regret, that, while the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government has failed to maintain their avowed

policy of upholding the integrity and independence of Denmark, it has lowered the just influence of this Country in the counsels of Europe, and thereby diminished the securities of peace:"—(*Mr. Disraeli*:)

And which Amendment was, to leave out the second paragraph of the proposed Question, in order to insert the words "To submit to Her Majesty the opinion of this House, that the independence of Denmark and the possessions of that Kingdom, on the terms proposed by the Representatives of the Neutral Powers in the recent Conference, ought to be guaranteed."—(*Mr. Newdegate.*)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

MR. LAYARD*: Mr. Speaker—I never rose in this House under a more painful sense of responsibility than I do this evening. It will be my duty to justify the conduct of a Department, one of the most important in the State, which I have the honour to represent—I fear very unworthily—in this House, and to vindicate the character of a statesman who has taken his place in history among those who have toiled most successfully in the cause of human freedom, and who has conferred eminent services on his country. Sir, I think it must be apparent to every Gentleman who has listened to this debate, that the attacks which have been made upon the Government have been mainly, if not exclusively, directed against the noble Lord at the head of the Foreign Office. I think I shall be able to show that he has been greatly misrepresented and wrongfully accused; that the extracts which have been brought forward are, I had almost said, to use the words of my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, garbled extracts, falsified extracts of despatches. ["Oh, oh!"] I trust hon. Gentlemen will wait until I can prove what I have said. ["Oh, oh!"] I have merely repeated words which have been used in this debate, and if I fail to prove what I have said I shall be open to the censure of the House. In order to do this I shall have to trespass somewhat at length on the patience of the House; but of this I am certain—that in an assembly of this kind, composed of Gentlemen of the highest character and honour, there is not a man who would not give me fair play and allow me to do the best I can to justify my noble Friend, and to show that the accusations are falsely brought against him. At the same time, I give it to be understood that when I have said that these attacks have been directed against the noble Lord at the head of the Foreign Office, and that I should vindicate his character, this is a constitutional country, and the noble Lord is not individually responsible. The despatches which he has written are the despatches of the Government, and the responsibility is shared, and willingly shared, by all the Members of the Administration. I fear I must go back a little in time in order to explain clearly the history of the Danish Question; for if hon. Members will permit me to say so, the case has never yet been fairly put before the House and the country. In the discharge of this duty I shall be saved some trouble, because the other evening the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire gave to the House a very able, clear, and impartial statement of the early part of these transactions; and if I refer to them at all it is to fill up one or two voids, in order that the House may have a clear understanding of what has really taken place. If hon. Members will turn to the papers which have been laid upon the table, they will see that as early as April, 1848, Prussia suggested that England should mediate between Denmark and the German Powers, who were then unhappily at war on account of the affairs of the Duchies of Holstein and Schleswig. On the 11th of April, Lord Palmerston announced his readiness to accept the office of mediator, "if the friendly intervention of this Government were agreeable to all parties concerned." There is a letter, also published among those papers, to which I wish to call attention, as showing how this mediation originated, and how much it was pressed on Her Majesty's Government. The letter is from M. Orla Lehman to Count Reventlow, and is dated April 6, 1848. It states that "It is evident that mediation can only be confided to, and can only be carried out, by England." In consequence of this urgent request of the belligerents Lord Palmerston undertook mediation, and succeeded in restoring peace between them. My right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer read the other evening an eloquent testimony from Denmark to the services which Lord Palmerston rendered to her by putting an end to the war. I will not trouble the House by reading despatches from Stockholm, Berlin, and Vienna, all bearing similar testimony to the services of the British Government, and expressing gratitude to Lord Palmerston for his successful endeavours in restoring peace. In consequence of this peace, a Protocol was signed in London on the 4th of July, 1850. I desire to call the particular attention of the House to this document, and to the Secret Article to which I shall also refer, for two reasons; first, because when they were signed by Austria and Prussia, those Powers were still the mandatories of the Diet for the settlement of the question in dispute between Germany and Denmark; and, secondly, because they were signed before those promises were made by Denmark upon the fulfilment of which, it has since been contended, the Treaty of 1852 was conditional. The first Article declares the unanimous desire of the seven Powers, Austria, Denmark, France, England, Prussia, Russia, and Sweden, that the possessions actually united under the Crown of Denmark should be maintained in their integrity. The second recognizes the wisdom of the King of Denmark in determining to regulate the order of succession in his Royal House in a manner to facilitate an arrangement by which the integrity of Denmark might remain intact. It will be observed, that although the Prussian representative is declared to have been present at the Conference of the 4th of July, his initials are not affixed to the Protocol. But it will be seen that on the 2nd of July there had been signed at Berlin a Secret Article of the Treaty concluded that day by which Prussia engaged herself to take part in the negotiations to be commenced by the King of Denmark, for the purpose of regulating the order of succession in the States then united under his sceptre; in fact, agreeing in substance with the Protocol of London signed on the 4th July. The words of this Secret Article are—

> "Sa Majesté le Roi de Prusse s'engage à prendre part aux négociations dont Sa Majesté le Roi de Danemark prendre l'initiative à l'effet de règler l'ordre de Succession dans les Etats réunis sous le sceptre de Sa Majesté Danoise. Le présent Article Sécret sera ratifié en même temps que le Protocole signé ce jour, et les ratifications en seront échangées simultanément.
>
> Fait à Berlin, ce 2 Juillet, 1850.
>
> (Signé) WESTMORLAND.
> T. PECHLIN.
> H. C. REEDTZ.
> A. W. SCHEEL.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU rose to Order. The hon. Member was quoting from a document not on the table of the House.

MR. LAYARD: It is well known, for it has been before the public again and again. I believe that with that secret Article there is a curious secret history connected. If I am rightly informed, the Prussian Minister at that time in England, Baron Bunsen, was a violent Schleswig-Holsteiner, and, as it was apprehended by the Prussian Government that he would make many difficulties in carrying out his instructions, there was signed at Berlin this Secret Article, in conformity with the Protocol of London, on which the Treaty of London was afterwards founded. The second Article of the Protocol, as I have said, bore testimony to the wisdom of the King of Denmark in desiring to settle the succession, but no person was designated in the Protocol as his successor to the Crown in default of direct issue. There was no candidate who was specially favoured by the British Government, nor, as far as I am aware, by any other Power. All they desired was that some person whose claims to the succession were considered to be the best founded should be recognized by the King in a legal manner, and should be accepted by the Danish people and by the inhabitants of the Duchies as his successor, in the event of the failure of direct issue. The Treaty of 1852, which was entered into in accordance with this Protocol, was negotiated by Lord Malmesbury—and I was surprised to hear it stated in this House that, though that noble Lord signed the treaty when he came into office, he did so merely as a matter of form, as the treaty was in such an advanced stage that he could not avoid signing it. So far was that from being the case, that Lord Malmesbury carried on difficult negotiations in reference to it with much ability, received on its conclusion the thanks of the several parties to it; and in a despatch expressed his own satisfaction with its contents and his approval of its object. The treaty, be it remembered, was not a treaty of guarantee. It imposed no obligation on this country, except that of recognizing the person who should be chosen in a legal and constitutional manner as the successor of the then reigning King of Denmark. After it had been concluded it was officially communicated to the various German States which form the Confederation, and adhered to formally by all of them, except Bavaria and five of the smaller States. This treaty has been condemned on principle. It is said that such treaties for the regulation of a disputed Succession are bad and that this country should not enter into them. Now, whether that treaty was founded on a vicious principle or not, this is certain—that it was not entered into, as it has been asserted, with the object of handing over, against their will, any people to those who had no right to be placed over them, or of depriving any one of his just rights; but that it was entered into solely in the interest of peace. The right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire very ably described what such a treaty regulating a Succession really was; how important such a treaty has frequently been to the peace of Europe, and how often disputed Successions have led to calamitous wars on the Continent. This treaty was made to prevent such wars. It had been seen that on a recent occasion the Duchies had been incited to rise, and had been the cause of a war between Denmark and Germany; in the case of a disputed Succession they might rise again and cause even a European war. My hon. Friend the Member for Rochdale (Mr. Cobden) chiefly condemned the treaty because it violated the principle of nationalities by placing a German population under Danish rule. He was loud in his praise of what he termed this new principle of nationalities—a principle to which, he declared, our foreign policy should now be made to conform, and which, to use his own words, was the "loadstone of peoples, bringing together those of the same language and religion." There are certain cases in which I might assent to that doctrine. I need scarcely mention the case of Italy. But we must beware how we push this doctrine to what may be considered its logical and inevitable conclusion. It would then become of a most dangerous nature—dangerous alike to the freedom and civilization of mankind. Let me ask the House to consider for one moment what would be its effect in Europe? There is a country which, though small, has been almost the cradle of liberty, where the sacred flame of freedom has been kept alive for a thousand years, where some of the greatest men of days gone by and of our own time have found a refuge from oppression and a home in which, unfettered and beyond the reach of persecution, they have uttered, in the sublimest accents, some of the loftiest doctrines ever taught to the human race—I speak of Switzerland. What, let me ask, would become of her if this doctrine of nationalities is to be carried out? Switzerland would have to be divided according to the languages and races of her population into three parts. One would have to be given to France, one to Italy, and one to some part of Germany, to Prussia, or to Austria. Would the carrying out of this new and favourite doctrine of nationalities be advantageous to this small, but free, and happy country, and would it, by destroying her, add to the liberty and civilization of Europe? There are few, I think, who would venture to assert that it would. You may say that we do not ask for the application of this principle of nationalities unless the wishes of the people are first consulted. I am sure my hon. Friend the Member for Bridgewater (Mr. Kinglake) although he supports the cause of Holstein and Schleswig, would not be the advocate for such appeals to their populations; for who has denounced with more bitter irony, and more withering sarcasm, the new-fangled doctrine of the *plebiscite*, and has shown more conclusively that under the pretence of consulting the wishes of a people it can be made the surest instrument of their oppression. Would you apply this doctrine of nationalities and of the *plebiscite* to Holland, and deprive her of Luxemburg and Limburg? The King of Holland is a member of the Germanic Confederation in virtue of being ruler over those territories. His turn may come next, and his spoliation may be justified by what has taken place in Holstein and Schleswig. Indeed, there is scarcely a country in Europe which would not be dismembered if you were to carry out this doctrine, and infinite confusion and general war would be the inevitable consequences. Recollect, too, that this nationality doctrine might be made the means of great wrong. In this case of Schleswig-Holstein nearly one-half, if not wholly one-half, of Schleswig is inhabited by a Danish population, and if the Danes are not to rule over Germans, why should Germans rule over Danes? Moreover, if this doctrine is to be acted upon by the Great Powers, there would, probably, be soon nothing left but three or four great military despotisms in Europe, and I doubt whether the extinction of all the small States would be advantageous to the happiness and freedom of mankind and to its general civilization. The balance of power was devised to prevent that result; and, instead of being an unreal figment, as my hon. Friend (Mr. Cobden) and those who think with him declare, it was a great manifestation of political wisdom, arising from an earnest desire to preserve and protect human liberty. On the other side of the Atlantic, this very principle of the balance of power has been laid down, though under another name. But no States in the world, are, perhaps, more interested in preserving the balance of power than the small States of Germany. Their independence is preserved by it, and they may rue the day when it is overthrown. In assisting to bring about this result, they may find that they have forged the instrument for their own destruction.

But to return to the Treaty of 1852. The principal objection to the validity of that treaty, as it affects Germany, is founded upon the fact that the Diet of the Germanic Confederation was no party to it; that it was never submitted to that body, nor ratified by it. It is therefore asserted that the Confederation is not bound by it. I will only glance at the dangerous, I may almost say immoral doctrine, that whilst the German States may have entered singly, and as independent States, into a treaty, or may have accepted it, as in the case of the Treaty of 1852, they are at liberty to repudiate its engagements when acting in the aggregate, and forming the Germanic Confederation. It is scarcely necessary to point out the results of such a doctrine, if it were admitted, in the relations of those States with other countries. It is evident that treaties and engagements made with them might only be binding so long as it suited their convenience, and no independent Power would consequently treat with them. But whether the Diet can put forward any just claim to be consulted on such a matter as a treaty of succession; whether it has any competency to deal with a change in the succession in the case of States forming part of the Confederation; and whether it was necessary to communicate the Treaty of 1852 to it at all; are questions upon which the opinions of those best informed are so much at variance that it is impossible to come to any positive decision. Lord Granville was desirous of submitting the Treaty to the Diet. Lord Malmesbury, on the other hand, thought that it was only advisable to notify it to the Diet after it had been concluded. Prussia was altogether opposed to its communication. The Russian Government maintained that the Diet had no power whatever to interfere in such a question as a change of succession; and certainly in the case of Austria, when the late Emperor abdicated and the Crown was settled on the present occupant of the Throne, passing over the next heir, that body had not been consulted. In order to effect the change in the succession, the King of Denmark had two steps to take—first, to abolish the *Lex Regia* by constitutional means, so as to exclude the female line; and secondly, to obtain the renunciation of those who stood between him and the successor that he might name. He obtained the sanction of the Danish Parliament to the first, but it is asserted that as he did not submit the law which changed the succession to the States of Schleswig and Holstein, and did not obtain their sanction to it, that law was invalid. This depends upon the authority and constitution of those States—a very complicated question, into which it is not now necessary to enter. As regards the renunciation of the Duke of Augustenburg, it will be remembered that, in consideration of a certain sum of money paid to him, he gave his Princely word of honour, for himself and his family, not to disturb the peace of Denmark, and not to oppose the measures taken, or to be taken, to change the succession to the territories then under the sceptre of the King, or the eventual organization of the Danish Monarchy. It has been said in Germany that that Princely word of honour meant nothing—we have heard strange things of this kind recently from Germany—that it did not bind the heir, who protested; and that the sum of money paid to the Duke of Augustenburg was in compensation for his estates. But those estates had been forfeited for treason to his lawful Sovereign; and it must be borne in mind that his son and next heir, the present pretender, although of age when his father made the renunciation, did not protest until six years after; and when the discontent which prevailed in the Duchies, produced to a great extent by the intrigues of his friends and partizans, encouraged him to hope for a rising in his favour. But who carried on the negotiations for this renunciation? Who settled with the Duke of Augustenburg the amount of compensation to be paid to him? Whose name is affixed to the documents which contain this agreement? Who was surety for the fulfilment of this Princely word of honour? Why, M. de Bismark, who is now the first to throw over these solemn engagements and to support the pretensions of the Prince of Augustenburg. And who went out of his way to praise the wisdom of the Treaty of 1852, and to declare that it was a fresh security for the peace of Europe? Why, Herr von Beust, who, as the leader of the popular party in Germany, is now foremost in denouncing it and violating its provisions.

Between 1850, when the Protocol was signed, and 1852, the date of the Treaty, Denmark had made certain promises to Austria and Prussia as mandatories of the Diet, and at the same time Austria and Prussia had made certain promises to Denmark. These engagements were contained in official documents and despatches which passed between these Powers, and not in any formal treaty; but were, nevertheless, unquestionably engagements which the Danish Government was in honour bound to fulfil. They chiefly related to the good government of the Duchies, and to a promise on the part of Denmark, that she would not incorporate, nor take any measures which might tend to incorporate, Schleswig. But it is altogether incorrect to assert, as it is asserted by Austria and Prussia, that the Treaty of 1852, changing the succession, rested upon those promises. As I have shown, the Protocol of July, 1850, was signed before those promises were made; and, therefore, it is not fair to say that the change in the order of succession was agreed to in consequence of them. There can be no doubt, however, that the King of Denmark was bound to fulfil, to the utmost of his power, the engagements into which he had entered. For four or five years, nevertheless, after the peace, there is no denying that they were not fulfilled, and that the Duchies were not well governed. There was, I am sorry to say, a great deal of petty and vexatious oppression, and just that kind of impression which tells more than any other on people like the inhabitants of the Duchies —interference with the education of their children, interference with their language, putting over them men whose tongue they did not understand, and so on. We constantly called on the King of Denmark to fulfil the promises he had made, as we were, indeed, morally obliged to do, as the peace we had been instrumental in bringing about was founded upon them. In 1855, the King gave a Constitution to Denmark, which, he believed, virtually carried out his engagements as regards the relative positions to be held by the Kingdom proper and the Duchies. I will not now enter into the question as to how far it did or did not accomplish that object; but I believe that it is generally agreed that in certain respects it did not. When Lord Malmesbury came into the Foreign Office, he found the controversy between Germany and Denmark on the Schleswig-Holstein question at its height. Earl Russell has been accused of inordinate activity in this matter. Well, Lord Malmesbury was in office from February 26, 1858, to June 18, 1859—little more than a year—and during that time I find that he carried on a correspondence on this subject which now fills seven large folio volumes in the Foreign Office. I have here a quantity of extracts from these despatches.

LORD ROBERT CECIL: Sir, I rise to Order. The hon. Gentleman is referring to despatches which are not on the table, and his extracts from which we are unable to verify. That is, I submit, contrary to the practice of the House.

MR. LAYARD: I have expressed my willingness to lay all these despatches on the table. I beg to ask, Sir, whether in that case I may not refer to them?

MR. SPEAKER: The despatches should be laid on the table before the hon. Gentleman can quote from them.

MR. LAYARD: I appeal to this side of the House, whether it is fair that I should be prevented from reading any of these despatches. ["Oh!" "Hear, hear!"] At least I may be permitted to say that there are in the Foreign Office seven large folio volumes of despatches, in which Lord Malmesbury uses terms almost identical with those afterwards employed by Earl Russell. Notwithstanding what, to use a word much in fashion just now, I may call his threats, Lord Malmesbury failed in obtaining the repeal of the Constitution of 1855. Earl Russell, on entering office, therefore succeeded to a *damnosa hæreditas*, and found himself in the very midst of the Schleswig-Holstein controversy. He learnt that Lord Malmesbury had been pressing Denmark to repeal the Constitution of 1855, and the German Powers not to act harshly or hastily towards Denmark, warning them that if they did so, serious complications might arise in Europe, into which England might be drawn. I do not blame Lord Malmesbury for having done this. No English

Minister could have withdrawn from a position which he was morally bound to accept; and if he had, he would have justly met with the reprobation of this country and of Europe. War was actually threatened at that time. An execution had, during the period when, if I am not mistaken, Lord Malmesbury was in office, been voted by the Diet. Lord Russell at once attempted to bring matters to a peaceable conclusion, and, if possible, to prevent hostilities. For this purpose he made proposals in 1860, 1861, and 1862, to the contending parties. Now, it has been said, over and over again, that Lord Russell meddled unnecessarily and alone. I have shown that he only carried on the negotiations to which he succeeded on entering the Foreign Office. Let me now read an extract or two to prove that in every proposal he made, in every step he took, he acted with the most entire concurrence of France, that Power having, in each case, been consulted, and having given her entire approval. In the end of 1860, Lord Russell submitted to the French Government a proposal he was about to make to Denmark and Germany. Here is the answer of the French Government, as conveyed in Lord Cowley's despatch dated December 28, 1860 —

> "In compliance with the instructions contained in your Lordship's despatch of the 12th inst., I communicated to M. Thouvenel the substance of the instructions enclosed in that despatch to Mr. Paget and to Mr. Lowther, respecting the question of the Danish Duchies; and his Excellency has since informed me that he concurs entirely in your Lordship's views, which are those which the Imperial Government has advocated since the commencement of this vexed question."—*Correspondence,* 1860-1, p.108.

In 1861 another communication, containing fresh suggestions for a settlement of the dispute between Denmark and Germany, was made to the French Government, and its reception may be gathered from the following extract from a despatch written by my noble Friend to Lord Cowley on the 27th of February, 1861:—

> "You will endeavour to agree with M. Thouvenel as to the instructions to be given to the English and French Ministers at Copenhagen, and send an identical telegram to Mr. Paget, so that Her Majesty's Government and the French Government may express the same opinion. I am glad M. Thouvenel concurs in the views of Her Majesty's Government."—*Correspondence,* 1860-1, p. 148.

All attempts at a satisfactory arrangement having, however, failed—chiefly, it must be admitted, through the neglect of Denmark to fulfil her engagements—and the danger of war being imminent, Lord Russell on the 24th of September, 1862, made a further proposal to the contending parties. The despatch in which it is contained has been called "the Gotha despatch," the implication being that it was written at Gotha and under the influence of the German Powers. What are the facts? That despatch was determined upon in this country before Lord Russell went to Gotha. Lord Russell, when on his way to Germany in attendance upon the Queen, sent for Mr. Paget to meet him at Brussels to communicate his views to him; but the despatch itself was signed when Lord Russell had returned to London, and was not even dated, as it has been asserted, from Gotha. If hon. Gentlemen will turn to the papers for 1863 they will find proofs of what I have stated in the following passage in one of Lord Russell's despatches to Mr. Paget, dated January 21, 1863:—

> "In the middle of the summer of 1862 it appeared to Her Majesty's Government that the negotiation, instead of producing a settlement, had tended more and more towards bitterness and strife, leading probably in the end to a rupture. You may remember that in speaking to you at Brussels in the beginning of September, when I was proceeding to Germany, in attendance upon Her Majesty, I pointed out to you this state of things, and gave you an outline of the mode of settlement which had occurred to me. That mode of settlement was developed in my despatch of September 24, which you were charged to take to Copenhagen on your return to that Capital."—*Correspondence,* 1863, p. 363.

I trust that this is a sufficient answer to the accusation that Lord Russell wrote the despatch in question under the dictation or pressure of the German Powers. This is an instance of how statements which have no foundation whatever may become current, and may almost find their way into history. Lord Russell's despatch was very severely condemned in England. It was, I believe, chiefly owing to the outcry in the public journals and among certain people in this country that Denmark was induced not to accept the arrangement suggested by Her Majesty's Government. If, however, the House and the country will now look back with calmness and impartiality upon Lord Russell's proposal, it must, I think, be admitted that it showed great wisdom. It was accepted by France, Russia, Austria, Prussia, Sweden, the Duchies, and the Diet. It satisfied everybody except Denmark, and what is very important, if it had been accepted it would have put an end to the question of the Succession. Had Denmark agreed to it, she might at this moment have been in quiet possession of the Duchies, and I cannot but think that it was a great calamity for Denmark that she rejected it. It may not have been the very best arrangement for her, but a statesman is bound to look not to what is best, but to what is practicable; and that at such a time Lord Russell should have devised a practicable solution of a question which had defied the most experienced politicians of Europe, a solution which every one now admits would have put an end to this unhappy question, is a striking testimony to his wisdom as a statesman. Why did Denmark object to that proposal? She objected to it because she thought that it would prevent her from incorporating Schleswig, and because it divided that Duchy too much from her. It is perfectly true that the proposed arrangement did give a certain autonomy to Schleswig; but still it bound Schleswig to Denmark. If, accepting that proposal, Denmark had ruled the Duchies wisely and well, had increased their prosperity, had rendered their happiness a contrast to the condition of neighbouring States, had given them a degree of freedom which their inhabitants might have compared with the oppression exercised not far off—if Denmark had acted thus, I believe that a community of interests would have been ultimately established, and that a time would have come when there would have been a real and solid union between the Kingdom and the Duchies. That opportunity was unfortunately allowed to pass away. Had it been seized these unhappy disputes would, I doubt not, never have arisen.

I could quote other papers to show that what England did between that period and the time when the statement, now celebrated, of the noble Lord at the head of the Government was made in the following year, was in complete accord with France; but I am ashamed to trouble the House with so many extracts from despatches. In July of last year a question was asked by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Horsham as to the course the Government were about to take with regard to the Danish Question. The noble Lord (Lord Palmerston) gave an answer which has been quoted over and over again, but which has, I think, been entirely misunderstood. The noble Lord said that in a certain event Denmark would not be left alone, but he did not mean in saying so that England alone would stand by or fight for Denmark, and no impartial man who reads the sentence previous to that which contains these words, and will consider the context, would venture to say that his words will bear this meaning. As the hon. Member for Horsham referred to this the other night, I am anxious that there should be no misapprehension about the matter, and I shall therefore read the words to the House. The noble Lord said—

> "We concur entirely with him, and I am satisfied, with all reasonable men in Europe, including those in France and Russia, in desiring that the independence, the integrity, and the rights of Denmark may be maintained. We are convinced —I am convinced at least—that if any violent attempt were made to overthrow those rights and interfere with that independence, those who made the attempt would find in the result that it would not be Denmark alone with which they would have to contend."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxii. 1252.]

It is thus evident that the noble Lord spoke of France and Russia in connection with this country, as being prepared to help Denmark if any attempt were made to destroy her independence and integrity. But let the House go a step further and see what was going on in that month of July. A negotiation was then on foot between Sweden and Denmark for armed assistance to be given by Sweden to Denmark. A draft treaty for this purpose had been actually sent to Copenhagen, and it was only upon the death of the King that the idea of a treaty between the two Powers was given up. Therefore there was at that time every reason to believe that Sweden would have assisted Denmark in resisting any attempt to invade the Danish territory. There was, moreover, no question at that time of a disputed succession, nor any pretence for an invasion of Denmark by Austria and Prussia. If they had then invaded Denmark without the shadow of a plea to justify such a step, it would have been a wanton act of aggression, and I will venture to say that England, France, and Russia might have given their aid to Denmark without the propriety and justice of such assistance being questioned. The noble Lord's statement is therefore perfectly consistent with what has since taken place, and cannot by any impartial man be construed into an assertion that we were prepared, alone and single-handed, and under any circumstances, to give material aid to Denmark.

I have been anxious to pick out from these papers all that may be construed into a threat. The charge brought against my noble Friend is that he has continually made use of threatening language towards Germany. Let us see what truth there is in this accusation. If the House will turn to the blue-books they will find an identic despatch from Earl Russell to Lord Bloomfield and Sir Andrew Buchanan, dated May 27, 1863. These are the words of the despatch—

"Her Majesty's Government have heard with much concern that it is in contemplation to consider in the Diet at Frankfort, of a Federal Execution in Holstein. Without discussing the declaration of the King of Denmark, of the 30th of March, they instruct you to say that it is very desirable not to add to the existing complications and dangers of Europe. Austria and Prussia declined in 1861 to negotiate on the affairs of Holstein without arranging those of Schleswig. But the affairs of Schleswig are matters of international concern, and should be discussed with the utmost calmness and deliberation by the Powers of Europe, and cannot be decided by the Diet of Frankfort."—No. 2, 73.

That is the first despatch which speaks of complications and of dangers to Europe, or of the affairs of Schleswig being matters of international concern. That is the first despatch which can be perverted into a threat, and I wish to point out to the House how careful Earl Russell was to prevent it being construed as anything of the kind. In July, 1863, Mr. Corbett, writing to Earl Russell, asks permission to give a copy of this despatch to the Danish Minister at Frankfort. What was Earl Russell's reply? Why, that no copy was to be given, and the reason of this refusal is obvious. Earl Russell did not wish the Danish Government to think that any language which might be construed into a threat had been held to Prussia and Austria. I now come to a despatch which has been mentioned more than once in the course of this debate—namely, the despatch of July 31, 1863. That despatch was quoted by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bucks as containing a threat on the part of Earl Russell to Germany; but the right hon. Gentleman, as in many other instances, left out a material paragraph in it which serves to qualify and explain other parts of it—that which relates to Sweden. Earl Russell said—

"These matters are becoming serious. There can be little doubt that Denmark will regard the advance of German troops into Holstein as a hostile invasion, and not as a Federal Execution. It is also clear that she will be supported by Sweden."—No. 2, 114.

That paragraph the right hon. Gentleman left out. The despatch goes on to say—

"You will communicate these views to Count Rechberg, and tell him that if Germany persists in confounding Schleswig and Holstein, other Powers of Europe may confound Holstein with Schleswig, and deny the right of Germany to interfere with the one any more than she has with the other, except as a European Power."

"Such a pretension might be as dangerous to the independence and integrity of Germany as the invasion of Schleswig might be to the independence and integrity of Denmark. The calm consideration of the existing difficulties will, it is to be hoped, induce Austria to consult the European Powers before she impels the Diet to a definitive resolution."—*Correspondence*, 1864, No. 2, 114.

It is evident from the context that Earl Russell alluded mainly to Sweden, who was prepared to go to war at that time. That despatch, which I will call the second threatening despatch, was communicated to the French Government, and what was the answer? Our Ambassador writes—

"Paris, Aug. 1, 1863.

"I have communicated to M. Drouyn de Lhuys, as authorized by your Lordship's telegram, your despatch of the 31st ult. to Lord Bloomfield, on the present phase of the question relating to the Danish Duchies. His Excellency expressed his approbation of your Lordship's wise advice, and said he would write in a similar sense."—No. 2, 115.

Therefore that threat, if it is to be considered as a threat, was not only entirely approved by France, but actually adopted by her. I now come to the third threat, which is contained in a Foreign Office despatch of the 31st of August, 1863—

"I have caused M. de Katte to be informed that Her Majesty's Government have no intention of making any communication to the Danish Government, after the reception which was given to my suggestion of last year; but that if Austria and Prussia persist in advising the Confederation to make a Federal Execution now, they will do so against the advice already given by Her Majesty's Government, and must be responsible for the consequences, whatever they may be."—No. 2, 123.

Here I omit a paragraph. The despatch proceeds—

"But if the Diet take steps for a still further object, and invade Holstein for the purpose of compelling the King of Denmark to acknowledge certain rights, which the German Confederation claim as belonging to Schleswig by virtue of the arrangements of 1851-2, the Diet will be entering upon a grave European question, as to which they have no exclusive competency of decision, and on which it belongs quite as much to every other European Government to form an opinion and to pronounce a judgment."—No. 2, 123.

That is the third threat, and the despatch containing it was communicated to Paris. If hon. Members will turn to the blue-book, they will see what France says of it. Lord Cowley writes to Lord Russell—

"Although not specially instructed to show M. Drouyn de Lhuys your Lordship's despatch of the 31st ult. to Mr. Lowther, stating that, in reply to a question of the Prussian Chargé d'Affaires, your Lordship had desired that gentleman to be informed that Her Majesty's Government had no intention of making any further communication to the Danish Government in order to persuade that Government to come to an understanding with the Diet, and giving the views of Her Majesty's Government upon the general position of the Holstein question, I thought it advisable to read it to his Excellency. M. Drouyn de Lhuys said that he coincided in all your Lordship's opinions as expressed in that despatch. He had more than once sent instructions in a similar sense both to Vienna and to Berlin, and he would repeat them if on reference he found that the dates of the last were not very recent."—No. 2, 125.

Therefore threat number three as well as threat number two was approved, and even used by France. I now come to the despatch of the 18th of September, which was quoted—or rather misquoted—by the right hon. Member for Bucks. It is from Mr. Grey to Lord Russell, and contains these words—

"The second mode of proceeding suggested by your Lordship—namely, 'to remind Austria, Prussia, and the German Diet that any acts on their part tending to weaken the integrity and independence of Denmark would be at variance with the Treaty of the 8th May, 1852'—would be in a great measure analogous to the course pursued by Great Britain and France in the Polish Question. He had no inclination (and he frankly avowed that he should so speak to the Emperor) to place France in the same position with reference to Germany as she had been placed with regard to Russia. The formal notes addressed by the three Powers to Russia had received an answer which literally meant nothing, and the position in which those three great Powers were now placed was anything but dignified, and if England and France were to address such a reminder as that proposed to Austria, Prussia, and the German Confederation, they must be prepared to go further, and to adopt a course of action more in accordance with the dignity of two great Powers than they were now doing in the Polish Question.—No. 2, 131.

Then, as the House will remember, the right hon. Gentleman skipped a passage. Hon. Gentlemen will observe by turning to the despatch from Lord Russell to Mr. Grey, dated the 16th of September, which on being communicated to the French Government led to the reply I am now quoting, that it merely contained suggestions as to what might be done, not actual proposals to take any particular course. As it is important to bear this in mind, I will read the passage I refer to—

"If the Government of the Emperor of the French are of opinion that any benefit would be likely to follow from an offer of good offices on the part of Great Britain and France, Her Majesty's Government would be ready to take that course. If, however, the Government of France would consider such a step as likely to be unavailing, the two Powers might remind Austria, Prussia, and the German Diet, that any act on their part tending to weaken the integrity and independence of Denmark would be at variance with the Treaty of the 8th of May, 1852."—No. 2, 130.

Now, the passage in the despatch of the 18th, which the right hon. Gentleman abstained from reading was this—

"France was not, his Excellency said, by any means indifferent to the maintenance of the integrity and independence of Denmark, and it was not from any indifference that he disapproved your Lordship's suggestion. He had already represented to the German Powers, that if they invaded Holstein for the purpose of effecting a revolt in Schleswig, or if they went further and invaded Schleswig itself, they would be infringing on the rights of an independent Sovereign, and entering upon a grave question affecting the balance of power in Europe, to which France could not remain indifferent."—No. 2, 131.

What did Lord Russell do on receiving this answer from Paris? Did he make either of the proposals he had suggested? Did he use his own words? No; but in writing to the Diet he adopted the very words which had been employed by M. Thouvenel, and those are the words which Lord Russell has been denounced for using, as implying a threat to Germany from which England could not with honour retreat! If the House turns to the papers, it will see the despatch written to Sir Alexander Malet on the receipt of that answer from Paris. It says—

"Her Majesty could not see with indifference a military occupation of Holstein, which is only to cease upon terms injuriously affecting the constitution of the whole Danish monarchy. Her Majesty's Government could not recognize this military occupation as a legitimate exercise of the powers of the Confederation, or admit that it could properly be called a Federal Execution. Her Majesty's Government could not be indifferent to the bearing of such an act upon Denmark and upon European interests. Her Majesty's Government therefore earnestly entreat the German Diet to pause, and to submit the question in dispute between Germany and Denmark to the mediation of other Powers unconcerned in the controversy, but deeply concerned in the maintenance of the peace of Europe and the independence of Denmark."—No. 2, 145.

Thus it will be seen that Lord Russell actually uses the very words suggested by the French Minister.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON: Will the hon. Gentleman be good enough to tell us what he calls misquoting a despatch?

MR. LAYARD: I say that a despatch is misquoted when two sentences are read which have no relation to each other, and when the intervening sentence which connects them, and either alters or modifies their meaning, is left out. I will not trouble the House with what Russia has done in this matter, because nobody has ventured to assert that Russia has not acted cordially throughout these negotiations with Her Majesty's Government, and has not approved everything they have done. I come, therefore, to the next stage of the question; and here I have to notice another misquotation. The noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Lord Robert Cecil) the other evening accused the Government of having lost a golden opportunity for making peace, because Prussia had suggested both arbitration and mediation to Her Majesty's Government, who might have proposed either to Denmark and to the Diet, but failed to do so, and were therefore responsible for the effusion of blood that had afterwards taken place.

I will not stop to point out the apparent inconsistency of hon. Gentlemen opposite in first condemning the Government for mediating at all in this Danish Question, and then denouncing them for refusing to mediate. What I wish to do is to show how despatches have been misquoted to support these accusations. If hon. Gentlemen will turn to page 219 of the Danish papers they will find a despatch from Lord Russell to Sir Andrew Buchanan, dated November 9, 1863. Her Majesty's Government had already in the month of October proposed mediation to the Diet, and the Diet, acting under the influence of the smaller German States, had declined to accept it. M. de Bismark now suggested arbitration. He did not, as the noble Lord said, ask Her Majesty's Government to propose it; but Sir Andrew Buchanan justly replied that no Power could accept arbitration where its independence was in question. (No. 3, 174.) M. de Bismark then proposed that Her Majesty's Government should again offer mediation to the Diet. The noble Lord the Member for Stamford stated that Her Majesty's Government refused to make that offer of mediation as recommended by Prussia, and quoted in support of his assertion the following extract from a despatch from Lord Russell dated November 9, 1863, in answer to the Prussian suggestion:—

> "As matters now stand, Her Majesty's Government have come to the conclusion that it is inexpedient for them, at all events for the present, to make any further proposal to the Diet.—No. 3, 193.

Here the noble Lord the Member for Stamford stopped at a semicolon, and read no more. Let hon. Members read on and tell me whether that was not a misquotation. The despatch continues—

> "Although if the Governments of Austria and Prussia were to unite in inviting them to do so, and would undertake to support with all their influence at Frankfort a proposal which Her Majesty's Government might then make to the Diet, Her Majesty's Government, in their anxiety to spare no effort to avert from Germany the consequences which perseverance in her present course in regard to Holstein threatens to bring upon her, would not be indisposed to make a further attempt."—No. 3, 199.

I ask, then, is it creditable thus to read to a semicolon in a despatch and leave out the remainder of the sentence, which so greatly affects the sense of that which precedes? If the noble Lord had left off at a full stop it might have been bad enough, but to stop short at a semicolon was intolerable. Her Majesty's Government said they would be willing to renew their offer of mediation if Austria, Prussia, and the smaller German States would guarantee that that offer would be accepted, but they would not go to the Diet and expose themselves to a second refusal. And was not Earl Russell perfectly justified and perfectly right in making this condition? Have you not condemned him in no measured terms for making offers which were not accepted? I ask then, again, is it fair to attempt to mislead the House by such misquotations? The proposal of Count von Bismark was made on the 5th November; the late King of Denmark died on the 15th. There was no time to bring about that mediation; if the German Powers had guaranteed that it would have been accepted, Lord Russell would, in the interests of peace, have proposed it, but the death of the King changed the whole state of things. It was now too late, for the unhappy question of the Succession had arisen. It is well known that intriguers and plotters in the Duchies were ready to get up a revolution when the King died. A rising did take place. The Prince of Augustenburg put forward his claim to succeed to the Duchies as Duke of Schleswig-Holstein, his father actually renouncing his own renunciation. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire stated that although Earl Russell had been intermeddling up to this point, had been holding out all these threats, of which we have heard so much, and doing all this mischief, when the moment came at which he might have been useful and might have prevented war by persuading the new King not to sign the Constitution, he maintained a selfish silence, spoke not a word, and allowed the King to take that step which afterwards led to so much disaster. The right hon. Gentleman told us he had studied the blue-books. He may have done so with great advantage to himself, but certainly not with much advantage to this House, if we are to accept as genuine the information he has given it. Why, the first step which Her Majesty's Government took on the accession of the new King was to advise him to avail himself of his position not to sign the Constitution. Sir Augustus Paget gave a reason for the King's adoption of a different course which I think was conclusive—namely, that Christian IX., being a German and suspected of German tendencies, and not having been much connected with Denmark, it would have been almost risking the loss of his throne to have declined to sign the Constitution which was loudly called for by the whole Danish people, and that consequently he had no alternative but to sign it. France and Russia gave precisely the same advice as we did. The Federal Execution, which had been impending for some years, was now enforced. The Federal troops entered Holstein on the 24th of December. The allegation is that Earl Russell protested against the Federal Execution, and threatened all sorts of things if it were carried out. Lord Derby said that at the meeting of his party. ["Oh!" *and cries of* "Private."] I name what was published in your own organs. ["No!"] I saw it in the newspapers. ["Who published it?"] I saw it stated in one of your own organs. ["No, no!"] I saw it stated in the newspapers that Lord Derby said, that upon every step taken by the Diet and the German Powers Earl Russell threatened, and threatened in vain; that when the Diet proceeded to carry out Execution he threatened, and that the threat was treated with contempt; that he again threatened with the same result when the armies of the German Powers crossed the Eider, and when they entered Jutland. This is entirely at variance with fact. Earl Russell always admitted that as Holstein was a part of the German Confederation, the Diet had a legitimate authority over it; but he also maintained that the Diet had no right to send troops into Holstein on the pretence of Federal Execution, and then by bringing pressure to bear upon Denmark to attempt to alter the constitution of the whole kingdom, for they would then trench upon international ground, and the question would be altogether altered in its character. It was only when the Diet changed Execution into Occupation, and countenanced the proceedings of the Prince of Augustenburg, that Earl Russell pointed out that its course was illegal and unjustifiable. It has been asserted that after the Diet, supported by Austria and Prussia, had taken these violent proceedings, Earl Russell weakened the position of Denmark and lessened her means of defence by seducing her into negotiations and Conferences. Now, is not this accusation against Earl Russell as devoid of foundation as others to which I have referred? Did he first suggest or press Conferences and mediation? Let hon. Members see what M. Hall, the Danish Prime Minister, wrote to Sir Augustus Paget, on November 20, 1863—

> "The King's Government cannot therefore do otherwise than call Lord Russell's attention to the opportunity which there would be, in our opinion, for reserving our question for that Congress [the one proposed by the Emperor of the French]; or, if the meeting should not take place, for a special Conference of the Powers who signed the Treaty of London. Should obstacles, however, interfere with the collective action of the Powers, the King's Government will always be fortunate in being able to count upon the powerful mediation of Great Britain."—No, 3, 236.

So that here was M. Hall actually writing at that time asking for a Conference, and, if that could not be obtained, suggesting the continued mediation of England. The next accusation made by the right hon. Gentleman against my noble Friend is, that he launched a special Envoy, Lord Wodehouse, upon Copenhagen, still further to injure unhappy Denmark by his fatal advice. Who first proposed the sending of this special Envoy? Russia, who said the moment was come to see whether anything could be done at Copenhagen, and who thought it would be well that the opportunity should be taken of the accession of Christian IX. to send special Envoys, who, while expressing congratulations to the new King, would urge him to repeal the Constitution and to make those concessions which Germany had a right to ask. Earl Russell willingly accepted this suggestion, hoping that it might conduce to peace; and the same desire which he had always shown to consult and act in concert with France, led him to communicate Lord Wodehouse's instructions to the French Government. And what did France say to them? Lord Cowley, writing to Earl Russell from Paris, on December 14, 1863, observes—

> "His Excellency (the French Minister) said that your Lordship's arguments appeared to him to be very conclusive, and the course which you proposed to pursue the right one. He had himself long ago insisted on the necessity of obtaining some more defined statement of the demands of Germany on Denmark, and until that should be effected, he felt it to be impossible to do more than to recommend moderation and prudence to the Danish Government."—No. 3, 379.

Lord Wodehouse was instructed to proceed to Berlin to endeavour to obtain a distinct statement of the demands of Austria and Prussia upon Denmark—a statement which had hitherto not been given—and then to go to Copenhagen, where he was to urge the King to repeal the obnoxious Constitution, as a first step towards satisfying Germany. Thus, all the Powers—not England alone—endeavoured to prevail upon Denmark to repeal the Constitution. The right hon. Gentleman accused Earl Russell of having called upon the King to do an illegal and unconstitutional act. He said, my noble Friend called upon the King to repeal the whole of the Constitution, which was about the same as if, after the Reform Bill had passed, the Sovereign of England had been recommended to repeal that law without consulting Parliament. I took down the words at the time.

Mr. DISRAELI: What I said was, that it was as if the Sovereign had called Parliament together for the purpose of repealing the Act.

Mr. LAYARD: Surely the right hon. Gentleman said he had called on the King to make a *coup d'état.* ["No, no!"] But what were Earl Russell's instructions to Lord Wodehouse? They were dated December 17, 1863, and will be found at page 385 of the papers. They contain these words—

> "The new Constitution, therefore, being without the requisite sanction of the Duchy of Schleswig, and being contrary to the engagement of the Crown of Denmark, ought, as far as Schleswig is concerned [not, be it observed, "the whole constitution"], to be repealed. How this is to be done it belongs to the King of Denmark, his Ministers and his Parliament, to decide. It is the wish of Her Majesty's Government that it should be done in the manner most suitable to the dignity and character of Denmark as a free and independent State."—No. 3, 385.

Are not these words an ample answer to the accusations of the right hon. Gentleman? The French Government gave similar instructions, and acted, through their Minister, in cordial harmony with Her Majesty's Government. Lord Cowley, writing to Earl Russell, December 24, 1863, p. 424, said—

> "In the meantime the French Minister at Copenhagen was, his Excellency said, instructed to give a general support to the counsels tendered by England and Russia to Denmark, although he had not been furnished with as detailed instructions as those given to Lord Wodehouse by Her Majesty's Government."—No. 4, 424.

So that, here again, the French and English Governments were acting entirely in concert; and this was after the period when it is alleged that the conduct of my noble Friend had produced a divergence of opinion between them. A threat to Germany is said to be contained in these words of a despatch of Earl Russell to Sir Andrew Buchanan, dated December 24, 1863—

> "It would be no less impossible for Her Majesty's Government to enter into any engagement, that if the Federal troops should not limit their operations to the Duchy of Holstein, but should on some pretence or other extend their operations to the Duchy of Schleswig, Her Majesty's Government would maintain an attitude of neutrality between Germany and Denmark."—No. 4, 413.

Why was this written? Because there was every reason to believe that France at that time held the same language as ourselves. I must here point out another instance of misquotation — another instance rather of the *suppressio veri.* Lord Wodehouse had reported that General Fleury had stated to the Danish Minister that under no circumstances would France give material aid to Denmark. The extract from the despatch with these words was read to the House by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bucks (Mr. Disraeli) and the right hon. Member for Horsham (Mr. Seymour FitzGerald), as a proof that at that time France was not prepared, under any circumstances, to go to war for Denmark, and that, unlike England, who was misleading the Danish people, she in a straightforward manner told Denmark so. But they took care not to notice a subsequent despatch, which qualified Lord Wodehouse's statement. Lord Cowley inquired of M. Drouyn de Lhuys whether General Fleury had made this statement, and he wrote the following despatch to Earl Russell on the subject:—

> "I said to-day to M. Drouyn de Lhuys that I had heard a report that General Fleury had in-

> formed the Danish Government that were a war to break out between Denmark and Germany the Danish Government must not expect assistance from France. Was this true? I asked. M. Drouyn de Lhuys replied that the instructions given to General Fleury prescribed to him to conform his mission as much as possible to the conveyance of complimentary messages from the Emperor. Should he be obliged—and it was hardly to be avoided—to speak on political matters, he was to advise all possible concessions for the maintenance of peace. It might be that with a view of furthering this pacific policy, the General had stated that the support of France must not be expected in the event of war, but he (M. Drouyn de Lhuys) was positive that no declaration had been made by the General which did not leave the Emperor free to take any course which events might render expedient."—No. 4, 443.

Is not that precisely what we had said? Was not the language held by Her Majesty's Government exactly in the same spirit? We will not bind ourselves to an absolute neutrality, we declared; we must see what events will bring forth, and it will then be time to decide; we cannot now pledge ourselves to any definite course. At that time we were right to hold that language; it was entirely in conformity with the position which France had taken up, and was such as became an independent European Power.

Now I come to one of the most important parts of this correspondence, and one which has furnished some of the most violent, and I will venture to say some of the most unjust, accusations against Earl Russell. I anxiously desire the hon. Members for Rochdale and Birmingham (Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright) to attend to me for a moment, because I think they have misunderstood, the country has misunderstood, and the House has misunderstood, the despatch I am about to refer to. In January, the Government had every reason to believe, as I have shown, that France considered herself still bound by the Treaty of 1852, and that she was not committed to a policy of inaction in the Danish Question. An invasion of Denmark by Germany being then imminent, Her Majesty's Government thought the time was come to ask France and the other Powers, parties to the Treaty of 1852, whether they were or were not prepared to

> "Concert and co-operate with Her Majesty's Government for the purpose of maintaining the engagements of the Treaty of May, 1852, and especially of upholding the integrity of the Danish Monarchy."

Now this despatch was called by my hon. Friend (Mr. Cobden) "a war despatch;" he said it was an invitation to France to join England in going to war, and that France had saved us from war by declining to accede to our proposal. My impression as to the reasons for which that despatch was written, and as to the object Lord Russell had in view in writing it, has been confirmed by my noble Friend, with whom I have talked the matter over in order to be perfectly clear on the subject, and I confidently declare that that despatch was eminently a peace despatch. No step was ever taken more in the interest of peace, and that was the object of Lord Russell in writing it. It has been called an invitation to France and Russia to join us in giving material aid to Denmark; but what is the truth? To whom was that despatch addressed? Not to France and Russia only, but to Austria, Prussia, and Sweden as well—in fact, to all the Powers that signed the Treaty of 1852. [See *Danish Papers*, p. 563.]

Earl Russell's argument was this: The time is now come to understand distinctly what these Powers are prepared to do. The German Diet wishes to bring about an illegal occupation of Schleswig, and to dispute that right of Succession which the treaty pledged the parties to it, and the German Powers, who subsequently adhered to it, to respect. Are the parties to that treaty prepared to give material aid to Denmark to resist that attack upon her integrity, and to maintain the order of Succession to which they are pledged? Could England call upon Austria and Prussia to make war on Austria and Prussia? If the Powers who signed the treaty say, we do not intend to give material aid to Denmark, then England is released from any obligation to do so under that treaty. Why should she give material aid when five other Powers, under precisely the same obligations as herself, consider that they are not called upon to give it, or refuse to give it? If, on the other hand, France, Russia, Austria, Prussia, and Sweden consent to give such material aid, the question is at an end, for in the face of such a coalition it is impossible that Germany should persevere in the attempt to dismember Denmark. It has been said in this debate that if England, France, and Russia acted together, war would be impossible. What then would the chances of war have been if England, France, Russia, Austria, Prussia, and Sweden had acted together? France asked for explanations as to the meaning of Her Majesty's Government in asking for the concert and co-operation of the parties to the Treaty of 1852; Russia and Austria asked for similar explanations. The same explanations were given to all. We answered, what we mean is this:—If Germany persists in the execution of her plan for the dismemberment of the Danish Monarchy, are you prepared, as parties to the Treaty of 1852, to give, if necessary, material aid to Denmark? They all replied, no. I defy any hon. Member to show one word written by Earl Russell from that moment which could bear the construction of a threat to Germany, or one word to encourage Denmark to believe that she might receive material aid from this country. If there ever was a peace despatch, I say it was this. The noble Earl wrote it with that view. I have refreshed my memory on the subject, as I have just stated, by conversation with my noble Friend within the last few hours, and that is his conviction now, as it was then—that if we could have come to such an understanding with all the Great Powers of Europe it would have been impossible for Germany to have made war on Denmark. Instead of being condemned, my noble Friend ought to receive the thanks of the country, and especially of my hon. Friends the Members for Rochdale and Birmingham, for writing that despatch, as it released us from any obligation to go to war on behalf of Denmark, and enabled us, at least, to remain at peace.

The last threat, if threat it can be called, is contained in Earl Russell's despatch to Lord Bloomfield, dated January 20, 1864; the answer from France declining to give material aid not having been received, be it remembered, until the 26th. It contains these words—

> "Count Apponyi and Count Bernstorff, in an interview I had with them on the 18th inst., contended, with an ominous identity of expression, that if the Danes resisted the occupation of Schleswig by the forces of Austria and Prussia, war must ensue; and that war would cancel all treaties, and sweep away the Treaty of London of May, 1852, together with other engagements. The primary intention of using this language seemed to be to induce Great Britain to persuade Denmark to admit the peaceable occupation of the Duchy of Schleswig. It is impossible for Her Majesty's Government to take any such course, and it is highly probable that resistance will be offered by the Danes to the occupation of Schleswig. But you will take care to remark to Count Rechberg, on every suitable occasion, that a war in Schleswig would not relieve Austria and Prussia from the obligations contracted towards England, France, Russia, Sweden, and other Powers of Europe, by the Treaty of London; that the Diet has no authority whatever to dispose of the Duchy of Holstein, or to oppose the succession of the King of Denmark; that the occupation of Holstein rested upon assumed Federal grounds, affecting the King of Denmark as the lawful heir of the late King in the Duchy of Holstein, and was an acknowledgment of King Christian as Duke of Holstein; that the proposed occupation of Schleswig relates not to Federal grounds, but to the international obligations contracted by the late King, and which have devolved upon the present King as his lawful successor; that to convert these several occupations into a claim to dispose of the two Duchies to a rival claimant would amount to an international aggression, and involve a breach of faith which might entail upon Europe the most wide-spread calamities.—No. 4, 571.

Can this language be called a threat; is it not rather a warning, and a prediction which has already been in part fulfilled? But how was that despatch received by Count Rechberg? Did he resent it as a threat? On the contrary; on the 21st of January, Lord Bloomfield writes—

> "Count Rechberg does not hesitate to admit the justice of the reasoning in your Lordship's despatch [the one I have just quoted]; but he said that, after long and patient negotiations with Denmark, Germany could hardly be accused of haste in adopting the late decisions."—No. 4, 597.

It has been asserted that throughout these negotiations Denmark was led by Earl Russell to expect material aid from England, and that, relying upon these expectations, she resisted Germany and was betrayed. In replying to this accusation, I must refer to something which occurred in another place. In a debate on the 5th of February, 1864, Earl Russell said (I quote his words), "The Danish Minister has repeatedly said to me, 'We expect no material aid from this country; all we expect is sympathy.'" After what the Speaker has ruled I am prevented from quoting a despatch which I had intended to read to the House; but I may state that I have a despatch which shows that Sir Augustus Paget told M. Monrad in direct words, that Denmark must not expect England to give her material aid. The reason why that despatch has not been laid upon the table is partly this—it relates a conversation with Bishop Monrad, in which he went fully into the means of Denmark for defending herself, and it would have been manifestly unfair to Denmark if we had given that despatch and allowed her enemies to know what her resources and her plans were. The date of that despatch is February 22, 1864. But there is a despatch which has been published—a despatch of the 9th of March, 1864, from Lord Russell to Sir

Augustus Paget, in which the former observes—

> "I must request you, before you require on the 12th instant that the answer should be given on that day, to state to M. Monrad and M. Quaade the very great imprudence, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, of throwing away a fair chance of settling a question in regard to which the whole of the Powers of Germany are ready to contend in arms against Denmark; and neither France, nor Great Britain, nor Russia, nor Sweden are ready in present circumstances to fight in her support."—No. 5, 780.

So I say that no word has ever been uttered or written by Earl Russell to lead Denmark to believe that she would receive material support from this country, and that any assertion to the contrary is unfounded. I may be permitted to remind the House that even the definite proposal for the Conference—that Conference which has been so much condemned, and which hon. Members declare they foresaw would come to nothing—came from Prussia, for it was made on the 16th December by M. de Bismark, who suggested that it should be held at Paris. We were quite willing that it should be held there or elsewhere. Our only object was to find the means of preserving peace. The events which took place at and during the Conference are so well known, and are so recent, that I do not wish to trouble the House with a relation of them; but I must mention two or three facts connected with it which have been misunderstood or misrepresented. In the first place, Lord Russell has been accused of proposing an armistice before the Conference, thereby placing Denmark in a false position. Did not France cordially support us in that proposal? If hon. Gentlemen will turn to a despatch from Lord Cowley, dated the 11th of February, they will find that M. de Talleyrand had been instructed to give his energetic support to his British colleague in proposing this armistice. It has also been said, and it has been made another matter of accusation against the Government, that they went into the Conference without a basis. But whose fault was that? Was it the fault of the British Government? They proposed basis after basis, but either the German Powers or Denmark would not accept them. We were not responsible for the refusal of other Powers, and when they declined to accept each basis which we proposed ought we to have given up all requisitions, and to have made no further attempts to preserve peace? I think Earl Russell is entitled to great credit for persevering in his attempts, never allowing himself to be baffled, and saying, when he could not get an armistice or any definite basis, "Still let us have a Conference; let us do what we can to restore peace." France agreed with us in that view, Russia agreed in that view, and if hon. Gentlemen will turn to the Correspondence relating to the Conference recently laid upon the table, they will see that the Conference was urged upon the Government by no Power more strongly than by Austria and Prussia. The right hon. Gentleman opposite and the hon. Member for Horsham have said that the Government went into the Conference declaring that their policy was to maintain the independence and integrity of Denmark, and that they came out of it having sacrificed both. That was not so. The Government expressly declared that the only thing to which they were pledged was the endeavour to restore peace between the belligerents, and if hon. Gentlemen will refer to almost the last page of the blue-book they will find a despatch from Earl Russell to Sir Augustus Paget of the 21st of March, by which it appears that even Denmark admitted that she went into the Conference without any engagements, not even insisting as a basis upon the arrangements of 1852. Earl Russell's words are—

> "Her Majesty's Government are glad to find from these despatches, as well as from M. Quaade's despatch of the 18th instant to the Danish Minister in London, of which a copy is inclosed in your despatch of that date, that the Danish Government accept the proposal for a Conference which you were instructed to make to them, and do not insist upon the formal recognition, by the Governments of Austria and Prussia, of the arrangements of 1851 and 1852, as the basis on which the Conference is to deliberate." —No. 5, 818.

The hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Seymour FitzGerald) declared that the statement made by my noble Friend, that Russia had been consulted before he proposed the line of the Schlei and the Dannewirke, was untrue, as the Protocols showed that that proposal had been made without its having been submitted to the Ambassador of Russia. That was made a grave matter of complaint against my noble Friend, but if hon. Gentlemen will turn to the Protocols of the Conference they will find that Lord Clarendon, in two Protocols, those of the 9th and the 11th, distinctly states that that proposal was not the mere proposal of Her Majesty's Government, but was a proposal made with the concurrence of the neutral Powers; and he expressly declares—

> "That the line was proposed by Earl Russell in his capacity of President of the Conference, on the result of the previous understanding which had been come to by the Representatives of the neutral Powers."

I have, further, Earl Russell's authority to state that Baron Brunnow was consulted before the proposal was brought forward, and expressed his willingness to support it, declaring, however, that his Government went into the Conference upon the basis of the Treaty of 1852; that Russia had always held the same language; but if it were found necessary to abandon that treaty, then he would support the line of the Schlei. Earl Russell has been further accused of breaking a distinct promise he had made to Denmark, that he would make no other proposal in the Conference than the line of the Schlei. But what Earl Russell did promise was, that he would propose no other line, not that he would make no further proposal, and the distinction is very evident. He is now accused of violating his promise, because he—speaking in the name of the neutral Powers—proposed arbitration. Was that breaking his promise? The arbitrator might have decided upon this very line of the Schlei. There was no pledge as to any line. What, let me ask, would this House and the country have said if Earl Russell had answered, "I will make no new proposal; I will adhere to the line of the Schlei; and if Germany will not have it, I will withdraw and will let the war be renewed." I say that the proposal of arbitration was a step in favour of peace, and might have been accepted without committing Denmark or any of the parties to the Conference to any particular line. Unfortunately, that proposal was refused by both parties—altogether by Denmark, virtually by Austria and Prussia, and it fell to the ground. Such, then, was the end of the Conference. But here I must again refer to the speech of the hon. Member for Horsham (Mr. S. FitzGerald), and I will venture to say that never has there been a speech delivered in this House in which dates have been given with a more uncompromising disregard for what they really are than in the speech of that hon. Member. I think I shall be able to show the House that that is so. The hon. Gentleman declared that, almost within twenty-four hours, he had himself heard Earl Russell, in the other House, say that he had again made an offer to France to unite with us in going to war for Denmark, and that that offer had been refused. ["No!"] You must not contradict me, for it will be in the recollection of the House that I objected to this statement at the very moment it was made. Indeed, I owe the hon. Gentleman an apology for having interrupted him. I said that such was not the case, upon which the hon. Member replied—

> "Yes; I heard Earl Russell say that the French Government had again declined to go to war for Denmark; and would anybody believe that such a statement would have been made by France otherwise than in answer to a question from our Government?"

This was altogether a different statement, but I have to assure the House that there is no foundation whatever for that inference. When the Conference closed, the French Emperor thought it expedient to explain the conduct he had pursued during the negotiations, and to state upon what grounds he had refused to give material support to Denmark. The statement which he has made to Her Majesty's Government is no answer to any question asked by them, but has been made freely and spontaneously by the Emperor himself.

I think I have now shown the House that Earl Russell cannot be accused of using threats; that the language he has employed has invariably been approved and even adopted by France; that he has not been unnecessarily meddling; that he has supported the honour of his country, and that throughout these most difficult and delicate negotiations he has shown an ardent desire to maintain peace. I come now to another important matter. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) opposite has asserted that the change of language which, according to him, took place on the part of France in the autumn of last year, was due to two things—first, to the manner in which France had been treated by England upon the Polish Question; and next, to the answer Earl Russell had given to the Emperor's proposal for a Congress. My right hon. Friend the Member for Stroud has successfully grappled with the right hon. Gentleman opposite upon the question of Poland. He said, very justly and truly, that, as to Poland, it was not Her Majesty's Government who were to be blamed, because their policy upon that question had been forced upon them by the House of Commons; and he reminded the House that a Resolution in stronger language than any used by Earl Russell had been moved by the hon. Member for the King's County in these words—

> "Humbly to submit to Her Majesty that these facts demand the interposition of England in vindication of her own public faith and solemn engagements."

"That Resolution, which meant scarcely anything short of war, was virtually forced," said the right hon. Member for Stroud, "upon my noble Friend at the head of the Government, and accepted by the House;" the Government acting, to a great extent, as it were, in conformity with the decision of the House. In answer to that statement, the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. S. FitzGerald said—

> "The House will be astonished to hear what I have to state to it. The Motion of my hon. Friend (Mr. Hennessy) was made on the 27th of February. But what was the date of Lord Russell's condemnation of the conduct of Russia? Why, the 21st of February. What was the date of the letter which has been so complained of with reference to the conduct of Prussia? The 18th of February. What was the date of Lord Russell's despatch seeking for concert and harmonious action with the Emperor of the French? The 27th of February—the very day of the debate. When the right hon. Gentleman again attempts to defend a Government on the ground that a course of policy has been forced upon them by the Opposition, I hope he will take care to be more accurate in his dates."

Every one of these statements was received with the usual volley of cheers. Will the House believe that there is not one part of the hon. Gentleman's statement which is correct; that it is a complete and absolute mystification from beginning to end; that one of these despatches, that of February 27, is entirely the creation of his own brain, and does not exist at all; and that the other two have really little to do with the matter? Now, I ask the attention of the House to this, because it shows how matters have been misrepresented. The despatch of February 18, which has been so much "complained" of, is addressed to Sir Andrew Buchanan, and it simply instructs him to procure a copy of the military Convention between Russia and Prussia, for the suppression of the Polish insurrection. The despatch of February 21, which is described as a condemnation of the conduct of Russia, merely assents to the views of France respecting this military Convention, and says there is no difference of opinion between the two Governments on the subject. As I said before, the despatch of February 27 does not exist. The debate on Poland took place on the 27th of February, 1863. I have read to the House the words of the Motion which was then brought forward. On the 2nd of March, Lord Russell wrote to Lord Napier, not in the strong terms of the Motion of the hon. Member for King's County, but in the spirit of the Address moved by the hon. Member. ["No!"] Who ventures to say "No?" Will hon. Gentlemen turn to the papers? If there is any doubt on the subject let me read the despatches themselves—

> "In reply to your despatch of the 16th instant, mentioning the nomination of Commissioners for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the military conventions between Russia and Prussia for the suppression of this insurrection in Poland, I have to instruct you to endeavour to procure and transmit to Her Majesty's Government a copy of the Convention in question."

That is the first of those "important" despatches; it bears date February 18, and is addressed to Sir Andrew Buchanan. The second, which is dated February 21, is addressed to Lord Cowley, and is in these terms—

> "The French Ambassador has just called upon me to say that the Government of the Emperor, although not in possession of the text of the Convention between Russia and Prussia, know enough of its purport to form an opinion unfavourable to the prudence and opportuneness of that Convention. The French Government consider that the Government of the King of Prussia have by their conduct revived the Polish Question. They consider this measure all the more imprudent, inasmuch as the Polish Provinces of Prussia are represented as perfectly tranquil. The French Government consider, also, that the Government of Russia should be advised to appease irritation, and calm the discontent prevailing by measures of conciliation and mildness. The French Ambassador has no orders to propose any concert with the British Government, but he is instructed to ask whether the views which he had explained were conformable to those entertained by Her Majesty's Government. I informed him that Her Majesty's Government entertained precisely the views which he had explained on the part of his Government."

This is the despatch which the hon. Gentleman has described as the "condemnation by Lord Russell of the conduct of Russia." As to the despatch of the 27th of February, in which Lord Russell sought for concert and harmonious action with the Emperor of the French, as I have already stated, there is no such despatch in existence. It is a pure invention of the hon. Gentleman's, both as regards substance and date. But now I come to the despatch of the 2nd of March, which was written after the debate to which the right hon. Member for Stroud alluded, and which was the first communication made by Lord Russell to the Russian Government. It is addressed to Lord Napier, and contains these words—

> "Great Britain, therefore, as a party to the Treaty of 1815, and as a Power deeply interested in the tranquillity of Europe, deems itself entitled to express its opinion upon the events now taking place, and is anxious to do so in the most friendly spirit towards Russia, and with a sincere desire to promote the interest of all the parties concerned. Why should not His Imperial Majesty, whose benevolence is generally and cheerfully acknowledged, put an end at once to this bloody conflict by proclaiming mercifully an immediate and unconditional amnesty to his revolted Polish subjects, and at the same time announce his intention to replace without delay his Kingdom of Poland in possession of the political and civil privileges which were granted to it by the Emperor Alexander I., in execution of the stipulations of the Treaty of 1815? If this were done, a National Diet and a National Administration would, in all probability, content the Poles and satisfy European opinion."

Now, this is an interposition of England justified by the engagements existing between herself and Russia, and virtually carries out in moderate and seemly language the Resolution submitted to the House by the hon. Member for King's County. Hon. Members opposite seem to think that I have used strong language in saying that despatches have been misquoted. I will leave them to determine what terms should be used with regard to the statements and quotations of the hon. Member for Horsham. My right hon. Friend the Member for Stroud (Mr. Horsman) was perfectly justified in drawing the inference that Her Majesty's Government had been encouraged to interfere more actively than they might otherwise have done in the Polish Question by the Motion of the hon. Member for the King's County, and by the language used on that occasion by Members on both sides of the House. But before I draw the attention of the House to what took place on the occasion of that debate, let me remind them of a statement made by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Horsham (Mr. Seymour FitzGerald) on that occasion—that he had that morning seen a most distinguished Polish patriot, who had been led to believe that something was about to be done for Poland at last. Sir, I know well who that Polish patriot was, and I am quite willing to admit that he is a distinguished man who has laboured long and ardently in the cause of his country. But what I wish to know is why, at that particular moment, was he invited to see the right hon. Gentleman and the hon. Gentleman opposite; why were hopes then held out to him, as I know they were held out, that something was about to be done for his unfortunate country, and that the Conservative party were prepared to support an energetic Polish policy? I think I know why this was done. It was because hon. Gentlemen opposite believed that, by getting the hon. Member for the King's County (Mr. Hennessy) to bring forward his Motion, and by supporting it with strong speeches, they might commit and embarrass Her Majesty's Ministers. They knew that, with the feelings entertained towards Poland by a large number of Members on this side of the House, the Government could not resist that Motion. And what was the Resolution of the hon. Member for the King's County but a Resolution which pointed to war. It was, in fact, a war Resolution. Yet, what was the language of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) with regard to it—

> "I will venture to give him (Mr. Hennessy) this advice, either to proceed with his Address, or, yielding to what I think is the general feeling of the House, and for the sake of unanimity, to withdraw it, but not on account of false scruples to consent to have the Address which he has proposed in a very spirited manner, and which very effectively represents his sentiments, emasculated in its language or changed in its expressions." [3 *Hansard*, clxix, 942.]

Such were the words of the right hon. Gentleman, who was afraid that the strength and spirit of the Resolution should be weakened by the alteration of a single word. He was for it *pur et simple*. [Mr. DISRAELI: I recommended its withdrawal.] Several hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, such as the Member for Horsham and the noble Lord the Member for Stamford, supported the Resolution with equal warmth, and, if possible, went further in urging a war policy upon the Government. Now, let us see what subsequently happened after the Government, acting upon what appeared to be the unanimous opinion of the House, addressed remonstrances to Russia. The hon. Member for the King's County later in the Session asked for a day to renew his Motion in favour of Poland. The Government gave the 22nd of June for that purpose, and my noble Friend (Viscount Palmerston) was quite prepared to accept the discussion on that day. One or two hon. Gentlemen, without communicating with the noble Lord, rose in their places and deprecated a debate on the subject. The hon. Member for King's County, however, resolved to proceed with his Motion. A division took place, but I have searched in vain in the division list for the names of the right hon. Gentleman and of the Member for Horsham. Where were they? To use a term which has now become almost classical, they had "skedaddled." They left the hon. Gentleman the Member for the King's County to his fate, and after his Motion had been rejected returned to the House to offer some lame excuse for their absence. They had in February supported the hon. Member for the King's County in order to embarrass the Government, by inducing them to believe that a vigorous policy would receive their support; and being in June under the impression that the Government were fairly committed to such a policy, they betrayed the hon. Member (Mr. Hennessy) and the distinguished Polish patriot who had seen the hon. Member for Horsham in the early part of the year, and who had been then led to hope for such vigorous and effective assistance from the Conservative party. Their object had been gained. They had embarrassed the Government, and when they found the country was not for war, they were the foremost to denounce us for having followed the very policy they had a few months before so eloquently advocated.

The second reason assigned for the Emperor of the French refusing to act any further with us in mediating between Denmark and Germany, and in supporting Denmark is, that the answer of my noble Friend to the invitation to the Congress was couched in unbecoming and offensive terms. Now, I will not dwell upon the words used with reference to that invitation by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Disraeli), which have been quoted more than once in this debate—that it was an adroit manœuvre, and ask whether that explanation of the proposal of the Emperor was more courteous than the reply of my noble Friend. But let me ask the House what the Emperor of the French must think when he finds the right hon. Gentleman, who affects to be His Majesty's peculiar friend, declaring before the world that he, the Emperor of the French, had abandoned an old and faithful ally—an ally which had fought and bled for the founder of his dynasty; that he suffered her to be outraged and despoiled; that he quietly looked on whilst solemn treaties were violated; that he permitted the peace of Europe to be broken; and all this out of mere personal pique towards Earl Russell, because he had returned a straightforward and honest answer to his letter? Why, Sir, I will venture to say that any language, however discourteous, which could have been held to the Emperor of the French, would have been infinitely less displeasing, less painful to him, than the language of the right hon. Gentleman—language which affects his honour as a Sovereign and his character as a man. The Emperor of the French had reasons, and weighty reasons, for not taking any step which might have involved him in war with the whole of Germany. He frankly stated those reasons to us, and we have no right to question his motives, or to pretend to be a better judge of the interests of France than he is himself.

Sir, I have listened in vain to the speeches delivered by Gentlemen on the other side for any indication of the policy they would have pursued had they occupied our places, or are prepared to pursue if they succeed to them. They have condemned indiscriminately every act of Ministers, but they have failed to point out in a single case any alternative. We have certainly heard from the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) something about the "honour of England and the peace of the world." But the House and the country will not be satisfied with these vague words. They will want to know definitely, before condemning Her Majesty's Ministers, what policy the hon. Gentlemen opposite are prepared to adopt in the place of that pursued by the Government. As the speeches we have heard here throw no light on this subject, I must look abroad and amongst those who may have some right to offer an opinion on these matters, and endeavour to ascertain what suggestions may have been made by those who are not members of the Opposition in this House. I find, then, that two courses have been proposed which Her Majesty's Government might have adopted. One suggestion is that of Lord Grey, whom I have heard described in this House as one of the greatest statesmen of the time. It is this—that Her Majesty's Government ought to have sent 25,000 or 30,000 men in January last to the Dannewerke. The Germans, he declares, would then have seen that England was in earnest, and would not have ventured to cross the Eider. The other suggestion is, that we should have persevered in what, to use the phrase of the teetotallers, I may term "total abstinence." Now, as regards the first suggestion, let me ask if any reasonable man would have ventured in January last to advise the Government to throw 25,000 or 30,000 men into the Dannewerke in the midst of a northern winter, with the sea ice-bound or storm-bound, with the works themselves very inadequately prepared for defence, and in the excited state of the German people then bent upon war? The proposal would have been really too chimerical to admit of serious discussion. As regards the second suggestion, could we, let me ask, have abstained altogether from interference and mediation? There was no part of the able speech of my right hon. Friend (Mr. Horsman) which appeared to me to deserve greater consideration than the distinction he drew between mediation or friendly intervention, and unnecessary interference in the affairs of a country. I entirely agree with the right hon. Gentleman in his definition of those terms. To unnecessary interference in the affairs of other countries I am as much opposed as any man in this House can be; as much opposed as my hon. Friends the Members for Rochdale and Birmingham (Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright). But mediation to maintain peace, intervention in the interest of peace, is a duty imposed upon every civilized nation; and any Government which, having the opportunity and the power of preventing war, or of restoring peace, refused to mediate or to intervene, would deserve not the praise, but the execration of mankind.

Whilst condemning so sweepingly the policy of Her Majesty's Government in this Danish Question, hon. Gentlemen opposite have permitted that policy to be persevered in, and have not until in these last days of the Session ventured to call upon the House of Commons to pronounce an opinion upon the subject. My right hon. Friend the Member for Stroud (Mr. Horsman) challenged them on this point. The excuse was furnished by the hon. Member for Horsham (Mr. S. FitzGerald) with his usual accuracy as to facts and dates. The other side having been asked for their policy, they answered that they were not bound to furnish a policy to the Government. But, replied my right hon. Friend, at any rate if you so completely disapprove the policy of the Government, why did you not bring forward a Motion condemning it earlier in the Session? Why did you not do so before the meeting of the Conference, the assembling of which you now denounce? The ready answer of the hon. Member for Horsham is, "How could the House have pronounced an opinion upon the policy of the Government when the material papers upon which such an opinion could be founded were only presented to the House at the end of March?" Now, the most material papers, and the only papers delivered in March, were those which contained the despatch addressed to the Powers parties to the Treaty of 1852, asking whether they would concert and co-operate with us in supporting Denmark. I might allude to the fact that the distinguished organ of the hon. Gentleman's party, *The Morning Herald*, which seems to have the means of obtaining very early and exclusive information of what is taking place in the French Foreign Office, mentioned the fact of the existence of that despatch in the month of January, a few days after it had been communicated to the French Government. ["Oh!"] However, as any allusion to this delicate subject seems to disquiet hon. Gentlemen opposite, I will not dwell upon it. But what will the House say when I state, that the only papers delivered in March — the papers which contained this important despatch, upon which the policy of Her Majesty's Government may be said to have turned, and which has been assailed more than any other step taken by my hon. Friend at the head of the Foreign Office—were presented on the 1st of March, and were in the hands of Members on the following day or the day after. So that hon. Members opposite had ample time for preparing and bringing forward any Motion on the policy of the Government, with a full knowledge of what that policy was, long before the meeting of the Conference on the 20th April. [An hon. MEMBER: When were they printed?] The Correspondence only ended in February. It was presented at the end of the month, and in the hands of Members on the 1st or 2nd of March. ["No, no!"]

Although hon. Gentlemen opposite have not ventured to propose a policy different from that pursued by Her Majesty's Government, yet we may perhaps gather from some of their speeches what they would have done had they been in our places. Not from the speech of the right hon. Genleman (Mr. Disraeli) who brought forward this Resolution. He is far too great a master of artifice—far too deeply versed in the mysteries of politics to commit himself to anything whatever, or to show his cards. But there may be some around him who may say what they really feel, and have not the art of the right hon. Gentleman to conceal their thoughts. Let us see what may have fallen from some of them. I think I am in the recollection of the House when I say that the speaker on the other side who received the loudest and most enthusiastic cheers in this debate—cheers that were taken up again and again by the sweet voice of the hon. Member for Knaresborough, to be re-echoed as they died away by the deep utterances of the Member for Wicklow—was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Huntingdon (General Peel). I will not venture to ask whether we may accept this demonstration as any confirmation of certain rumours which have of late been floating about in the political world; but certain it is that the right hon. Gentleman was most vociferously cheered by those seated behind him. He began his speech by declaring that he was no party man. And yet those hon. Gentlemen who thus cheered are not altogether innocent of the suspicion of being party men. He then told us that he was about to give us an after-dinner speech which he had delivered nearly three years ago. He need scarcely have particularly mentioned this fact, as his speech smacked most unmistakably of "after dinner." There was a great deal in it about "humiliation," "degradation," and every other kind of "ation,"—big words, it appeared to me, strung together without any very apparent connection or definite meaning. The right hon. Gentleman having completely exhausted his own stores of eloquence, was compelled to search about him to cull the sweets of English literature in order to find terms sufficiently strong to express all his contempt for, and indignation at, Her Majesty's Government. He could discover nothing that came nearer to his standard of eloquence than an extract from *The Standard.* At least, I presume, from its choice expressions and its refined sentiments, it could only have been taken from that eminent journal. One of the select passages quoted by the right hon. Gentleman was that the British Government "were branded as big-mouthed bullies, who sneaked off at the first show of danger." After he had thoroughly, and to his heart's content, denounced the policy of the Government, the right hon. Gentleman then told us what he would have done. My hon. Friend the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) quoted one passage, but omitted a very material part of it, to which I wish to call the particular attention of the House. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire was so much alarmed at the indiscretion of his right hon. Friend, that he immediately put up the hon. Member for Horsham (Mr. Seymour Fitz Gerald) to deny the correctness of the words quoted by the Member for Bradford. But I happened to have made a note at the time of the principal words used—expressly those relating to a treaty by which it appears we promised to protect Denmark. The right hon. Gentleman's words were—

> "I emphatically declare that you have tarnished the honour of the country. I appeal to every Englishman, let his party be what it may, whether he has not felt the deepest humiliation at seeing a small country, which we have promised to protect, overwhelmed by stronger Powers."

Here the hon. Member for Bradford stopped in his quotation. But what were the words which followed, and which are even more remarkable and more decisive than those I have quoted—

> "If such a thing had occurred in common life, the greatest coward in the world would have rushed forward to protect the weak against the strong without even asking what the cause of quarrel was."

After making two or three other observations, the right hon. Gentleman added—

> "I see no reason why the Foreign Minister should not be guided in the affairs of his office by exactly the same principles."

I ask the House whether these words do not mean a war policy, and a war policy of the most dangerous kind, because founded upon mere sentiment and not upon right? Forsooth, if we see a small country attacked by a great country, we must rush into war in defence of the small country without stopping to inquire whether it is in the right or in the wrong! And such was the announcement of the policy of the right hon. Gentleman (General Peel), which was so loudly cheered by hon. Members around him — far more loudly and enthusiastically cheered than the guarded speech of the right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire.

But who was next put up by Gentlemen opposite to advocate a peace policy, and to denounce the Government for having been too warlike? Why, of all men in the world, the noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Lord Robert Cecil).

If any Member of this House has exhausted words of violence in denouncing the Government for their pacific and cowardly conduct, has asked for war with Germany, with the United States, and I know not with what other country, it is the noble Lord. Why, he is the very Mars of the Opposition gods who are seeking to scale Olympus. The noble Lord is a man of remarkable power, and if he did not show a want of generosity and of fairness to his political opponents, which even exceeds the privileges of a partizan, he would occupy a very high position in this House. The time may come when he may attain that position, to which his abilities undoubtedly entitle him. I regret, therefore, that he should have felt compelled, by the exigencies of his party, to make the speech we heard from him the other evening. I need scarcely ask the House whether he ever made so bad a speech before. It was the very worst I have ever heard from him. And why was this so? Because he appeared, for the first time, as the advocate for peace, and had to support a cause to which his own sentiments and opinions were entirely opposed.

I was surprised to hear my hon. Friend the Member for Rochdale (Mr. Cobden) declare that he had no preference for either party—those who sit on this side of the House, and those who sit on the other; that they were both equally bad, and that he was only disposed to tolerate the present Government because he did not wish to expose the country to the inconvenience of a change. The hon. Member for Horsham (Mr. FitzGerald) warned us that the hon. Member for Rochdale could put an end to us at once if he chose, and plaintively remonstrated with him for inconsistency in condemning Her Majesty's Government and yet giving them his vote. The hon. Gentleman may remember an historical anecdote which may illustrate this apparent anomaly. James on one occasion said to Charles II, "Be warned, brother; it is said that there are those who seek to assassinate you." "Brother," Charles replied, "I much doubt whether there be any to be found who would kill me to put you in my place." Bad as we are said to be, I doubt whether there be any one, even my hon. Friend the Member for Rochdale, who would wish to see the hon. Member and his friends in our places. But I confess to have heard with no little astonishment his declaration that there was no difference between the two parties in this House. I should have least expected this assertion from him. In the course of his able speech he pointed out how the prosperity and wealth of England had been developed of late years. Our trade, he said, had increased more during the last twenty-five years than it had during the previous 1,000. Let me appeal to my hon. Friend, who after all wishes to be an impartial though a severe critic, and ask him whether those who sit around me have not had some share in promoting the prosperity and wealth of the country—whether they have not been the means of giving to it some beneficent legislation — whether they have not been the instruments of making treaties with foreign nations which have conduced to this result, availing themselves for the purpose of his abilities and experience? But still more, have not hon. Gentlemen opposite advocated a policy with regard to the United States which is altogether at variance with the opinions and sentiments of my hon. Friend? Have not Her Majesty's Government preserved peace with the United States, in spite of the taunts of those hon. Gentlemen; and should we not have been at war at this moment with the United States if we had yielded to their counsels and their menaces? But if my hon. Friend feels no satisfaction in the past policy of Her Majesty's Government, has he no fear as to the policy of the hon. Gentlemen opposite in the future if they should succeed in their attempt to overthrow the Government and should come into power? As regards the policy hitherto pursued by Her Majesty's Ministers in the Danish Question there would be no change, as hon. Gentlemen opposite have declared that they are prepared to follow the same policy. ["No!"] They now cry "No!" but I understood them to say very clearly that they had no objection to our policy, which has been a peace policy, but that they object to the manner in which it has been carried out. Let it, therefore, now be understood by the country, that hon. Members opposite would reverse our policy. But there is even a more important question. How are hon. Gentlemen opposite committed as regards the United States of America? It is, I believe, not right to see, or at least to draw attention to what passes in this

House beyond the immediate floor upon which we are assembled; otherwise I might point to the anxious and eager faces of those who have been listening to this debate—of those who are eagerly watching for its result, hoping that it may end in the overthrow of the Government. And why? I will tell you. The very moment you come into office the attempt will be made to send rams out of Liverpool and to embroil this country in a quarrel with the United States. You have committed yourselves upon this subject. You have maintained in this House and against the Government—you have endeavoured even to carry a Resolution against us in support of your opinion—the right of Confederate agents to fit out rams and ships of war in our harbours to wage war against the United States. It may be very distasteful to you at this moment to be reminded of these things, but neither the House nor the country has forgotten them. It is remembered that the highest legal authority on your side of the House, a Gentleman who would be your Attorney General, if he would not hold even higher office, has committed himself in debate to an opinion, that the fitting out at Liverpool of the rams which we stopped and prevented, was legal, and that our conduct was illegal and unconstitutional. You say that this is not the question. I contend that when you declare that your Resolutions mean a general Vote of Want of Confidence in the Government, that their conduct in this important question, involving peace or war with the United States, is a part of that question.

What great crime, let me ask, has Earl Russell committed that, because of him the House should be called upon to eject the Ministry, and put hon. Gentlemen opposite in their places, and that this vast risk to the peace of the country that I have pointed out should be incurred? I do not contend that mistakes may not have been committed in this Danish matter. Let me admit, for the sake of argument, that they have been; and let me ask any man who has had either, in public or private life, to carry through long, arduous, and anxious negotiations, whether he could look back and say that one thing might not have been left undone, or that another might not have been better done? My noble Friend (Earl Russell) during these most difficult and delicate negotiations, which have unfortunately ended in the breaking up of the Conference, has had, I will boldly say, but one object in view—to preserve the peace of Europe by inculcating justice and moderation upon those who sought to appeal to arms, and by endeavouring to maintain the faith of solemn treaties and engagements. If any mistakes have been made, they are infinitesimally small when compared with the great end which my noble Friend has laboured most earnestly, most loyally, most indefatigably to attain. It is infinitely to his credit that he has never been discouraged, that he has never quailed before difficulties which would have appalled most men, and that under the most adverse circumstances he has never abandoned the attempt to preserve Europe and this country from the horrors of war. Even admitting that, as you assert, mistakes have been committed, do mistakes, let me ask, lower the influence of a great country in the councils of the world? Is it by striving to maintain peace, is it by inculcating moderation, is it by declaring our respect for treaties, is it by warning those who are about to break them of the fatal results of violating solemn engagements, that that influence is lowered? No, Sir, the influence of England could be lowered by no such means. But I will tell you what is likely to lower it. It is such speeches as we have heard in the course of this debate from hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, speeches which tell foreign Governments and foreign peoples that our country is humiliated and degraded; it is, to use a homely yet expressive phrase, by fouling our own nest; it is by proclaiming to the world that an English Minister and an English Ministry can be both dishonourable and cowardly, that you can lower the character of England and destroy her just influence in the councils of Europe. Condemn the Ministry if you will, but I entreat you do not degrade the country. You say that such is your object, that you do not mean this Resolution to be anything more than a Vote of Want of Confidence in the Government. If that be the case, why do you not withdraw it, and propose such a form of words as will express your meaning without touching the honour of the country? Remember that this Resolution, declaring that the just influence of England has been lowered, will, if carried, be branded to all time upon the records of the British Parliament. Remember that it will be there to tell posterity, that through the conduct of my noble Friend this country has been so humiliated. And yet, that the just influence of England has been lowered I utterly deny; and no man who holds dear the honour of his country, and knows the position she holds in the world, will venture to assert it. I look forward, therefore, with confidence to the verdict of the House and of the country upon this issue. I cannot believe that after the statements I have made, that after I have shown how Earl Russell has been misrepresented and misunderstood, how unjustly he has been accused and how grievously maligned, the House and the country will condemn a statesman and a Minister who has laboured beyond all other men, in truthfulness and sincerity, in spite of taunts and threats, and has laboured successfully during a period of almost unparalleled difficulty and danger, to secure for his country the inestimable blessings of peace.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: Sir, I do not wonder that the House—or at least a part of it—should have received with cheers the first defence that has been made for the despatches of the Government. ["Oh, oh!"] I repeat it—the first defence that has been made throughout this debate of the despatches of the Government. It might be supposed from the speech of the hon. Gentleman, that the whole world has been under a delusion as to the conduct of the Foreign Secretary, that there has been no feeling either in England or in Europe that this country has directed against other nations threats which it had no intention of enforcing—indeed, according to the hon. Member, they were not meant as threats, though they bore that appearance in order to influence the conduct of foreign Governments.

The hon. Gentleman commenced his speech by going back to a very early period of these transactions. In that I do not intend to imitate him. The hon. Gentleman went back to what took place in 1848 and 1853; but it seems to me I should not advance the cause which I am about to defend if I were to enter upon the transactions of that early period. The time from which, as it appears to me, the real question at issue between us lies is September, 1862. The noble Lord at the head of the Foreign Office at that time wrote a despatch—I care not where it was written—which for the first time gave Germany to understand that England was about to take her side in the contest which had been going on so long with respect to Schleswig-Holstein. From the 24th of September, 1862, dates the beginning of the renewed agitation throughout Germany, when the Germans supposed that England was about to support them. But the noble Lord was not content with that interference, by which he created a new idea of the policy of England. A little later he gave encouragement to Denmark, and offered her advice as to the course she should take, not only after but before the Patent of March was decreed. This is shown to be the interpretation which was put upon it by the Danish Minister. You will find that M. Hall attributes to the noble Lord the advice under which the King acted when the letters Patent were issued, the words, "earnestly advised." The hon. Gentleman has made grave charges against my right hon. Friend (Mr. Disraeli) with respect to the extracts from the despatches; but I tell him that those charges are utterly unfounded. ["Oh, oh!"] The Chancellor of the Exchequer sneers; but I say that a quotation is not garbled when the page of the book in which the quotation is found is mentioned, and while the right hon. Gentleman opposite held the book in his hand at the same moment. If there was any passage which he wished to have read, and he did not say so at the time, it must have been that with that subtlety and cunning for which he is distinguished, he intentionally let slip the opportunity for the purpose of subsequently making this charge of misquotation. ["Oh, oh!" *and Cheers.*] The right hon. Gentleman, using language which was not borne out by fact, spoke of "falsified extracts;" but the extracts were perfectly correct, they were complete in themselves, and I venture to say that no man can prove that the passages cited by the right hon. Gentleman opposite the other day, and those which have been quoted by the hon. Member today, have the slightest effect in weakening the force of the quotations used by my right hon. Friend. The extracts quoted by my right hon. Friend gave the whole tenor of what was done, and I will before I sit down prove that that is the case. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Layard) wished to quote some despatches which were not before us. He spoke of seven folio volumes in his possession, to which he was anxious to refer. But I do not think there has been any want of papers. We have received not only the papers which really bear upon the subject, but even extracts from newspapers, despatches from every petty State in Germany, everything in short which tends to embarrass and confuse; in fact, such a mass of papers is before us as renders it very difficult for any man to make a selection. With respect to the tenor and bearing of these papers, I need not appeal to the opinion of hon. Members on this side of the House; for while the hon. Gentleman taunted us with the tone of the speeches made on this side, he took good care not to allude to the speeches made by hon. Gentlemen on the other side. What did the hon. Member for Rochdale (Mr. Cobden) say of the diplomacy of the Government? He said that our diplomacy was "an anarchy" and disgraced us in Europe; that we could not at this time approach a foreign country on a question of foreign politics without being looked upon with a want of consideration and a mistrust. And then nothing could exceed the strength of the language used by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stroud (Mr. Horsman). He said there was not a State in Europe—east, west, north, or south—in which the lost influence of England was not regarded with sorrow, derision, or contempt.

MR. HORSMAN: I said that was the result of our diplomacy last year with regard to Poland.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: Yes, but then followed the words, "that we had taught the Germans that we were a nation of bullies, who were willing always to bully, but would never fight."

MR. HORSMAN: I did not use those words. The word "bully" never came out of my mouth. ["Oh, oh!"] ["Yes, yes."]

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: I do not wish to put words which he did not use into the right hon. Gentleman's mouth, but I am quoting from a report which I believe to be correct. Sir, the right hon. Gentleman while he spoke was much cheered from certain quarters. I was myself struck by the enthusiastic cheers with which the conclusion of his speech was received by hon. Gentlemen who sit behind the Ministers. And yet he treated those Ministers as a master treats a spaniel in disgrace; he flogged them unmercifully, but they cheered him after all, because he ended by promising them that which they believe the best of all things—his vote. Having got a promise of his vote they had got everything they required. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Horsman) told us that we on this side were responsible, and that we had let the time pass by in which we ought to have interfered. The right hon. Gentleman, with a sort of dignified humility which was almost touching, said, "I, even I, the great censor of both sides of the House, have neglected my duty. I, too, have been negligent of my duty; we have all been negligent; let us all forget what we have done; let us forget how much evil has been committed in consequence, and give Ministers all the benefit of the past." But the right hon. Gentleman says that even he was silent. Why, Sir, never was a Gentleman more fitted to bring forward a question of the kind. He could compromise no party, because he has none to compromise. He could compromise no other Gentleman but himself, for a more independent or isolated Gentleman never existed in the House of Commons. But the right hon. Gentleman dictated to Europe what was the right course, for he put a Motion on the paper on this subject as far back as the 12th April; but from that until the present time he has never brought it forward. Was it owing to the forbearance of the right hon. Gentleman that he has not attacked the Government? Not at all. The right hon. Gentleman has given the House abundant evidence of his powers of attack on other occasions. Any one who remembers the bitter language which has fallen from the right hon. Gentleman when attacking the occupants of the Treasury Benches, knows that he is not shy of attacking under certain circumstances. But this Motion of his was to the effect that we were bound by the Treaty of 1852, and that Her Majesty ought not to be advised to give her sanction to anything that would compromise the integrity of Denmark without it being made known to Parliament. But what is the right hon. Gentleman going to do? Having regretted in his Motion the violation of the Treaty of 1852, which was to have maintained the integrity of Denmark, he is now going to vote for the Government which has abandoned the integrity of Denmark. He told us that we had plenty of opportunities for bringing forward the subject, and the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Layard), though I called his attention to the mistake, stated that the papers had been delivered by the beginning of March; and yet the noble Lord, under whom he serves, on the 18th day of March gave as a reason for having a Motion on the subject put off that the papers had not been laid upon the table. I called the attention of the hon. Gentleman to the subject, and gave him the opportunity of correcting himself; but he would not be corrected—he persisted that we had all the papers in our possession on the 1st of March. The facts are that, on the 18th of March, Lord Ellenborough wished to bring forward a Motion on the subject of Denmark; and what did Earl Russell say? He said, "I trust that the noble Earl, on grounds of public policy, will postpone this Motion until all the papers have been laid upon the table."

MR. LAYARD: I said nothing of the kind. ["Order!"]

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: The hon. Gentleman has used language, with respect to Gentleman on this side of the House, that does no credit either to him or the Government he represents; and now, when the hon. Gentleman is convicted of a misstatement which has been made in the hearing of the House, he gets up and interrupts, though my Friends sat still when he made a calumnious statement—["Order, order!"]

MR. LAYARD: I rise to Order. I move that the words just used by the hon. Gentleman be taken down. I refer to the words, "calumnious statement." ["Order!" "Chair!"]

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: If I am out of Order, I shall be told so by you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: There did not appear to me to be anything calling for my interference.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: I rise to Order. ["Oh, oh!" "Chair, chair!"] I apprehend that it is a fundamental rule governing the debates in this House, that motives shall not be imputed to Members. I appeal to you, Sir, whether, when one Member imputes to another that he has made a calumnious statement, it does not imply that he made this statement with the motive of distorting the truth? [*Loud cries of* "Order!"]

MR. DISRAELI: I rise to speak to the point of Order. Having listened to this debate, I understood that the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs charged Gentlemen on this side of the House with falsification; and Gentlemen on this side of the House, though conscious that they did not merit the charge, yet not wishing to disturb the order of the debate, were content to remain quiet until the proper time should arrive to repel the charge in terms befitting the accusation, and to express with respect to the imputation that sense which every English gentleman would feel. I maintain, therefore, that the opinion you, Sir, have given is really the proper one in the position in which the House is placed; and that the hon. Gentleman near me was perfectly justified in using the term to which exception is taken after so un-Parliamentary and so indecorous an expression had fallen from the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER [who was received with *loud cries of* "Order!" *and* "Chair, chair!"] said, considering, Sir, that when the right hon. Gentleman rose to address the House there was immediate silence on this side, I trust I shall be permitted to say what I have to say in peace, so long as I confine myself to the question of Order. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli), as I understood him, founds his justification of what has just taken place in point of Order upon an allegation made by him, that my hon. Friend (Mr. Layard) had charged Gentlemen opposite with falsification. In the first place, I am not aware that that is the case ["Oh, oh!"]—that the allegation is correct in point of fact ["Oh, oh!"]; but permit me to say that if disorderly words were used—which I do not admit, because I am not conscious of it—by my hon. Friend (Mr. Layard), it was the duty of Gentlemen who thought them disorderly to do that which was done by my hon. Friend (Mr. Layard), to call the attention of the House and the Chair to the matter at the moment when the words were spoken. But I apprehend that I am safe in laying it down that a breach of order, much less a mere allegation of a breach of order, committed by one speaker, will not justify a subsequent speaker in violating order. ["Oh, oh!"] I hope it will be clearly understood ["Order!" "Chair!"] whether the imputation of calumnious statement is or is not to be henceforward within the liberty of Parliamentary discussion. ["Oh, oh!"]

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON: I think it right, after what has fallen from the right hon. Gentleman, to state that I myself heard—and I must say heard with feelings of deep indignation—the word "falsification" from the lips of the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs; and at the time I said across the House that the word was too bad. I say that if the hon. Gentleman is to be allowed to accuse us on this side of falsification, we have a right to call that word calumnious. After hearing all that has passed, I believe that the Speaker has ruled most properly.

Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE: I rise to speak to Order, and to make a respectful and moderate appeal to the House. I do so, Sir, in support of your just authority. After you were appealed to by an hon. Member in this House, and after you had laid down the law as you did in your usual straightforward manner, I put it to the House whether we are not imperilling our just influence in the affairs of Europe and this country if, when you have given your decision that a speaker, on whatever side of the House he may be, is perfectly in order, any other Member is to get up and dispute your decision, and endeavour to overrule it. Such, Sir, is not my idea of the way of preserving order, and I am surprised that the Leader of this House should endeavour to bring your authority into discredit. ["Cheers" *and* "Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that the hon. Member for Leominster (Mr. Gathorne Hardy) would be the last man in this House to impute motives to any man. Certainly, the debate has been a very warm and exciting one; but it would be putting the House in a false position if heated language on one side is to be a justification for language passing the bounds of order on the other. Undoubtedly, any words imputing motives to an hon. Member are contrary to the rules of this House. What has passed in explanation of this matter has, in some degree, altered the case. I mean, it is now alleged that language which rather passes the ordinary rules of debate has been used in consequence of similar language having been used previously. The debate has certainly been a heated one, but I confess, as it was going on, there did not appear to me any necessity for interposition on my part. I trust that the hon. Member for Leominster did not intend to impute motives, which would be of an un-Parliamentary nature by his statement. It did not appear to me to be necessary under the circumstances that I should interfere. However, after what has occurred, I trust the House will return to a calmer spirit, and that no exciting language will be used on any side which passes the proper bounds of debate.

Mr. LAYARD (who was imperfectly heard) was understood to say—I wish to express regret to my hon. Friend if I have occasioned any misunderstanding. I did not use the word "falsification" as my own word, but as quoting the expression of my right hon. Friend ["The Chancellor of the Exchequer"]. If the hon. Member took that as an accusation on my part, I beg to offer him my assurance that it was no expression on my part.

Mr. HORSMAN: I wish to speak upon another point of Order. ["Oh, oh!"] The hon. Member for Leominster a few minutes ago holding in his hands the Motion of which I gave notice in March ["Order!" "Chair!"], has incorrectly described it. Let him read the exact terms of my Motion.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: I trust that neither now nor on any other occasion shall I be wanting in respect to the Chair, and to the character and dignity of this House, but I cannot help saying that, on the first night of the debate, language was used by the Chancellor of the Exchequer—[*Cheers.*]

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER rose to Order. The hon. Gentleman had no right to refer to what had been said on a former occasion. [*Cries of* "Same Debate!"]

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: I have only to observe that, without imputing motives either to the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or to the hon. Gentleman opposite, what I meant to say, and should still say if the charge had not been retracted, is that to accuse this side of the House of falsifying anything is a calumny, by whomsoever it be uttered. I repeat that in saying so I do not impute motives. It is not necessary. A calumny may be uttered for various reasons without the person who does it being at all influenced by a desire to depreciate or injure any one. The statement made was one which wounds the honour of Gentlemen on this side of the House. The hon. Gentleman had no need to apologize to me; I ask for no apology. I do not attribute either to the right hon. Gentleman opposite, or to the Under Secretary, anything wilful, nor anything except that in the heat of debate they used words which wound the honour and feelings of Gentlemen on this side of the House.

I will now, Sir, endeavour to resume my remarks at the point where I left off. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Horsman) has called me to order because I did not read in full all his Resolution. I should have been very glad to read it all if I had not been unwilling to detain the House. [Mr. Horsman: Read the last paragraph.] I will do so; it is as follows:—

"In the opinion of the House, Her Majesty ought not to be advised to give Her assent to any new engagements affecting the integrity and independence of Denmark until these engagements have been made known to Parliament."

I believe I read that already, or stated the substance to the House. Well, I was about to say that the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary had stated that the House was in possession of the papers on this subject on the 1st of March. [Mr. LAYARD: I said they were presented then.] And the right hon. Gentleman opposite had asserted that there was no objection on that side to the discussion taking place at any period. It has been made a taunt to hon. Gentlemen on this side, that they did not use the opportunities offered during the Session of bringing this question before the House. Before Easter, however, the Government deprecated any such discussion. Let us see what Lord Russell said on this subject. The noble Lord the Foreign Secretary said that a discussion at that time would be liable to misapprehension by the parties engaged in the war, and might "tend to the public injury, and prevent the success of the negotiations" then going on. That was on the 18th March. In consequence of that declaration, Lord Ellenborough did not proceed with his Motion, although he said he did not agree with Earl Russell's reasons. During the recess, we received a further instalment of papers; and on the 4th of April the House resumed. On the 19th of April, the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Bernal Osborne) brought forward his Motion in regard to Denmark, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bucks has been called to account for moving the Previous Question on that occasion. But what did the hon. Member the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs say then? Why, he objected to the subject being discussed within a few hours of the meeting of the Conference, and said that the debate ought to have been avoided at a time when he was tongue-tied, although, under other circumstances, he should have been able to give an answer to the hon. Member for Liskeard. Moreover, the noble Lord at the head of the Government acknowledged that there was a great deal of weight and justice in the reasons alleged by my right hon. Friend for not proceeding with the debate. Let us not then be told that we have condoned these things, and have become responsible for them. It is clear that the Government, who themselves deprecated discussion, have no right to complain of us for following a similar course; above all, let not the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Horsman), who has himself neglected his duty, tell us that we ought to have brought on a discussion. What we did we did at the request of the Government. Even within the last few days, did we not hear Earl Russell say that much credit was due to Lord Derby for his forbearance in abstaining from discussion while the negotiations were going on? But did the Opposition neglect their duty in respect of these things? I say no. Did they not continually keep the question before the House? Did they not persistently endeavour to obtain information as to the state of affairs? It has been said that we ought to have known what was taking place, for there was such and such a thing in the newspapers. There were, however, no documents, or but incomplete ones, on the table to which we could refer, and I say that the House would have been placed in an utterly false position if they had attempted to deal with such a question, merely upon information derived from the newspapers. We are all sufficiently acquainted with the noble Lord at the head of the Government, and the answers he has given to several questions on this subject during the Session, to know very well what he would have said if the foreign policy of the Government had been criticized on the strength of unofficial statements in the public journals. This is really the first opportunity we have had of raising the question. When the Government desired to go into the Conference we refrained from interference. We gave them every opportunity of carrying the negotiations to a successful close. It was our desire that the dispute might be brought to a peaceful and honourable termination, and that an European war should, if possible, be averted. No one, Sir, would have rejoiced more than I should if the Government had been able, by means of the Conference, to bring the question to a satisfactory conclusion. At length we are in possession of the papers, and the negotiations are over, and at once we ask for the opinions of the House. We are told, however, that we must not merely discuss the past, but that we must deal with the future. To-night we have had a good illustration of our means of framing a policy. The hon. Gentleman opposite has just told us that there are seven folio volumes of despatches, full of matter so important that he was anxious to quote some of them — and yet we have never seen any of them. All the despatches and every kind of information *in extenso* are in the hands of the Government, but the papers before us constitute only the Ministerial case. These papers, these mere extracts, tell us all which cannot be concealed; but they form, as I say, merely the case for the Government. Her Majesty's Ministers are in possession of information infinitely beyond what any one of us can have ; and we, the Opposition, are therefore justified in declining to propound a policy for the future when we have not at our command the materials on which it can alone be based.

Then, we have been asked why we do not bring forward a Vote of Want of Confidence. The hon. Member (Mr. Layard) must have an odd notion of what is a Vote of Want of Confidence if he thinks this is not one. What is our address ? We say the Government have mismanaged affairs, impaired the honour of the country, failed to carry out their own avowed policy, and reduced England to a position where her influence is ineffectual to maintain peace. Does not that mean we have had enough of your mal-administration, and would be rid of you ? If that is not a Vote of Want of Confidence, then I do not know what is. The hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Layard) quoted a passage from the speech of the gallant General near me (General Peel), which was so justly applauded the other evening ; but the extract conveyed very little of the sense of that speech. I appeal to the hon. Gentlemen the Members for Rochdale and Birmingham, who were present when it was delivered, whether the tone and spirit of that speech were not on the side of peace, and whether, if a similar spirit governed our foreign policy, it would not be a guarantee for the maintenance of the peace of Europe ? In reviewing the course of the debate it is rather curious that the hon. Gentleman should have omitted all mention of the speech of the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley). Did not the hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. Forster) say he agreed with much that fell from the gallant General, but that he was ready to endorse every word spoken by the noble Lord ? What was the effect of these speeches ? In these speeches the Government were told that they had discredited England by their foreign policy, because they had threatened and had not carried out their threats, they had promised and not fulfilled their promises, they had given advice, had seen it accepted, and had then deserted those who took it. These things were said in these two speeches, and these two speeches received the assent of the hon. Member for Bradford. But did not the hon. Member for Bradford, and also the hon. Member for Rochdale, also condemn in strong terms the policy of the Government ? So did the right hon. Gentleman opposite, and so did the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck.) The watchful "Tear'em," to use the hon. and learned Gentleman's description of himself, always looking after British honour, sprung upon the Foreign Secretary, tore from him every rag of reputation, and exposed him in all his nakedness to the House and the country. The hon. and learned Gentleman criticized the conduct of the Government with a contempt and bitterness which were rather inconsistent with his announcement that he intended to vote with them. Yet I hardly wonder at it. Fourteen years ago the busy watchdog was the means of saving the noble Lord at the head of the Government from an awkward dilemma, and he has not forgotten his old master. He may snarl and bite at the heels of the bad company among which he sees the noble Lord, but he is ready to follow him into the division lobby, grumbling, barking, and snapping, as he does so, while the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Horsman) sneaks in behind. It is not only admitted by all the unofficial speakers who have taken part in this debate that England occupiers an embarrassing position, but a similar impression prevails throughout the Continent of Europe. Who is it who has brought her to such a position, and how did the Government find her when they entered office ? According to their own statement, up to the middle of last year we were in union with France and Russia, and on friendly terms with every part of the Continent; and we know what was the case when it was found, on the meeting of Parliament this year, that Her Majesty's Government were unable to give in the Royal Speech the usual assurances of friendly relations with Foreign Powers. We say you have failed in the preservation of peace by your constant meddling. I have already said that the meddling began early. In September the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary wrote one letter, in November another, and on the 1st of April M. Hall sent him the decree which had been passed on the 30th of March. Accompanying that decree M. Hall sent a statement describing the circumstances under which it was passed, and the noble Lord has never dissented from that statement. What does M. Hall say? I hope some hon. Member will take a copy of the blue-book in his hand and see that I do not omit anything in the quotations I am about to make. M. Hall speaks of the decree as an act which Lord Russell had originally advised, and he then goes on to say—

> "His Lordship will see by this document that, having decided on taking the step which had been so earnestly suggested to us, the King's Government has done it frankly and without reservation."

Now what was the first step to be taken in order to enable the Danes to come to terms? It was the repeal of this very decree which had been passed at the earnest suggestion of Lord Russell. Is not that one of the things for which the hon. Member for Rochdale denounced the Government —namely, their meddling in the affairs of foreign States, and their constant advice as to what form of Constitution is best suited to the subjects of another country? [Mr. LAYARD intimated dissent.] The hon. Member for Southwark appears to dissent from this statement, and implies that I am stating something that is inaccurate. Now, the first despatch from Lord Russell after the receipt of that from M. Hall is on the 22nd of April, when the noble Lord wrote to Sir Augustus Paget—

> "I am informed that the French Minister at Copenhagen will be instructed to press upon the Danish Government the expediency, more especially at the present time, of acting with the greatest prudence and caution in regard to the Holstein question."—No. 2, 48.

There is not one word by which the noble Lord refuses to acknowledge what had been done, although M. Hall had stated in plain terms, that the noble Lord had advised and suggested the decree. Her Majesty's Government, therefore, may be fairly accused of having caused Denmark to commit a fatal error.

The hon. Gentleman has called our attention to different despatches which were written in the course of last summer—on the 31st of July, the 31st of August, and the 18th of September, and I think the House, notwithstanding the hon. Gentleman's denial, will be of opinion that the passages which the hon. Gentleman has quoted, and which occur in all those despatches, such as they are, are all of them threats. The hon. Gentleman says—

> "Upon the 18th of January, 1864, we knew that France would not give material assistance to Denmark, and from that time I defy any man to find one word in the despatches threatening Germany."

Then up to that time he does not deny that there were plenty of threatening words. When the hon. Member says that after the 18th of January no threatening language was used, he must necessarily mean that the language employed before was of a different character. But if the hon. Gentleman makes such a denial, such is not the general opinion of Europe. I find in these blue-books a letter of the 13th of February, which shows how lately threats were employed, and that is long after the period when the hon. Gentleman tells us the noble Lord ceased to use threats. That letter contains an official statement that up to the last moment the English Government had done their utmost by means of strong representations, and even by "direct threats," to prevent the German Powers from making any serious onward movement in their enterprise. It is plain, therefore, if no threats were used, that Germany, Denmark, and the unofficial speakers on the Ministerial side of the House have all misconceived the meaning and object of the despatches.

The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer said it was a mistake to suppose that France and Russia had ever ceased to act cordially with us; and the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Layard) has repeated to-night that France and Russia have acted cordially with us throughout. Then how does it happen that a better conclusion has not been arrived at? But how is that statement reconcilable with what the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary said in the January of this year? The noble Lord, with that sanguine feeling which makes difficulties so light to him, stated on the 9th of January this year that "the difficulties in the way of the settlement of the differences between Germany and Denmark were much less grave than they were supposed to be;" and he added that if France, Great Britain, Russia, and Sweden were to act cordially and strenuously together, Germany and Denmark might be reconciled on terms honourable to all parties. After that admission I wonder at the boldness with which the hon. Member opposite has said that there has been no coldness on the part of France and Russia. Yet the Continent of Europe saw your isolation, and the despatches sent home to the noble Lord by our Ministers at foreign Courts ought to have been a warning to him. Over and over again Sir Alexander Malet told him what the real state of English influence on the Continent was. Our Minister at Frankfort at first naturally thought that the strong despatches of the noble Lord were likely to have a considerable effect upon the Diet; and on the 1st of October, referring to the vote which was to be taken upon that day, he said there could be no doubt that the language held by the noble Lord would produce a salutary effect. Sir Alexander Malet said—

> "I fully expect that the vote will be taken to-day, as the members of the Diet all have their instructions, and there is not time to ask for fresh ones from their Governments. There can, however, be no doubt that the language held by your Lordship will cause all the forms of delay which the Diet's rules allowed to be observed; and though irritation will be felt at the intervention, especially by the smaller States, I am convinced that a great and salutary effect will be produced."—No. 3, 148.

But on the same day—the 1st of October—Sir Alexander Malet wrote another letter to the noble Lord, in which he said—

> "I have just learnt that the Diet's vote on the report on the Danish Duchies has taken place. The three weeks allowed to Denmark for notifying compliance with the demands of the Diet thus voted will reckon from the date of the communication of the protocol to the States directed to enforce the execution."—No. 3, 149.

So much for the effect of English diplomacy at that period. But what was it later? On the 8th of January in this year, Sir Alexander Malet, wiser after the experience of October the 1st, again wrote to the noble Lord, stating—

> "I am bound to say that there is a wonderful indifference to our representations, while they are at the same time resented as interfering with a cherished project. There is an absolute persuasion that England will not interfere materially, and our counsels, regarded as unfriendly, have no weight."—No. 4, 416.

It was Germany that you were threatening, but you did not tell your threats to Denmark. You only gave her promises and advice. Are we not, then, to say that the just influence of England has been lowered, and that our advice had no weight whatever in inducing the Diet to pause? They passed their vote on the very day they received our remonstrances. Nor did Austria and Prussia attach more importance to our counsels than the Diet. There is a very remarkable despatch from Sir Andrew Buchanan to Lord Russell, on the 14th of December, 1863, in which he says—

> "I regret also, with reference to the representations which I have made by your Lordship's order to M. de Bismark during the last fortnight, on other subjects connected with the question, that I have failed in obtaining a compliance with the wishes of Her Majesty's Government. I was instructed to suggest that time should be allowed Lord Wodehouse to negotiate with the Danish Government before the Federal Execution is carried into effect. The Execution will take place in six days after his Lordship's arrival at Copenhagen. I was instructed to express the hope of Her Majesty's Government that no disputed territory on the frontier or at Rendsburg would be occupied. Rendsburg will be occupied, with the exception of that portion which is on the north bank of the Eider. I was instructed to state that the Execution should only take place for Federal obligations violated. The Execution will take place (I am willing, however, to admit, on grounds of expediency, to avoid a question of serious domestic embarrassment in Germany) in virtue of a decree of the German Diet, against which Her Majesty's Government have formally remonstrated at Frankfort, by a despatch communicated officially to the Governments of Austria and Prussia."—No. 4, 391.

What do you see there? Prussia treats you with the utmost contempt. On every one of the propositions which you make to her she immediately announces that she does not mean to act, and she tells you she is going to do as she pleases. But England had a policy. The noble Lord the Foreign Secretary in one of his letters, dated December 1, lays it down that England's policy is "to advise." It has been said that he would be prepared to take the command of the Channel fleet at a moment's notice, and so he actually undertakes to advise how Federal Execution should be carried out, and what the German troops should do. On the 1st December he writes that the line of policy of Her Majesty's Government is to

> "Advise Austria, Prussia, and the other Powers who signed the Treaty of London, to adhere to their engagements, and to advise Denmark to observe all the engagements she has taken to Germany."—No. 3, 293.

On the 8th of the same month, the noble Lord, writing to Lord Bloomfield, observes—

> "As the Diet seems determined to proceed with the proposed Execution in Holstein, Her Majesty's Government consider it to be of great importance

> that the objects of that measure should be distinctly defined, and that it should be strictly limited to the enforcement within the Duchy of Holstein of the rights which the German Confederation alleges to have been disregarded by the Danish Government. In conformity with this principle, the Federal commanders should be strictly prohibited from extending the Execution to any parts of the frontier in respect to which any doubt may exist as to whether it belongs to the Duchy of Holstein; and that, more particularly at Rendsburg, no doubtful or mixed territory should be occupied by the Federal troops. In the same manner the Federal commanders should be enjoined to repress any attempt to throw off the authority of the King-Duke, who at the present time is in *de facto* possession of the Duchy, and not to sanction or allow insurrectionary cries to be raised with a view of exciting the population to renounce their allegiance."—No. 3, 443.

I refer to that to show what the Government were doing. They were meddling with everything that was being done; and if France or Russia gave a cold acquiescence in their proceedings, that does not relieve them of the responsibility due to the prominent part they played. We have heard a good deal of a celebrated iron-clad in America; but the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary is the political "Monitor" of Europe. He seems to be impervious to shot and shell in a diplomatic contest; and while everybody in Europe is wondering how he can have the audacity to expose himself after the fearful battering he has received, out he sallies with the same self-complacent demeanour as ever, as if utterly insensible to all the attacks which have ripped open his plates and left him a sheer wreck.

With respect to the despatch of September, relating that General Fleury declared on the part of France that no material assistance would be given to Denmark, it is said that a letter was immediately sent to Paris by Her Majesty's Government, to ascertain whether General Fleury had spoken according to instructions, and that M. Drouyn de Lhuys stated that no statement had been made by France which would not leave France perfectly free. But all that that amounts to is that France declared her policy while she reserved her liberty to take what course she pleased, just as she had reserved it on a later occasion, when, as you admit, she finally declined to interfere by arms. In what sense does that qualify the facts stated by my right hon. Friend (Mr. Disraeli), or diminish the force of the expressions of General Fleury, which the French Government never denied, but rather confirmed? M. Drouyn de Lhuys plainly showed, at that time as on others, that France was unwilling to be a coadjutor in anything that would involve going to war on behalf of Denmark. And what did France say about the proposal of the Conference? Why, that if all the other Powers went into the Conference she would not decline to go into it too, although she thought it would be quite useless. Does such a frigid, formal acquiescence as that imply her cordial concurrence in the proposal, or show that it was her proposal as much as Her Majesty's Government's? I say it was very well known what France would do; and Russia, too, never held out any prospect that she would interfere by force.

It is denied that threats were used towards the German Powers, but the statement that after a certain time there were no more threats is an admission that there had been threats previously. A despatch communicated to Earl Russell a statement from M. Bille, that it was understood at Frankfort that, in case an attack was made on Jutland, Denmark would not be left without support. That despatch was answered by Earl Russell, but he did not deny its effect. ["Hear!"] I am not aware of any passage in which Earl Russell says that the statement, as made by M. Bille, was unfounded. The hon. Attorney General seems to dispute this, and will have an opportunity of setting me right if I have failed to observe the comment of Earl Russell. But we were told that, after the 8th of January, there was nothing to show that the Government threatened or were inclined in any way for war. Now, there is a despatch from Earl Russell to Lord Napier on the 10th of February, which shows that when it was written the Government had not made up their minds that they would not go to war alone for Denmark. He says—

> "With respect to the two questions put by Prince Gortschakoff, and reported in your despatch of the 26th ultimo, in regard to 'concert' and 'co-operation,' the Prince must see that it would be premature to pretend to answer them at present. The very object of the 'concert' proposed would be to settle the nature and extent of the material assistance to be afforded in order to maintain the integrity of Denmark. With regard to the second question, likewise, it must result from the communications received whether Her Majesty's Government would only act with all the other Powers, or with some of them or alone."—No. 5, 674.

Therefore, at that date, the Government were instructing their Minister at St. Petersburg as though they were then still in doubt whether they would not take action, even alone, on behalf of Denmark. But I will go further and turn from the despatches to a speech of the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary, made in another place. On the 8th of March last questions were put, as to the intentions of the Government respecting the fleet; and the noble Lord replied, "that they would not make war when the safety and the interests, the integrity, and independence of Denmark could be secured otherwise, but that they would not neglect any means by which the safety and independence of Denmark could be secured." And how did he interpret his "any means?" Why, he said that the fleet, with a view to have that fleet at command, had been directed to rendezvous at one of the home ports, so that it might be within reach, if it were necessary, to give it any orders; and the noble Lord added that he "certainly did not think that the Austrians or Prussians would venture to encounter our squadron." Now, has that language meaning, or has it not? I ask any hon. Gentleman to look the matter honestly in the face, and to say whether the Government at that time had made up their mind to go to war for Denmark or not?

Then, again, what happened at the very conclusion of the Conference? France retired, and Russia retired, and there was no question then raised in anybody's mind whether either of those Powers was going to interfere. But what was the state of feeling in regard to England? Why one of breathless suspense. All Europe watched to see whether we would interfere. If the Government had given no reason for the supposition that they were about to interfere, do you believe that Europe would have looked on in such expectancy? If they had come to the resolution not to go to war, why did they hold so many and such protracted Cabinet Councils, and why was Europe kept so long in suspense? And when the hon. Gentleman talked of material concert and co-operation in the interests of peace, was there ever anything so childish, was there ever such a solemn mockery as to address their requests for such concert to Austria and Prussia as well as France and Russia when those Powers were actually on the march, and when they were engaged in a formidable war to crush Denmark? The Government have addressed themselves to France and Russia but in vain. They threatened on the 8th of March, and they held long consultations at the end of the Conference. But that is not all. This great peace Administration, who are to get up a cry that the Opposition are for war, and that they are for peace, have gone still further. The noble Lord at the head of the Government—I admit, with faltering accents and a hesitation not at all common to him—spoke only the other day of eventualities in which England might still be called upon to act; and that he spoke the sentiment of the Cabinet was proved by the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary using almost the same language on the same day in another place. Therefore you have no guarantee, after all, for their peace policy. Throughout the whole of these transactions they have acted with doubt and vacillation, whether from embarrassments and divisions in the Cabinet I know not. I cannot join with the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck) in seeking to dissever the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary from his Colleagues, because I hold his acts to be administrative acts for which the Government are responsible. The noble Viscount at once repudiated, and justly, any such individual responsibility in his noble Colleague, and in the same constitutional spirit I hold the Cabinet, of course, responsible for all that has taken place.

I have adverted to the facts of this case. I have shown that advice was tendered to Denmark from one end of these proceedings to the other. But I now want to call attention to the mode in which that advice was given and the hopes held out. I have shown what was the opinion of Europe and Germany on that point, and I think it may be inferred what was the opinion in Denmark. When Sir Augustus Paget, on the part of the Foreign Secretary, urged Denmark to revoke the patent, suggesting that Earl Russell had "good reasons" for pressing it, that was a suggestion that England was interested in the cause of Denmark, and that Denmark would gain by following her advice. And when, on the 23rd of February in the present year, Sir Augustus Paget at length announced to Bishop Monrad that England would not interfere, what did the Danish Minister say? Denmark had repealed the patent; she had allowed the execution in Holstein, she had offered to repeal the November Constitution—she had taken all these steps in deference to the pressing advice of the noble Lord. It has been said this was in agreement with the neutral Powers; but when the Danish Minister went on to say that he hoped the noble Earl appreciated the steps Denmark had taken on "the pressing advice of the British Government," not mentioning any other Power, what did the noble Earl say? He admits generally the truth of the assertion, though he adds that the steps were not taken with the promptitude necessary to make them successful. When, then, Sir Augustus Paget told the Danish Minister that nothing was to be expected from England, the Danish Minister said, "under these circumstances he trusted that at least the British Government would abstain from urging negotiations or interfering with the policy which the Danish Government was now determined to pursue." That language showed what had been earlier the expectations of Denmark. Denmark said, "Interfere with us no more—if you won't give us assistance, don't importune us with your advice." It would have been far better if that state of things had occurred sooner. It would have been far better if, when it was ascertained that the treaty was repudiated, Denmark had been left to settle her own business with Germany. Had that been done they would have left to Denmark the responsibility of acting, and would not have embarrassed themselves by the advice they had given.

We now come to the question of the Conference. I cannot help thinking that all mankind with M. Drouyn de Lhuys foresaw the issue. The war had began. Parties were exasperated, and it was impossible to conciliate them. The Conference was called together, no doubt, in the interests of peace. I wish from my heart it had succeeded; but when you go into a Conference without a policy and without concert you are almost sure to fail. You began by discarding the treaty which was the whole object of your policy. Denmark yielded at your instance to a suspension of hostilities: an opportunity was thus given for Germanizing the provinces which were undisputedly Danish; and Denmark, in order to bring everything to a conclusion, agrees to your *ultimatum* and makes it hers. She agrees to a particular line. If things had so ended, Denmark would have gone out of the Conference in union with the neutral Powers; but you proposed something else; you proposed an arbitration, when you knew Denmark would not accede to it. The Danish Minister distinctly states that their *ultimatum* was agreed to on the distinct understanding, arranged with Lord Russell, that it was to be the last proposal made on the part of England. Well, the Conference ends. Russia and France retire with honour. There is no imputation against them, they always said they were not bound to take up arms under the Treaty of 1852; but the Government of Peace tells us we must yet wait to see whether they will interfere or no. Let me, rather out of place, correct one statement of the hon. Gentleman opposite, who said there was no threat with regard to the invasion of Holstein: that was an error. Lord Russell, in his despatch of November 23, stated that England could not interfere in case of a purely Federal execution, but foreseeing that the execution might be changed into an occupation, he said that if the German troops entered Holstein on international grounds, Her Majesty's Government might be obliged to interfere. This in diplomatic language is about as strong a threat as could possibly be used.

What, then, is the present position of affairs? The Government have presented these papers, and beg us not to pronounce an opinion on them. They put before us their past policy, and they tell us it is unfair to express any opinion in regard to it, and that we ought to state our own policy for the future. The hon. Member for Bridgewater (Mr. Kinglake) moves an Amendment which avoids the sense and pith of the Motion of my right hon. Friend: it might be put as a rider to that Motion, but it is no real Amendment to it. It is true that England is at peace, but it was not the object of the Conference to maintain England at peace. It is the peace of Europe, the integrity and independence of Denmark which you have failed to preserve. That was the object of your policy, and after all your advice, threats, and promises, having failed in your object, you attempt to ride off on the pretence that England is at peace. Why, England would still have been at peace, her peace would never have been endangered if there had been no mischievous meddling on your part in the North of Europe. You have lost all your alliances. You have dispersed, sent to the winds all the friendships England had in Europe. The Speech from the Throne was an admission that we had no friends in Europe. Denmark has been defrauded (for the noble Foreign Secretary has termed the occupation of Holstein "a fraud") of one of the provinces that belonged to her. France, it is said, bears us no malice, but because you deserted her in the Congress and on other occasions, from a warm ally she has become a cold associate; she has ceased to trust you and to act with you; and when the hon. Gentleman opposite quotes the approval of the French Minister to some of the despatches of the noble Lord, it is to the advice given that that approval is accorded, not to the threats used. Russia is distrustful and suspicious; she remembers your conduct with regard to Poland; she dreads having any communication, concert, or co-operation with you. How does Germany feel? I will take the description of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, that an Englishman is discredited in Germany, that he cannot go anywhere in Germany without feeling that his country is looked upon with coldness, and almost with contempt. They say, "You have used threats, and you have not fulfilled them, and we do not believe in your influence." Then, as to the rest of Europe, it stands amazed at the position of England in these transactions; England, which used to be the bulwark of peace, but which now only utters brave words, while she is ready to swallow the leek whenever any great Power turns round and demands it. Then, as to loss of the influence of England, is it not true that that influence has been diminished? The Chancellor of the Exchequer, as a last resort, pointed to the noble Lord at the head of the Government, and said "Look here at the man who has directed the foreign policy of England for so many years—the man who forms the stability of our Ministry—can such a man have been guilty of the offences against England with which you charge us?" The right hon. Gentleman once held very different language concerning the noble Lord. As to this very question I do not know whether in the Cabinet the Chancellor of the Exchequer has succeeded, like the Old Man of the Sea, in getting upon the noble Lord's shoulders and in riding him for his own purposes, but certainly he has very much changed his opinion of the noble Lord. When we had the great Pacifico debate the Chancellor of the Exchequer used these words—

> "A sentiment exists to the effect that the noble Lord, notwithstanding his distinguished abilities, is not altogether as prudent as he is able in the management of the foreign affairs of the country. There prevails an opinion or a suspicion that during the time when the administration of affairs has been in the hands of the noble Lord, the country was apt to be too commonly near the verge of war."—[3 *Hansard*, cxii. 548.]

In the hands of the noble Lord on this occasion the country has been brought to the verge of war; the Government admit it. The noble Lord told us in a most solemn tone, that when the Conference came to an end, the Government had to consider with great care what their duty was, and what their policy should be. So much for the Government then. Are they going to meet this question boldly as a Vote of Want of Confidence, or are they going to ride off with the miserable Amendment, that they are now at peace when they might have been at peace without committing all these blunders? I say their conduct has diminished the chances of peace. England, as I have said, ought to be the bulwark of peace. All the considerations which were detailed at such length by the noble Lord in another place, and here by the noble Lord at the head of the Government, all those considerations should have operated upon their minds during the course of the negotiations as much as at the close. It is true that England is vulnerable upon many points, that her soldiers are scattered over many countries, that her ships are sailing upon every sea; but these things were as true in 1863 when you were threatening, as they were in 1864 when you are declining to act. I say that these facts point to the conclusion that the position of England, free from Continental complications and embarrassments, fits her for being the mediator of Europe. They point out that, having nothing to gain from the oppression of the smaller States, nor from the damage of the larger, she is qualified to occupy a position of dignified neutrality, a position in which she can wield more influence than she could ever gain by war. She may gain a crown of glory by war, but she can more certainly gain that crown by being instrumental in the preservation of peace; but she cannot maintain peace when she mixes up her advice with threats and promises and takes steps which complicate her position and disqualify her from exercising that impartial influence which her character as a neutral should confer upon her. The hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), agreeing with all that had been said upon the policy of the Ministry which he undertook to support, tried to get a cheer from his own side by taunting Members on this side with subserviency to France. There is a great difference between unworthy subserviency and friendly courtesy. We may occupy a dignified position towards all other nations, and may hold out to them the hand of friendship, saying, "In your embarrassments come to us for mediation, but not for the sword." I do not mean to say that England is to abandon all interest in the affairs on the Continent; I agree with Mr. Canning, that she is too great to do that; but when she is able, as in this case she would have been able, to maintain the position of neutral, she occupies the proud position of the best mediator in Europe.

Then comes the last statement of humiliating the country in the eyes of Europe. We are told that if the country is humiliated we ought not to say so, because we shall be damaging the country when we seek to attack the Government. The humiliation of the country consists in the opinions of those other countries with which she would have influence, and if we ascertain that in every part of Europe, I might almost say of the whole world, that influence is gone, and that, therefore, she is humiliated, are we not to say that you who have brought her into that position are the culprits, and should be condemned as such by the House of Commons? You cannot cure a wound without laying it bare. We cannot get rid of the evils which we see to exist, without telling the country what they are. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has told us that we should at all times speak openly upon national affairs; shall we hesitate now, when the opinion of Europe is so strongly expressed; shall we hesitate to say so, and to endeavour to relieve ourselves from the reproach which our Ministers have brought upon us?

I thank the House for the courtesy with which it has listened to me. I will only add that I deeply regret that England should occupy a position of such powerlessness. I do not mean that she is unarmed for war, but that she is powerless for good—that she should occupy so isolated a position in the councils of Europe. Seeing that she has been brought into that position, we boldly declare that you—the Government—are responsible for it. Throughout the Session we have made menaces and threats which we now fulfil. We strike the blow which we threatened, and we are ready to take the responsibility of the consequences.

Mr. HORSMAN: I must apologize to the hon. Member for interrupting him when he quoted me as saying that we had shown the Germans that we were a set of bullies. I knew that in reference to Danish affairs I never had such sentiments in my mind, that I never expressed them, and I am sure that it was not imputed to me in *The Times*. I have had the reports examined, and I find that I did in an early part of my speech, referring to Poland, use expressions to the effect that last year with respect to Poland we had taught the Germans that we could be bullies when we could not act.

Sir FRANCIS GOLDSMID* said, on Monday night my hon. Friend the Member for Bridgewater (Mr. Kinglake) assigned, as a main reason for proposing his Amendment, that he could not, consistently with his opinions, vote directly for or against the Resolution proposed by the right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli). My difficulties are even greater. I am unable entirely to agree either with the right hon. Gentleman or with the Government; still less can I vote for my hon. Friend's Amendment. I trust, therefore, that the House will allow me to state my grounds for the course which, after much consideration, I have determined to pursue.

I so far concur with the Government, as to think that they were perfectly right in inviting, at the beginning of this year, the co-operation of France and Russia, in order to resist the German invasion of Schleswig. But then I would venture to recal to recollection, what some of those who have spoken on behalf of Ministers have seemed half inclined to forget, that that invitation necessarily implied an opinion that the threatened invasion was an act of high-handed injustice. If it was not unjust, the Government were no more entitled to resist it in combination with another power than to resist it alone. If it was unjust—if, when it was about to take place, the Danes had put themselves so far in the right as to put Germany completely in the wrong, of what use is it to travel back beyond that point, and to endeavour to console the country for the subsequent failure of the attempts to protect Denmark, by imputing to her some prior acts of supposed perversity and wrong? I agree, however, as I have said, with the Government, in thinking that their readiness to concur with France or Russia, in resisting the invasion of Schleswig, deserves approval. I am willing too to concede (though this appears to me to admit of more question) that they judged well in not actively interfering, unless in concert with France or Russia. But then comes the question whether, if this was to be our policy—to resist in combination with France or Russia, but not to resist alone—that policy has been properly and skilfully carried into effect? And it is upon this question that, notwithstanding my general confidence in the Government, I am forced to coincide in part in the views of the right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire. Some of those views seem to me, indeed, to be influenced by the natural exaggeration of party feeling. But I find myself unable to avoid the conclusions, first, that Her Majesty's Government have, I will not say made promises to Denmark, but allowed her to entertain expectations, which they have not fulfilled; and secondly, that, without having assured themselves of the aid either of France or Russia, they held out to Germany distinct threats, which, unless with the help of one of those empires, they were not prepared to carry into effect.

And, first, let me say a word or two as to the expectations which the Danes were permitted to entertain. If a great power undertake to advise a weak one, confronted by overwhelming strength, she thereby implies her intention to support that weak power, unless she take care distinctly to guard herself against such a presumption. Now, I find no such care taken in the early part of these despatches. Nay, more, I think that some of them state conversations that were rather likely to encourage the Danish hopes of active assistance. And it should be remembered, that any expressions having that tendency were sure to be understood in their widest sense by those to whom they were addressed. In March, indeed, Earl Russell wrote a despatch (No. 1140), which has been quoted by the Under Secretary of State, and in which Denmark was warned not to rely on our help. But if we did not intend active interference, prudence required that such warnings should have been much earlier given. Then, as to the threats held out to Germany, the case against the Government is stronger still. I will not again cite despatches which have been already cited, nor even read any additional ones which I consider important; but will content myself with giving the dates, and referring to the most essential passages, so that hon. Members, who feel inclined to do so, may verify what I say. The despatch addressed by Earl Russell to Sir Andrew Buchanan on December 24th (No. 500), that written by Sir A. Buchanan on January 2nd (No. 606), Lord Russell's reply, dated the 6th (No. 620), and his despatch to Lord Bloomfield, dated 14th January (No. 696), contain, and not in isolated passages merely, clear threats of war. On January 6th, Earl Russell said, that by the invasion of Schleswig, without giving Denmark time to repeal the Constitution, "the relations between Prussia and England might be endangered." I am not deeply versed in diplomatic phrases; but I ask those who are, whether it be possible to threaten hostilities in terms much less obscure? Then again, on the 14th of January, Earl Russell states a conversation between him and Count Bernstorff, in which the probability of dangers to Europe if Germany and England should become enemies was adverted to, and in which Earl Russell said that, for some time past,

> "Great Britain had warned Austria of these dangers; that Prussia and Germany had likewise been warned; but that the voice of England was unheeded, and that little time was now left for counsel, wisdom, and moderation. He hoped it would not be thrown away."—No. 4, 535.

Can there be a plainer threat of armed interference? But then it is contended by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that when these threats were uttered, England had reason to expect the support of France. Neither by him, however, nor by the Under Secretary of State, can I find that any document has been cited in proof of this position, except Mr. Grey's despatch of the 18th of September (No. 126), and Sir Henry Howard's of the 17th of February (No. 984). Now, for the purpose of supporting this argument of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, one of these despatches is (whatever may be its contents) distressingly too early, and the other provokingly too late. The real effect of M. Drouyn d'Lhuys' conversation with Mr. Grey, reported in the despatch of the 18th of September, has been much disputed between the right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I need not enlarge upon it. I will merely remark that, whatever might otherwise have been the fair inference from what was said by the French Minister, it appears to me impossible to maintain that a conversation, in the very conclusion of which he stated that he "desired to preserve entire liberty for France in this matter," can be understood as imposing on that country the slightest liability to render us active assistance. But even supposing that any such promise had then been made, how can the Queen's Government maintain that they were entitled to attach any weight to it after the death of King Frederick VII.? They have argued that the declaration made last summer by the Prime Minister, that if the integrity of Denmark were attacked, he was convinced that she would not stand alone, ought not to have been relied on by the Danes, because, by the subsequent death of the King, the whole state of things was so completely altered. I think there is great weight in this argument. But then it must follow, by parity of reasoning, that the English Government were not entitled to rely on any promise of assistance made by the French (if they had indeed made any) previously to the accession of King Christian.

Then, as to the French despatch of the 12th of February, referred to in Sir Henry Howard's letter of the 17th—this is just as much too late. The despatch, as stated by Sir Henry Howard, is indeed a singular one. It seems strange that France should have used to Hanover a phrase so ominous as "not remaining indifferent," if she did not address similar language to the other German powers. On the other hand, if she did, it seems strange that there should not be a trace of it throughout these papers. My own conjecture is, that Sir Henry Howard, who does not appear to have had any copy of the despatch, did not remember it quite correctly, and being accustomed to such expressions as "not remaining indifferent" in English despatches, unconsciously transferred the phrase to a French one. Assuming, however, that his recollection was accurate, it is impossible that the menaces addressed by England to Germany, in December and January, can have proceeded on a French despatch of the February following. *Post hoc, ergo propter hoc,* is said to be bad logic; but *ante hoc, ergo non propter hoc,* is logic perfectly irrefragable. I am, therefore, reluctantly compelled to arrive at the conclusion that Her Majesty's Government, without having assurances of support from either France or Russia, uttered distinct and repeated threats to Germany, to which they were not prepared to give effect unless with the assistance of one of those powers. And I cannot deny that such a course must have lowered the influence of this country.

I now turn to my hon. Friend the Member for Bridgewater, who, being quite satisfied with the attitude, so agreeable to the German powers, which has lately been assumed by Ministers, attempts to offer some consolation or excuse for what he can scarcely help regarding as their previous errors. He tells us that what has lately taken place is entirely consistent with the principle of non-intervention. Why, Sir, what can my hon. Friend mean? He said, and I believe quite accurately, that by non-intervention is to be understood abstinence from interference in the internal concerns of an independent state. But is that what we have recently seen? On the contrary, as has sometimes been said with reference to reciprocity, the non-intervention we have just witnessed is non-intervention all on one side. In despatches of last December and February, from our Ambassadors at Berlin and Vienna (Nos. 372 and 1007), we find distinct admissions by the Prussian Minister that the present King of Denmark would, but for German sympathisers, have maintained his authority even in Holstein, and by Count Rechberg, that there was great indifference in Schleswig as to the prince in whose hands the governing power should be placed, and that little would have been heard there respecting the Prince of Augustenburg but for the cries in his favour got up by the agitators of small German powers, following in the rear of the advancing army. We have here the clearest evidence that in Schleswig, and even in Holstein, the Danish Government would have remained undisturbed if it had not been overthrown by the armies of Germany. This, then, has been an intervention on the part of strong states against a weak one, and has been successful, because it has not been resisted by any strong power on the other side. Such a result may be very satisfactory to my hon. Friend; but it is the very reverse of a triumph of the principle of non-intervention. Then, again, the hon. Member for Bridgewater tries to comfort us by the reflection, that all the advice we gave to Denmark has increased her moral strength. I should like him, however, to tell us of what use her moral strength has been to her in staying the aggressions, or moderating the demands of her German foes, when they had once ascertained that those demands and aggressions were not to be resisted by any material force coming to the aid of the unhappy Danes. On the whole then, Sir, I can find in such topics as these no consolation for our present position; and I am driven to conclude, that if I were absolutely compelled to give a direct affirmative or negative to the Resolution of the right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire, I could not say "no" to that Resolution.

But then an Amendment is announced by my hon. Friend the Member for Bridgewater, whom, although from his Amendment itself I differ as widely as possible, I shall hail, when he moves it, as a temporary ally, and almost as a deliverer. He will deliver me from the necessity of voting directly for or against the right hon. Gentleman's Resolution. When the Amendment of the hon. Member for North Warwickshire shall have been disposed of, and that of the Member for Bridgewater shall have been moved, the first question which you, Sir, will have to put will be, not whether the House will affirm or negative the paragraph of censure proposed by the right hon. Gentleman, but whether that paragraph shall stand part of the Question. In other words, the House will have to determine in the first instance, not whether the course of negotiation pursued by the Government has been censurable, but whether the House desire to pronounce any judgment on that subject. On that question I think I shall be free to vote in the negative, and I will shortly state why I am inclined to do so. In order to prevent my vote from being misunderstood, I have been compelled to confide to you, in all the privacy of debate, my opinion of the Danish policy of Her Majesty's Government. But by thus stating my opinion, I do not directly contribute to transfer power to right hon. Gentlemen opposite, as I should do if I voted for a paragraph of censure being submitted to the House. I am, for obvious reasons, very desirous to avoid taking any part in bringing about such a transfer. As to internal affairs, I agree much more nearly with the present Ministers than with those who would be likely to succeed them. As to foreign affairs—if I look to the subject now before the House — no policy has been, or, we are told, can be, announced by the Opposition. I am willing to believe, as they assure us, that this silence is unavoidable. But then it forces me to look to past experience, in forming a conjecture whether anything would be gained by a change of the Government. And the following is the comparison which experience leads me to form. Since the present Government came into office they have had to conduct important negotiations connected with the affairs of four foreign countries—Italy, Poland, the United States of America, and Denmark. As to two, Italy and America, they have, as it seems to me, managed these negotiations with admirable ability and success; as to the other two, Poland and Denmark, unsatisfactorily and unsuccessfully. Now, if I am to judge from the past, my conjecture is, that if all these affairs had been in the hands of the right hon. Gentlemen opposite, their policy would thus far have been more consistent, that it would have been everywhere marked by equal unskilfulness and failure. For these reasons, Sir, I have determined to avail myself of the forms of the House, and, though I could not directly negative the paragraph of censure, to vote that it shall not stand part of the Question.

And now, Sir, let me in a few words ask the House to consider whether, if it be determined that that paragraph shall not stand part of the Question, the Amendment of the hon. Member for Bridgewater ought to be substituted—a point which it will be impossible calmly to consider in the excitement consequent on the first division? To that Amendment I am entirely opposed. I think that the concluding observations made by the noble Lord at the head of the Government on Monday week—to the effect that if Copenhagen were about to be attacked, and King Christian were in danger of being made prisoner, it might be necessary to reconsider the course to be taken by this country—were generally distasteful to the House. Hon. Members may have had different reasons for disliking the purport of those observations; but I believe I am not wrong in saying that the prevailing impression was, that either such contingencies should not have been contemplated at all, or it should have been stated, that if they arose, England would be prepared for action. The Amendment, however, appears to me to go further than those observations of the noble Lord. The effect of its adoption would, I apprehend, be, so to bind the Government to neutrality, that they could not depart from it even if the contingencies referred to arose. And this I cannot believe to be intended by the House of Commons. But even if it is intended, can anything be more undignified than the language of the Amendment? We are asked to express satisfaction. Satisfaction! Can any ten men in the House, or in the country, feel satisfaction at what has occurred? In a publication, forming a portion of the foreign press, to which the Chancellor of the Exchequer referred—in the French *Chari-*

vari—I am told that a series of woodcuts has lately appeared, intended to cast ridicule on England, and that one of these represents a Dane sinking into the water, whilst an English sailor on the shore says, "I cannot help, the place looks rather dangerous." If I did not know that my hon. Friend the Member for Bridgewater was serious, I should suppose that, not content with the powers of the *Charivari*, he desired to add to its ridicule of England a touch of satire of his own. Now—when that gallant little nation, for which, during the past year, we have written and talked so much, and have done nothing, appears to be finally going down in the deep waters of destruction—my hon. Friend proposes in effect, that this prominent assembly of Englishmen should say to the country, "At this conjuncture, when those unlucky fellows are drowning, we learn with satisfaction that we are not to be called on to make a single effective effort to save them."

To such a point I trust that the House of Commons has not yet come. I earnestly trust that whatever may be done as to the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman, the House will not adopt the Amendment of the hon. Member for Bridgewater.

Mr. BENTINCK said, he had no desire to sneak into the lobby with anybody, but wished to state the grounds upon which he proposed to give his vote on the Motion before the House. The House must have been a good deal struck with the contrast which the present discussion had offered to many others which had preceded it, from the large amount of interest which it had excited. A great many attempts had been made during former Sessions and during the present Session to get up party discussions and party divisions; but they had always signally failed, and the comparatively small numbers that could be mustered for these occasions, had shown that the influence of party had pretty nearly ceased to exist in that House. ["No, no!"] Hon. Gentleman said "No, no!" but he wished they would let him finish his sentence. The result of what had taken place on every previous occasion had shown that neither the party attacking the Goverment, nor the Government attempting to defend themselves, had been able on a mere party question to assemble around them more than a very small number of supporters. For the accuracy of that statement he would appeal to the division lists, and he ventured to say that no hon. Member present would dispute the fact. He apprehended there would be little difficulty in tracing the cause of that state of things. It arose chiefly from the fact that for some years past principle had been utterly sacrificed to party feeling, until we had arrived at that pass that distinction of principle could hardly be said to exist, and distinction of party had been almost obliterated. And why had that been the case? There were various reasons, but two of them were so obvious that he could not refrain from mentioning them. They had seen—many of them with great regret—Members on both sides of the House, who professed to be the steadfast and zealous supporters of the Protestant Church, coalescing for party objects with that Ultramontane party whose only object was the downfall of that Church—they had seen men on both sides of the House who professed to have the honour and interest of the country at heart, coalescing with Gentlemen below the gangway on the other side for the same party objects, and attempting to carry out a policy the result of which would be the destruction of the character and the annihilation of the interests of the country. When they saw such proceedings carried on by men who ought to occupy influential positions in that House, they could not wonder at the fact that those who by courtesy were called leaders of party should find themselves, whenever a question of mere party conflict arose, entirely unsupported. He almost entirely agreed with what had fallen from the right hon. and gallant Member for Huntingdon (General Peel). That hon. and gallant Member had disclaimed all intention of entering into the question before the House with any party view; and if he (Mr. Bentinck) were to enter into the discussion in a spirit of party—supposing the result likely to be fatal to Her Majesty's Government—he confessed he should feel very much in the position of one about to witness a public execution, and who, although thoroughly convinced of the justice of the sentence about to be inflicted, yet felt that his sympathies between the culprit and the executioner were somewhere on a par: and for this reason, that the executioner had formerly been the associate of the culprit. ["No, no!"] He said "Yes, yes"—that he had on more than one occasion turned king's evidence, and had now been admitted to the high and distinguished post of being the finisher of the law upon his former associates. Having disclaimed any party feeling in the matter, he must now be allowed to say that, during the debates, he had heard a great deal which, upon reflection, he thought all must regret. It might be the lamentable consequences of a debate of this kind, but he confessed his great regret at hearing Members of the House of Commons indulging in violent ebullitions of feeling on the German or on the Danish side. In his opinion, both parties were in the wrong; but he believed the national feeling of the people of England to be enlisted with a gallant people who were fighting against such enormous odds. Beyond that, he contended that the House of Commons ought not to look at the question either in a Danish or German point of view—they ought to confine themselves to the honour and interest of England. And he would venture further to say that, in the present complication of European affairs, there was quite sufficient to occupy the attention of Parliament without indulging in vague and absurd theories of national sentimentality in favour of foreign nations. Now, with respect to the Motion before the House. The speech of the right hon. and gallant Member for Huntingdon was the only speech which he had listened to with pleasure. It was an honest, straightforward, and gallant speech, and void of that circumlocution and special pleading which was too apt to disfigure the speeches delivered in that House. His hon. and gallant Friend said he entirely endorsed the Motion now under discussion. So far as the truth of the Motion went he entirely agreed with his hon. and gallant Friend. But he must go a little further. The Motion was no doubt indisputable, but it was a truism, and nothing more than a truism, and under present circumstances it became a platitude. And for this reason—that it did not touch the really grave part of the offence of the Government in this case. He would endeavour to show the House why in his opinion the words of the Motion entirely failed to convey those charges which he was prepared to prefer against the Government. He agreed with the Motion in stating that the diplomatic conduct of the Government had been most unfortunate. He believed that by their vacillating policy they had lowered the country in the estimation of Europe, and thus decreased the power of England to mediate between other countries. But that was the minor part of the question. It was a trifle to what the Government had done, which was not touched upon by the rose water Motion before the House. It would be a work of supererrogation to remind the House of the remarkable speech made by the noble Lord at the head of the Government at the close of the last Session, when he told the House and the country that in certain contingencies Denmark would not stand alone. That was a most remarkable and most significant speech coming from the Prime Minister, and could admit of no misconstruction. It could only mean that, under certain circumstances, this country would take a part in European hostilities. It was followed up in August by the despatches of Earl Russell, which were of a most warlike tendency. And what had happened since that time? The Government, at the commencement of the Session, introduced Estimates for the army and navy, which, so far from providing for the possible contingency of war, contemplated a reduction in both services. That in itself was a blot on the course of Her Majesty's Government which no argument could get over. It would be idle to attempt to prove that a Government which talked of war and prepared for peace was not doing its duty. But there was a great deal more to complain of than that. Remonstrances were made at the time. He could not say when or where they took place, but they took place somewhere or other—in some part of Great Britain. The hon. Member for Inverness-shire (Mr. H. Baillie), in a debate to which it would be irregular to refer more particularly, called the attention of the country to the fact that we were at that moment 20,000 men short of the number of troops required for our colonial reliefs in time of peace. He himself (Mr. Bentinck) took occasion to endorse that statement; no answer was elicited from those who could give an official answer. He asked if it was to be tolerated that the Government of this country should induce that House not only to pass Estimates lower than last year, but lower than were considered necessary in a time of peace. That was not all. Within the last few weeks the noble Lord at the head of the Government had told them that contingencies might arise—which contingencies, from present appearances, might occur in the next fortnight — which might induce the Government to alter their pacific intentions, and declare to the House a warlike policy. He should have thought with the possibility—not to say the probability of such contingencies—the Government would have asked the House to give them the means of supporting such a policy if they should find it necessary to resort to it; but he could not understand the conduct of a Government which said they might be called upon to go to war in a few days, and yet continued to rest on peace Estimates. But there was something even more than that. When he read the language of the noble Earl in another place, which was unnecessarily offensive — language imputing falsification to the Government of a great country—(an expression of of which they had heard something that night)—he had said to himself it was impossible after that language that the noble Lord at the head of the Government could refrain from asking for an immediate addition to our naval and military armaments. There had, however, been no such announcement, and, therefore, he was prepared on that account to find fault with the conduct of the Government. They seemed to have an infatuation. He could not possibly understand a Government continually proclaiming the probability of war, at the same time using the most irritating language, and sitting down quietly content to leave the country to trust entirely to defences which it was admitted were hardly adequate for a time of peace. That was his grievance against the conduct of the Government. He had, however, another complaint. He was not a strong partisan, but he should be glad to see any discussion or the result of any division in that House which would have the effect of putting a stop to what, for some years past, had been called the Liberal foreign policy of this country. It appeared to him that the Liberal foreign policy of this country had been the curse of Europe. He was sorry that the name of the noble Viscount, towards whom he did not wish to use an uncourteous word, had been so mixed up in it; but his opinion was that that policy had produced more mischief in Europe than anything else during the last fifty years. It was a policy that commenced in anarchy and ended in despotism. He would gladly see the foreign policy of this country transferred from the hands of the noble Earl who now conducted the foreign affairs of this country to the hands of the noble Earl who preceded him in office. He believed that Lord Malmesbury had conducted the foreign relations of this country with the greatest possible ability. He had conducted them in a manner that was conducive to his own honour and the advantage of the country; and he thought that little justice had been done him either by his friends or his opponents. Both parties had used him ill. [Lord JOHN MANNERS: No.] The noble Lord might say No, but did he remember a certain despatch that was laid on the table of the House? He would, however, not pursue that subject. In the course of the peroration delivered by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire, he made allusion to those bygone days when England was able to cope successfully with the world in arms, and he stated his belief that England was able to do so still. He, with the right hon. Gentleman, looked back with pleasure to those days, and he agreed that England was able to do as much again; but the right hon. Gentleman forgot to mention that in those days the country was ruled by men who never allowed themselves to prefer the interests of party to the honour of the country; and he forgot to mention that when England was great and controlled the destinies of Europe, they never heard of that wretched, sordid, petty-fogging, petty penny-wise-and-pound-foolish policy of which the right hon. Gentleman and the present Chancellor of the Exchequer were the great promoters. England still retained her energy and had greater means than she ever had. There were two lessons which he trusted that those hon. Gentlemen who sat on the front benches on opposite sides would learn from that discussion—the one was that in future neither the House nor the country would tolerate that course of aberration from public morality—that practice of preferring expediency to principle, which had so much characterized both parties of late years; and the other was that the House and the country were determined at no time and under no circumstances to allow any men to hold the reins of government who would not, without reference to party or party arrangements, maintain this country in a position which would enable her at all times to defend her honour and her best and truest interests. Having said thus much, he wished to advert to a subject which, though of a character which was not usually introduced into debates of the House, he thought it right to mention. It was a subject which probably was not very well understood by the public, but which was perfectly familiar to those whom he addressed; nor did he propose to dwell on it for more than a single moment. He had said that he intended to give his vote in no party spirit, but, in consequence of a rumour which had prevailed during the last two or three days, he was anxious to guard himself against the contingency of being hereafter told that he had been caught in a trap. The rumour to which he referred was—and he begged those hon. Gentlemen to whom it particularly related not to suppose that he meant to say anything personally discourteous to them — that a compact or arrangement had been entered into on some ground or other, which, not being a party to the compact, he was unable to state, by means of which a certain number of those who were called the Ultramontane Roman Catholic Members had been induced under severe pressure to pledge themselves to give their votes against the Government. ["Oh, oh!" *and Cheers.*] That interruption confirmed the rumour that that party had been induced by some very pressing reasons from some very high authority—he was now speaking of those who under ordinary circumstances voted with the Government—had been induced, under certain circumstances, to pledge themselves to give their vote against the Government. He was merely speaking of the rumour that had been circulated that certain Members against their own inclination had pledged themselves to vote in accordance with some arrangement, or agreement, or compact, whatever it was, with certain high parties. All he wished to say was, that he did not believe the rumour, but if he did believe it, notwithstanding all the misdeeds of Her Majesty's Ministers, and though they were as black ten thousand times as any man on the Opposition side of the House could paint them, sooner than be in a majority composed in the manner which he had indicated, he would gladly record his vote with the Government. He asked for no indignant denial of the truth of the rumour. It was a mere rumour, and he had adverted to it as such, that the Ultramontane party were to vote as he had stated. He referred to it, as he had before said, in order that he might not be hereafter open to the charge of having been caught in a trap; and he was well aware that the division lists which would be published in the course of two or three days would best vouch for the truth or falsehood of the report. If those lists should show that it was founded in reality, he, for one, should not envy the position of those who were parties to such a coalition.

MR. COGAN said, that the insinuation or charge in the latter portion of the speech of the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken, conveyed in sentence so complicated and involved that it was difficult to say what it really meant, was as unworthy of him as it was of the House of Commons. To presume to cast censure on any body of men in the House in the way which the hon. Gentleman had done, and on mere vague rumour to imply that they meant to give their votes from any other than right motives, was, in his opinion, to pursue a most unjustifiable course. He demanded from the hon. Member as a matter of right that he should name his authority for the imputation which he had made, in order that it might be traced to its base fountain head; and if he did not produce his authority, then must the report on which he based his remarks be regarded as mere idle wind. For his own part, he would say that he recognized no distinction between Protestant and Catholic as a Member of that House. He was a Roman Catholic, and was proud of his religion; but he had entered the House of Commons as a political man and a British subject, and he thought it unworthy of any hon. Gentleman to class its Members according to their religious denominations. Upon one side of the House sat those who were called Conservatives, and upon the other those who were termed — sometimes not with perfect truth—Liberals. He was one of those who was proud to be classed in the ranks of the Liberal party. For upwards of twelve years he had held that position, he hoped with honour, and he could not listen to the taunts of the hon. Gentleman without expressing his indignant denial of their justice. The course which the hon. Gentleman had taken rendered it incumbent on him, as a matter of justice to himself, to state his reasons for the vote which he was about to give; for on the present occasion he feared he must sever himself, for the first time, from many of the Friends with whom he had been united in political action for several years. He was prepared, however, to vindicate the step which he was about to take on the broad principle of political right, and he trusted his own character, humble though his position in that House might be, was a sufficient denial of the charge to which on mere rumour the hon. Member for Norfolk had not hesitated to give publicity. He should give the vote he intended to give on this Motion from a conviction that the conduct of the Government had been most blameable throughout a large portion of these negotiations. That was the sole consideration that influenced his vote. But to pass from this personal matter to the important question before the House, he would observe that, while he believed the conduct of Denmark towards the Duchies to have been characterized by much wrong, he did not think that was the point at issue that evening. He denied that the question of peace or war was in any respect raised by the Motion, for there was no man in that House insane enough to say that the country should be plunged into the horrors of war for such a quarrel as that in the North of Europe; but the ground of complaint was, that though war had not been resorted to, the honour of the country had not been sustained. With regard to a question of peace or war, he believed that the Government were the parties most likely to lead the country into war, for they thought that they ought to have gone to war; and it was only owing to the Emperor of the French that this country was now at peace. The disastrous policy of the Government would have plunged the country into war, from which it was only saved by being plunged into dishonour. False hopes had been raised and vain threats had been used, and the consequence was that this country had been humiliated, had lost her just influence, and had become a bye-word among nations. He was not one of those who admired the foreign policy of the noble Lord at the head of the Government; but, at anv rate, when that noble Lord was Foreign Minister the name of England was feared and respected; but the noble Earl now at the head of the Foreign Office had rendered England neither feared nor loved. It was cruel kindness of the Prime Minister to have placed the noble Earl in a position for which he was constitutionally unfitted; but he would not say that that was done for the purpose of paying off old scores. The late Sidney Smith said of the noble Earl, that at one hour's notice he would take the command of the Channel fleet, but by the cruel kindness of the noble Lord he was placed in a position where it might be said of him—

> "I, demens, et sævas curre per Alpes
> Ut pueris placeas et declamatio fias."

In Italy, in Poland, in Russia, in China, and in Brazil, the noble Earl had been getting the country into difficulty and danger. He believed that Lord Derby's words "meddle and muddle" aptly described the noble Earl's policy; and it would have been well if the noble Earl's diplomacy, which was inaugurated at Vienna, had ended there, and had not descended to the miserable "decline and fall" witnessed at the Conference in London. It appeared to him that some remarkable fallacies had been uttered in the course of the debate. The hon. Member for Stroud (Mr. Horsman) had charged the House with forcing the Government into a course of intervention in the affairs of Poland. The Government, however, ought to be responsible for their own policy, and it was a new doctrine that they were to accept a Resolution from the House for fear of being beaten by a majority and losing their places. The next strange doctrine of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Horsman) was, that he not only charged the House with complicity, but he said that the responsibility was thereby thrown upon its Members and not upon the Government. So puerile and absurd a doctrine he had never before heard in that House. It was the duty of a Government to act on their own opinion; and, if necessary, to appeal to the country. With regard to the hon. Member for Rochdale, he could see no consistency between the opinions expressed by that hon. Member and the vote he intended to give. The hon. Gentleman said: You Gentlemen on the opposite side are making a great mistake; the noble Lord at the head of the Government will carry out your policy better than Lord Derby; he has greatly demoralized the liberal party; leave him where he is, and when he has demoralized it thoroughly he will leave you the residuary legatee of its miserable remains. Would the hon. Member vote for sustaining in power a Government which would still further demoralize the Liberal party, which was already greatly demoralized? Would the noble dog "Tear'em," as the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck) was called by the hon. Member for Leominster, vote for a Government and a party in whose faces terror and pallor were depicted when the Chancellor of the Exchequer made a Reform speech that let in a new ray of hope for the working men of this country? He had heard them asking each other what was to be done, and whether the Government could exist after that revolutionary speech. He would not dwell upon the conduct of the Government in Ireland, because it was not exactly *ad rem.* But in a word he condemned the Government for sending to Ireland as Chief Secretary the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Tamworth (Sir Robert Peel). It was an outrage and an insult to the Irish people to send to that country a person of the known opinions and previous political career of the right hon. Gentleman. He believed that if they disapproved of the policy of the Government in regard to Denmark, they certainly had no right to sustain them on the Ministerial benches. But then he was met with the cry, "Will you let in the Tories?" He had great respect for those hon. Gentlemen, but he did not wish to do that, and he would always do all he could to keep them out of office, and would always support the Liberal party. ["Oh, oh!"] For those reasons he should now vote against the present Government, and by so doing he hoped to purify the Liberal party. He believed that if the Government should be defeated they would be more consolidated hereafter, and that it would not be that heterogeneous party in future which for a long time it had been. He believed that by defeating the Government they would be doing the greatest service to the Liberal party, and for that he had the authority of the noble Premier himself, for did he not on a former occasion put out of office Earl Russell and let in the Tories? Therefore he should not vote for the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman opposite for the purpose of sustaining his views, but for the purpose of ultimately benefiting the Liberal party. He contended that he was taking the constitutional course, for the conduct of the Government in the management of foreign affairs he had no confidence in, and he stated that after they had had a long trial he thought it was better that they should be sent back to their constituents, in order that they might say whether the House had acted rightly or not. He confessed that he never had given a vote with a stronger feeling of its propriety, and although it was painful to him to sever himself from those with whom he usually acted in that House, yet he did so from a sense of duty, and duty alone.

MR. PEACOCKE said, that it must have been a great treat to the Government to have received that night both the speech and vote of an independent Member, for up to that moment almost every Member who had spoken in that debate had condemned the policy of the Government, though some of them had promised to adhere to the Government in recording their votes. Even for their votes, however, the Government no doubt would be very grateful, for they would be sure to want every one of them. The right hon. Member for Stroud (Mr. Horsman) had denounced in the strongest terms the policy of the Government, but he had denounced still more the policy of the Opposition. It was not for him (Mr. Peacocke) to defend the line pursued by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bucks, for when on a former occasion the right hon. Gentleman moved "The previous Question," he (Mr. Peacocke) opposed him; and he believed that the country was of opinion that the right hon. Gentleman was then more intent on the dismemberment of the Government than on securing the integrity of Denmark. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Horsman) enlarged on the strong ties by which we were bound to support Denmark; but the right hon. Gentleman did not follow up his speech logically by announcing that it was his intention to vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate). The hon. and learned Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck) said that much as he disliked the Government, he disliked the Opposition more. He did not know on what grounds the hon. and learned Gentleman founded his opposition to Members on those benches, but he would only say, "Try them." Five years had elapsed since 1859, and if hon. Gentlemen here should be distasteful to the hon. and learned Gentleman he might exercise his influence to displace them. He thought it would be good for those who sat on the Ministerial benches to experience the invigorating air of opposition. There was something enervating in occupying the Treasury bench—it was like the climate of India, which rendered it necessary for sojourners in that country to take an occasional journey home; and so he observed that too long a continuance in office caused lassitude and weakness, and he thought the foreign policy of the Government showed signs of this. They had heard hard words lately from the noble Lord opposite (Viscount Palmerston) and from the Secretary for Foreign Affairs with reference to the German Powers; but in the December of last year Earl Russell highly praised the conduct of Austria and Prussia for the efforts they had made. He thought that such vacillation showed the necessity of a change of Government. The only independent

Member who had offered a defence of the Government was the hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), and he excused this weakness and vacillation of the Government on the ground that it only represented the state of feeling of the country. He (Mr. Peacocke) did not hold it to be the duty of the Government to catch at every straw wafted by popular opinion. If it reflected every passing phase of public opinion it ceased to be a Government. The hon. Member for Southwark (Mr. Layard) had vindicated the policy of the Government at great length. But what was the object with which the Government entered the Conference? It was to preserve the Treaty of 1852, and the promise made in consequence of it. The conduct of the Government had been most inconsistent. A proposition had been made by the German Powers to preserve a personal union, by which separate Parliaments might be held for the different provinces, though they might be united under the government of one crowned Head. The Government, however, opposed the personal union, and proposed the separation of Holstein and part of Schleswig under a foreign prince. Earl Russell suggested that the populations should be consulted as to the authority under which they would place themselves. He was surprised to hear Her Majesty's Government advocating the principle of nationality. A more dangerous policy was never advocated by a Minister of the Crown, and it was especially dangerous to a country like this. They had been told the other day that Wales greatly hated them, and that if a *plebiscite* were taken in Ireland she would not remain under the sway of England. Nor had France, which advocated this principle on this occasion, always been faithful to that principle, for it was not by appeals to nationality that she had added Lorraine and Alsace to her territory. For assenting to such a principle a British Minister richly deserved the censure of a British Parliament, and on that ground he should support the Resolution which had been placed in the hands of the Speaker.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Sir, the House will naturally, on an occasion of this sort, look with some anxiety for an explanation of the reasons why the conduct of the Government is disapproved, and of the different course of action by which the grounds of censure might have been obviated. It is the penalty of want of success that everybody immediately sets to work to consider how success might have been attained; but we may at least derive some instruction from the wonderful diversity and contrariety of opinion manifested in this debate, among those who censure the policy of the Government, as to the course which ought to have been pursued. The hon. Member for Rochdale (Mr. Cobden), who always speaks with great authority here, thinks, for instance, that our entire system of foreign policy, from beginning to end, is a mistake; that the just influence of which the Motion speaks ought not to exist or to be exercised; that we ought simply to abstain from all interference of any kind, whether remonstrance, expostulation, or advice, in regard to the affairs of friendly foreign countries; that we ought, in short, to hold our hands and remain only spectators of the course of events, sheltering ourselves in our insular situation, and separating ourselves from all the doings of the world. At all events, although every opinion of the hon. Gentleman is supported by powerful arguments and is entitled to consideration, I may assume that those who intend to vote for the Motion are not prepared to do so on the grounds which he has laid down. The "just influence" in question is evidently an influence of the very kind which he repudiates. I agree with the hon. Gentleman that the intervention of one country in the affairs of another should be limited carefully and cautiously, so as not to involve the interposing country unnecessarily in her neighbour's disputes. Yet, when that doctrine is carried to the extreme length to which it seems to be carried by the hon. Gentleman, it produces an Utopian set of ideas, totally incompatible with the relations which this country maintains with other countries — relations of duty, interest, and necessity. The hon. Gentleman's policy is, therefore impracticable, and, if practicable, would be hardly generous or honourable. When listening to the views of the hon. Member I could not help being reminded of a ludicrous passage in a play of Dryden's which amused me when a schoolboy. The state of the world as it now exists, with England having a footing in every country, and the world as it would be if the policy of the hon. Member could be realized, really brought to my mind two of the most absurd lines which that great poet ever wrote. Introducing in one of his plays the hero and heroine in a most interesting spot in a previously undiscovered part of America, he says—

"'Twould seem the old world, retiring from the view,
Came here in silence and brought forth a new."

It would really be necessary that some such operation should be performed before England, the greatest of commercial nations, having wherever the sun rises or sets an interest in the world, could retire altogether from the affairs of the universe, and separate herself wholly from all concern in those events in other nations by which the peace of the world may be maintained or disturbed.

Then, Sir, we have the opinion of the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield. I must admit that, however votes may be given, hon. Members on both sides have been very free in their comments of the conduct of the Government. Yet, when I observe the criticisms so various, I cannot but think that if we could take the sense of the House on each one of them separately we should probably find each particular view in a considerable minority. The remarks of the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck) were bold and decided. He would cast to the winds all engagements of Denmark to Germany, and would look at the question in the abstract. It is very inconvenient that there should be separate constitutions for Schleswig Holstein and Denmark, and he would have them united under one consolidated form of government. The notion of nationality, the hon. and learned Gentleman says, is absurd—no nation acts on it. Therefore, if I understand him rightly, he thinks the Government ought to have been prepared to support Denmark in disavowing all her engagements with Germany, and to have aided her, under those circumstances, if necessary, by arms. That is not a view which I should say the House would be disposed to endorse.

Again, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stroud (Mr. Horsman) holds that we ought to have taken the line of modifying the Treaty of 1852; in other words, that we should have divested ourselves of our right to insist upon the engagements undertaken by that treaty, which alone introduce us as mediator, adviser, and negotiator in the matter, and then to have assumed the decided attitude of a partizan. No other speaker of influence, however, has expressed that opinion in the course of the discussion. I come now to the remarks of the right hon. and gallant Member for Huntingdon (General Peel) and of my noble Friend the Member for Stamford (Lord Robert Cecil). I was very anxious to discover whether there was any principle in the Motion, except that of turning out the Government. It was, therefore, a great relief to me to hear my noble Friend the Member for Stamford explain the principle which he conceived to be involved in the Motion, and I believe it was much the same as that expressed by the gallant Gentleman the Member for Huntingdon. That principle is, that we are never to take any part whatever in foreign affairs, in the shape either of remonstrance or advice, unless we are going to fight. ["Oh!"] My noble Friend said distinctly in substance that that was the principle he understood to be involved in the Motion—by "going to fight" I mean, of course, "prepared to fight." It is a very serious doctrine to advance, that you are never to negotiate except with your hand on the hilt of your sword; that you are either to abstain from the language of just remonstrance and expostulation with a foreign country — to refrain from urging your just claims on Foreign Powers — or else to do so on the understanding that if you fail to carry your point you intend to go to war. I hope no vote of the House of Commons will give countenance to that doctrine. I hope it will not be acted upon by right hon. Gentlemen opposite when they come into office, for if ever they venture to speak out in a free and open manner to any foreign nation it will, on their own showing, be at once interpreted as a threat or a menace of war. ["Oh!"] We know, however, well enough that you never mean to act on it. If you were in power, you would do as your predecessors—even those of your own party—have always done. You would negotiate —you would offer mediation—you would come forward as having an interest in maintaining the faith of treaties; you would say that there is a grave responsibility in these things, and that this country cannot look on with indifference. But how would you reconcile such conduct with the principle you have expressed in this debate? How can you hold such language to Foreign Powers—or, if you did, will they not look to these debates and see how you have taught them to interpret it? The truth is, you do not mean anything of the sort; and if you were in place you would have acted exactly as we have done.

Now, what is the view taken by the right hon. Gentleman who moved this Motion, and followed, I think, by the hon. Member for Horsham (Mr. S. FitzGerald)? The main point in the right hon. Gentleman's speech seemed to me to be that, although we pursued a right policy down to the time when the proposal of a General Congress was made by the French Emperor, everything was marred by the manner in which Lord Russell declined that proposal. The right hon. Gentleman does not think that the proposal of a Congress ought to have been accepted; but he thinks that if you had used guarded language — if you had only wrapped up your meaning in some plausible but specious terms—if you had only pretended to accept when you were declining, and suggested and insinuated instead of frankly and honestly stating your reasons for taking the course you did —then it would have been all right; the Emperor of the French would have been your good friend as much as before; he would not have changed his entire foreign policy merely to exhibit his pique against this Government, and you would not have been placed in the painful predicament in which you found yourselves. I cannot help thinking that the views brought forward by the right hon. Gentleman will not meet with the acceptance of this House. If what was done was right, the country will not, I think, blame Lord Russell for doing what was right in a direct, open, and straightforward way; nor will they readily believe that the motives imputed to him could have determined the policy of so sagacious a Sovereign as the Emperor of the French. We had no motive for interfering at all in those matters, except our regard for the common interests of Europe—the maintenance of peace, the maintenance of justice and right; and I do not know anywhere any page of history in which one could meet with a better exposition of the policy which ought to govern this country in such a case than is to be found in two passages in Lord Russell's despatches. I think my hon. Friend the Member for Leominster (Mr. Gathorne Hardy) quoted one of them, and I think he said it was the only one he found satisfactory. On the 1st of December, 1863, writing to Sir Andrew Buchanan, Earl Russell says—

> "I have to state to you that the line of policy to be pursued by Her Majesty's Government in the questions at issue between Denmark and Germany is perfectly clear. That policy is to advise Austria, Prussia, and the other Powers who signed the Treaty of London to adhere to their engagements, and to advise Denmark to observe all the engagements which she has taken to Germany.—No. 3, 293.

But it may be said, "What had you to do with the matter at all?" I would answer that question by another passage written by the same noble Lord. If it does not appeal to the common sense and right feeling of Englishmen I do not know what would. This passage occurs in a despatch of the 31st of December, addressed to all the Powers, and proposing a Conference, with a maintenance, in the meantime, of the *status quo*. Earl Russell says—

> "Thus much Her Majesty's Government consider themselves entitled to ask in behalf of the peace of Europe. They are not interested for Denmark otherwise than as one of the independent monarchies of Europe; but they are interested for European peace. They, therefore, entreat the Sovereigns and their Cabinets to consider how difficult it may be to compose differences once delivered over to the bloody arbitrament of war. Who shall say how far such a war may extend, what aspirations it may excite, what regions may be visited by its devastations. It matters comparatively little in itself whether a Prince of the House of Glucksburg or a Prince of the House of Augustenburg should reign in Holstein or in Schleswig. Under either Prince the liberties and privileges of his subjects may be adequately secured. But it matters much that the faith of treaties should be maintained, that right and possession should be respected, and that the flames of war should not be spread over Europe by questions which a calm and timely exercise of justice and reason might bring to a peaceful solution."—No. 4, 464.

Is not that good sense? Is not that good policy on the part of England? I do not think there can be a doubt on that point; and should the House come to the conclusion that all the noble Earl did was in the interest of that policy, if there has been failure, either such failure has been incident to the fallibility of man, or to the impossibility of controlling other Powers; in either case I do not think a just and generous House of Commons will ever pronounce a vote of condemnation.

Sir, let me now come to the charges made against Her Majesty's Government. They are threefold—that they have meddled, that they have menaced, and that they have promised—the two latter more particularly, menaced where they were not prepared to act, and promised where they have not performed. First, as to the meddling. I have already disposed of that charge—it is easy to use a word—and in reference to what my hon. Friend the

Member for Rochdale said on this point I would observe that his objection applies equally to all the cases in which negotiations have been undertaken by the country since the beginning of the century. You must make out that either there has been interference where we should not have interfered, or interference to a point beyond that to which it ought to have been carried. In this case I say that neither proposition can be sustained. What would the House, what would the country have said, if we had done nothing but stand by in silence, without so much as endeavouring to do anything by negotiations or remonstrance, to prevent the violation of the Treaty of 1852, and the dismemberment of the Danish Power? But I pass from that charge to one better understood, that of menacing. Does the House really mean to say that in a case of this kind, where a great wrong is perpetrated, where treaties are violated, where the peace of Europe is in danger, you are to dip your pen in rose water and veil your thoughts in some superfine language? If there were here words of contumely, words of insult—if there were a needless demonstration of warlike intentions — I could understand the use of the word menaces by way of a charge against the Government; but if I am told it is menacing to remind Powers that they are bound by treaties—that they are bound by obligations—if it is menacing to say most serious consequences will or may result from a particular cause — if it is menacing to say the peace of Europe is endangered—if it is menacing to say we and other great Powers cannot be indifferent—if it is menacing to say we look upon this in a serious light—then all I can say is that either you are bound to abdicate the function of negotiating in such matters at all, or you are bound to do that which in the course of this debate has been called using menaces. The passages referred to in support of this charge are not menaces. They are merely enunciations of honest truth; merely timely warnings of mischief and danger — mischief and danger as much to those who receive the warning as to those in whose behalf it is given. I should like to ask whether those notifications of danger were not true, even if it had been manifest from the beginning—if it had been declared from the beginning—that in no possible event would this country go to war? I should be glad to know, refraining from war as we are, and looking on as we do, sad spectators of what is going on, whether dangers have not resulted to Austria and Prussia from the course which against our remonstrances those Powers have taken? Is there the same good understanding as before between Austria and Prussia and the other Powers of Europe, ourselves included? Have we not been told by the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield, and apparently with the approval of great part of the House, that after what has taken place Austria and Prussia are not to reckon on the sympathy of the other nations of Europe; that if the day of retribution should come they cannot any longer reckon on the feeling, sympathy, or willingness to help, as far as help can be given, which they might otherwise have counted on in England? Is the loss of that sympathy and that support nothing? And would it have been right to allow that danger to occur without words of warning, without some words of expostulation? Have we been allies of Austria and Prussia for centuries, and connected with them by other ties not to be forgotten, are we to hold our peace while they do a great wrong which is to sever them from us, perhaps for ever —to cut them off from our friendship, sympathy, and help; and are we to be told that if we do not intend to go to war in this particular quarrel it is not right for us to say, "You must take the consequences if you do this, and those consequences may be serious?" I say that if from the beginning of this affair the result might have been foreseen, still it would have been our duty to speak the language of warning and remonstrance, to speak the words of honest truth, and not to mind what censure a critic, even so tender and mealy-mouthed a critic as my noble Friend the Member for Stamford, might cast on what he might please to call the incivility and menacing character of such warnings.

Now for the promises. What are the promises? I want to know what is meant by those who talk of promises? Is it meant that in a matter of this kind a nation is bound, before she interferes by good offices and mediation, to make up her mind in all the contingencies of unforeseen circumstances that she will or will not go to war; and that unless she so makes up her mind she is bound not to do anything to encourage a hope in the mind of the nation with whom she sympathizes? I apprehend that such a doctrine was never held in the history of the world. It is as new as many others of the doctrines put forward in the course of this debate. There is no case in history where negotiations have been carried on with a view to help a friendly country in difficulties, in which the effect has not necessarily been to raise some hopes or expectations of material aid in case of circumstances arising which should make it necessary. I have been very much struck by the contrast between the accusation made against the Government for not speaking out in the cause of Denmark, and the observations that have been made on the same point regarding the conduct of the Government in respect to Poland. It is said that the Government ought in some early stage of the negotiations to have told the Danes, that they would not under any circumstances go to war. Hon. Gentlemen opposite took a very strong course with respect to Poland, and almost compelled Her Majesty's Government to address strong remonstrances to Russia; but the hon. Member for Horsham says that we spoilt all the effect of those remonstrances by stating, through the mouth of Earl Russell, that we would not go to war for Poland. In this case, on the other hand, the Government are charged with misconduct, because they did not inform the Danish Government that they did not intend to go to war for Denmark. In Poland we spoilt everything by saying that we should not go to war, and in this case we spoilt everything by not saying so. I put it to the common sense of the House whether a great nation engaged in negotiations of this sort, endeavouring to do good and preserve peace, would be likely to further that object if she were to fetter herself by declarations and engagements that under no circumstances would she go to war? No one could tell what circumstances might arise to justify war, and if you wished to destroy the effect of your representations, the best course to take would be to say, "Now, mind, in no possible circumstances shall we back them up by having recourse to arms." Such a course was never taken before; no critics of a Government have ever recommended such a course; and except for the purpose of finding some ground for cavil, I do not think such an argument would have been brought forward now. The House will excuse me if I feel anxious to guard as much as I can the acts of the Government, so far as they may be thought capable of affecting the honour of the country, from all possible doubt and uncertainty. There is one point which does touch the honour of the country, and that is the accusation against the Government of having given promises which we did not perform, and having held out expectations to Denmark which we have failed to carry out. I say that nothing of the kind was done. Our conduct throughout was similar to that of our Allies, and we were as cautious and as reserved in not encouraging expectations of material aid as any other Power. The House will recollect the difficulties and dangers under which these negotiations were undertaken. The Danes and the Germans were almost equally responsible in the first instance for these difficulties and dangers which beset the question. The Danes were anxious to get rid of engagements, perhaps unwisely entered into, with regard to separate constitutions for Schleswig, Holstein, and Denmark, and their policy was directed to the incorporation of Schleswig, and such arrangements in reference to Holstein as would interfere as little as possible with the Royal authority and power. It was very natural that Denmark should take that course; but it was a course opposed to her engagements; and the departure of Denmark from those engagements tended directly to endanger the peace of Europe. The Germans, on the other hand, were equally ready to avail themselves of any opening arising out of the affairs of Holstein or Schleswig to encroach upon the rights of Denmark in Schleswig, and our policy was to endeavour to induce both parties to fulfil their engagements. There was, therefore, considerable difficulty arising out of the attitude of both parties. That the Danes were presuming upon their position, and relied upon the European embarrassments that would arise to prevent war, is apparent from a very able despatch early in this Correspondence from Mr. Lytton. I do not know whether he is connected with the right hon. Baronet the Member for Hertfordshire [An hon. MEMBER: His son]; but it does appear to me that he is worthy to be related to so distinguished a person. He has written despatches which display remarkable ability, and in one of them there is a passage which I cannot help thinking must show the House the difficulties with regard to Denmark with which the Government had to deal. The despatch is dated the 11th of March, 1863, and Mr. Lytton expresses his feelings thus—

> "It cannot, I think, be otherwise than a matter for unmitigated regret to all who are sincerely

interested in maintaining the dignity and independence of the Danish monarchy, that the present Cabinet of Copenhagen should have so pertinaciously resisted every friendly suggestion for the peaceful termination of a state of things of which the continuance is not less undignified than dangerous. . . . I cannot, however, entirely resist nor disguise my general impression, that the apparent languor with which the Danish Government continues to follow, with only fretful protest or grudging submission, that stream of events which seems now to be hurrying this country into open conflict with the Federal Power, is, in a great measure, caused by the conviction that Denmark is a geographical necessity in Western Europe, and that, in the event of renewed hostilities with Germany, England or France, or both those Powers together, will be compelled to defend in arms the integrity of the monarchy."—No. 2, 22.

That is a passage well worthy the attention of the House, because it enables the House to see that long before there was any pretence for saying that the language or conduct of this country had held out expectations to Denmark, Denmark was herself speculating upon the position she occupied, and upon the necessity which France and England might be under of assisting her in the event of a war with Germany.

Sir, I pass on now to the point of time which has been so much adverted to in the course of this debate—namely, the speech made by my noble Friend the First Minister, in which he referred to the possibility of Denmark, in the event of war, not being left to act alone. The House has already been reminded by my hon. Friend the Member for Southwark (Mr. Layard) of the exact circumstances under which that statement was made. The Swedish Minister, Count Manderstrom, had intimated that Sweden would interfere in favour of Denmark, and the Swedish Government were actually at that time negotiating a defensive treaty. It was to that principally that the speech of the noble Lord referred. In a despatch written on the 21st of July, Lord Bloomfield was directed to communicate to the Court of Vienna that it was clear Denmark would be supported by Sweden, and Lord Bloomfield made that communication on the 6th of August. Therefore it was quite true that at that time there was at least one Power which was likely to intervene in case of war. I was astonished in the course of the able speech of my hon. Friend the Member for Leominster (Mr. Hardy)—a speech to which we all listened with great pleasure — to hear my hon. Friend say that Russia at all events had not on any occasion shown a disposition to aid Denmark, or to induce her to suppose that she would. So far from that being the case, on the 12th of September, 1863, a despatch was written by Prince Gortschakoff to Baron Brunnow, in which Russia offered her co-operation. The despatch says—

"Germany is not ignorant that the Schleswig question partakes of an international character; and that the non-German Powers, Russia, France, and England, have an equal interest in the maintenance of the independence and integrity of the Danish Monarchy. . . . If the Cabinet of London thought fit, on its part, to re-assure the Danish Government on the result in the event of war, its representative at Copenhagen would meet with the most sincere co-operation on the part of the Baron de Nicolay."—No. 2, 133.

What could be more expressive than that? On the 3rd of September M. Hall, the Danish Minister, writing to M. de Bille, expressly stated that she placed her reliance on the North. The despatch is well worth the attention of the House. M. Hall says—

"Our line of conduct has long been decided upon, and I have every reason to hope that we shall not be left to our own resources in a struggle in which not only the fate of Denmark, but also the most sacred interests of the entire North, are involved."—No. 2, 127."

"The entire North;" says M. Hall, and therefore the reliance of Denmark was upon the interests of the North—namely, of Russia and Sweden. The Danish Minister himself says, "We shall not be left to our own resources," and in making that statement he is not looking to England but to other Powers. What was the attitude of England at that time? It was most cautious and reserved. I have already told the House what the communications were which were made by Sweden to this country in order to enlist this country on behalf of Denmark; and no doubt everything that passed between our Government and Sweden would be immediately communicated to Denmark. And what was it that passed? What was the language of Earl Russell when the Swedish Minister addressed himself to him? It was the first of several passages which distinctly disprove the allegation that we even left ourselves in a condition to be misunderstood on the matter. Earl Russell's conversation with Count Wachmeister, as reported by the Count to his Government, was as follows:—

"Earl Russell expressed the difficulty of saying precisely what steps would have to be taken by other Governments were the Germanic Confedera-

> tion to invade Schleswig; and said that Denmark's chief and immediate object ought to be the thorough fulfilment of her engagements respecting that Duchy."

Therefore, when England was invited by Sweden to concur with her, the answer returned was that it was impossible to say beforehand what this country would do; and the only advice given was that Denmark should fulfil her own engagements. Upon a later occasion—the 25th of September, 1863—Earl Russell had a further conversation with the Swedish Minister, when he stated,

> "That Her Majesty's Government set the highest value on the independence and integrity of Denmark, and were ready to offer their good offices to the two parties about to contend in arms. Her Majesty's Government would be ready to do so in conjunction with France or alone. But the course which Her Majesty might be advised to take with regard to these matters, if the good offices of Her Majesty's Government should be unsuccessful, must be the subject of future consideration and decision."—No. 2, 137.

Was there anything to mislead there? Was it possible to misunderstand that declaration? The House has heard so much as to the course which has been taken by France, that it is not necessary to refer to the despatches on the subject. It is, however, somewhat singular that hon. Gentlemen opposite should find that the very same language has so different a meaning in the mouth of France from that which it has in the mouth of England. When the British Government say that we cannot look with indifference upon the invasion of Schleswig, hon. Gentlemen opposite regard it as a menace and a threat of going to war; but when France says so, the declaration is regarded in a very different manner; it means that she is perfectly peaceable and by no means disposed to go to war. If you try by that test all the language in these documents which is called the language of menace, you will find that every single expression was echoed, assented to, and repeated both by France and Russia.

I now bring the House to the month of October, and what was the attitude of this country then? On the 14th of October a conversation occurred between Sir Augustus Paget and M. Hall, and the grounds on which Denmark then looked for support in the event of war were not stated by M. Hall to be founded on any expectation of aid held out by the Government of this country. Two conversations are reported. In the first M. Hall spoke in a tone of much decision and confidence:—

> "His Excellency went on to observe that, although a war with Germany would undoubtedly be a misfortune now as at any time, the present moment was perhaps as favourable for Denmark, and as unfavourable for Germany, as any that would occur; that it was impossible for Denmark to live under a continual menace of hostilities; that Sweden was with her; that the public feeling of England, France, and Europe in general was roused in favour of Denmark at this moment. If, therefore, the question must be settled by an appeal to arms, it had better be so now; and he felt convinced, he said, that Denmark and Sweden would not stand alone."—No. 3, 159.

On what was that expectation founded? On the public feeling of England, France, and Europe generally. I ask the House to consider the meaning of the public feeling of England. Does that mean the official action of the Government? Does it mean the menaces, the threats, and the promises which are pretended to be found in these papers? No; it means the feeling exhibited in the country, the sympathy entertained by the people of England for Denmark, the sympathy entertained for the wronged and oppressed, and for the cause of justice and right. But it is not confined to England; it extends to France, and to Europe at large. Down to that time, at all events, that was the only ground of Denmark's expectations; and we are perfectly clear of having held out to her hopes of aid in any way. I trust the House will permit me to call its particular attention to a matter which seems to me to have been a little too much overlooked in this debate. On the 14th of October, Sir Augustus Paget had a conversation with M. Hall, which is reported in these papers. On that occasion, M. Hall wanted, on certain terms, to obtain a formal promise of support from England; and this is what took place. We were pressing for the revocation of the Patent of the 30th of March. M. Hall, upon this, replied that—

> "There was one other condition on which the Patent could be withdrawn—namely, that England and France would give to the Danish Government a formal promise to support them against any further demands of Germany."

What did Sir Augustus Paget say to that? His words are—

> "I said I did not think much would be obtained by forwarding this message; but I suggested, as an idea of my own—though, in doing so, I was taking a great responsibility on myself—that the Danish Government might state to the Diet at the time of withdrawing the Patent that they would only enter into negotiations with Germany on matters which would embrace the other portions of the monarchy, on condition that all the Powers who signed the Convention of London should take part in them."

That was a plain intimation that M. Hall was not to look for any distinct engagement from this country. At the same time it shows that Denmark was always well aware that England was not likely to enter into any engagement singly, for England and France were coupled by her, and it was from both those Powers together that she sought the promise of help. Our Government had held out no promise, and bound themselves by no obligation, express or implied, down to that time.

On the death of Frederick VII. matters became more complicated. M. Hall had been playing a high game. I was astonished to hear that the hon. Member for Leominster (Mr. Gathorne Hardy) imagines that the Patent of March was issued by M. Hall in conformity with the advice of Lord Russell. I suppose the hon. Gentleman is aware of Lord Russell's despatch on that subject to the Danish Government, and I suppose he has also read the Patent. If so, he must know that the Patent deviated in the most important particulars from the essence of Lord Russell's advice; and offended, in a manner which is undeniable and undenied, against the engagements which Denmark had entered into with Germany. Therefore, it is a most extraordinary thing that the words of M. Hall, which are shown to have been insincere and preposterous, should be taken by the hon. Member as evidence that the Patent was in conformity with Lord Russell's counsels. M. Hall heaped up difficulties for his country, first in issuing the Patent, and afterwards in persisting with the new Constitution, which brought on a crisis. We are accused of interfering with our advice and of having urged Denmark to do a great many things which she otherwise would not have done; and it is said that since she followed our advice we were bound to support her by arms. But what was the nature of our advice? I could understand that if we had advised her to go to war, and to take steps calculated to embroil her with other nations, then we might be bound to support her against her enemies. But our advice to her went entirely in the opposite direction. We advised her to do nothing but to remove obstacles to peace, to keep her engagments, and when she had broken those engagements, to return to their fulfilment. We advised her to abstain from opposing Federal Execution because she would bring on war upon herself. In every part of that advice the other Powers concurred with us, although it is said that those other Powers differed from us only in not intending to go to war. Whether or not they or we intended to go to war, we gave Denmark right advice, and the only advice which could possibly extricate her from her difficulties; and how can it fairly be contended that we engaged to defend her by giving her advice of that character, by following which she might avoid war, and in offering which the other Powers, who are now said to stand in so honourable a position, concurred?

I hope the House will bear with me while I endeavour to come to close quarters on another point which has been a good deal dwelt upon. The right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire adverted to certain conversations which took place in the months of November and December last between M. Hall and Lord Wodehouse, and said expressions were used in the course of those conversations which must have been calculated to create the belief that England even single-handed would assist Denmark. My noble Friend the Member for Stamford (Lord R. Cecil) also referred particularly to one of those conversations, and said that language was used in it which could not be explained away. He said, "You cannot say the effect of that conversation was not to give Denmark to understand that she was to look for assistance from England, even though England might stand alone." I join issue with the noble Lord on that. I say not only was that not the meaning of the conversation, and it could not have been so understood at the time, but, what is more, that it was not so understood in fact. This I am prepared to prove from the papers. The House will recollect that the conversation occurred on the 20th of December, 1863, and arose thus:—Lord Wodehouse went to see M. Hall on that day—the very day before the Rigsraad was dissolved. Did he go alone? My noble Friend the Member for Stamford, in his excessive zeal to find something to criminate the Government, fastens on this interview as if it furnished proof of an engagement at least morally binding on England separately. But Lord Wodehouse did not go alone. He went with M. d'Ewers, the Russian Minister, and the representation then made was the joint representation of England and Russia; and it was also in substance backed by France. Well, the Russian and English Ministers both conjointly urged on M. Hall the revocation of the Constitution. M. Hall asked, "What would Denmark gain by following our advice?" Lord Wodehouse suggested that the question was rather what she would lose if the Constitution was not revoked.

> "I entreated his Excellency to weigh well the gravity of the dangers which threatened Denmark. General Fleury had informed M. d'Ewers and me that he was instructed to tell the Danish Government that France would not go to war to support Denmark against Germany. It was my duty to declare to him that if the Danish Government rejected our advice Her Majesty's Government must leave Denmark to encounter Germany on her own responsibility. Surely there was nothing inconsistent with the honour of Denmark in yielding to the united counsels of England, France, and Russia?"

But did it stop there? The Russian Minister took up the conversation—

> "M. d'Ewers said that M. Hall would do the Russian Government the justice to admit that they had never varied in their language. They had constantly warned the Danish Government against the hazardous policy which they were pursuing. He pointed out forcibly the perilous situation in which Denmark was placed, and concluded by saying that he was instructed to declare in explicit terms that Russia must leave to Denmark the responsibility of the consequences which might ensue from the rejection of our advice."—No. 4, 418.

This is the one passage singled out by my noble Friend as an example of the advice given by England separately. The Rigsraad was dissolved the next day, and the consent to convene it again was not given till the 23rd of January. It was quite clear, therefore, that if there had been anything like the holding out of the prospect of assistance upon terms, the terms were rejected, and nothing followed from them. But the matter does not stop even there. The noble Lord forgot that there were two other interviews on the same day, all to back up the same advice. The same day General Fleury had an interview with M. Hall, and stated to Lord Wodehouse and M. d'Ewers in the ante-room, that he was about to support the advice they had offered. So that France, Russia, and England were here acting together. Sir Augustus Paget also went in afterwards to back it up; and what followed? My noble Friend could not have read this despatch, because with his candour he would have seen that Denmark did not understand the conversation in the sense which he put upon it. After the conversation with Lord Wodehouse was over, Sir Augustus Paget tried what he could do, and urged the same arguments; and M. Hall said that even if he could succeed in getting the proposition adopted, which he thought an impossibility, he could not see of what advantage it would be to Denmark. He added these important words:—"There is no promise of support to Denmark if Germany should continue her aggressions." These are the conversations to which the noble Lord alluded, and I must say I think Denmark is the best interpreter of her own understanding. M. Hall expressly states that there was no promise of support. What we said was "You will put yourself morally in the right; judge for yourself how far in these circumstances there may or may not be a prospect of material aid." These, I think, are the only conversations to which the noble Lord adverted. There were earlier conversations, in December, 1863. Earl Russell was then advising that Federal Execution should not be resisted. What did he say? Did he give that advice in the tone of one who was going to give material aid? On the contrary, he merely expressed his personal opinion that that course would be for the advantage of Denmark.

Now, I want the House to consider whether this country has not been better than its word in this matter. We proposed no assistance; but we were quite prepared, if the object could have been accomplished, to take our part in maintaining the independence and integrity of Denmark. We invited the five Powers to act in concert. What was the history of that part of the transaction? It was not a step unadvisedly or inconsiderately taken. Sir Andrew Buchanan had suggested that the probable effect of a joint representation would be to put an end to the whole affair; and upon that suggestion it was a becoming course for us to see whether that joint representation could be made. Accordingly, Earl Russell on the 18th of January sent a despatch to the five Powers, in which he asked their concert and co-operation. That despatch, as explained by my hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State, was addressed to all the Powers who, as parties to the Treaty of 1852, were bound together by a common tie. If France and Russia had concurred with England, no doubt peace would have been effectually maintained. Surely that was a very proper course for England to take. England was anxious to stop this war and prevent this wrong; she used her good offices, she persevered in the midst of many obstacles, she exhausted all available means, she offered mediation which was declined, she was prepared to join the great Powers in effective intervention; France and Russia would not concur, and England could do no more than she has done. It would be a most serious imputation if it could be made good that we had held out to Denmark expectations of aid which we had not given; but I must say I do not think that these arguments are much believed in by those on the other side of the House who use them; and I will tell the House why—if they were believed, this is not the Motion which would be made. If hon. Gentlemen opposite really believed that England had given a pledge on her honour and good faith to sustain Denmark, would not they—would not the country—say the honour of England must be redeemed—the engagements of England must be fulfilled—we must give the aid which was promised? I cannot understand how hon. Gentlemen opposite, having had the despatches which raised these questions before them since the 3rd of March, should have been content to watch the course of events to see what might happen—to see what line the Government would take—to see how the Conference would end, and what the country would think of the result—and then come down to the House and move a Resolution of this character. Can there be doubt, that if they were for peace, and thought we were holding language which might involve us in discredit if we did not go to war, they would long ago have let us know their minds upon that subject? Can there be a doubt, if they had now considered that the honour of the country was pledged, that they would have come forward with a Resolution to redeem that honour and fulfil the pledge that had been given? It is because they know that no such engagements were made that they seek to censure us, not for not going to war, but for compromising, as they will have it, the interests of peace. I think that a very lame and impotent conclusion of such arguments.

But, Sir, although the conduct of the Government may be called in question, before the other nations of the world, England is responsible for all the engagements that have been made by her Government; the country would be bound by those engagements, and must perform them; and it is not by heaping vituperation and abuse on the present Ministry—it is not by displacing the Government, that you can get rid of any such engagements. The truth is, there are no such engagements, and this Resolution is merely brought forward to serve party purposes. A new light has broken in upon the hon. Gentlemen in the course of these transactions, and this is supposed to be a convenient opportunity to displace a Government, and therefore this Motion is made. For that purpose we are told of dishonour to the country, of bad faith, and of breaches of engagements, which, if broken at all, the breach must be visited, not upon one particular set of men sitting upon these benches, but upon the nation. Surely, that is not a course worthy of a great party in this country. Surely they cannot have reflected on the effect, on the character and position of this country on the minds of Foreign Powers, of thus casting imputations of dishonour and bad faith on Ministers who are not the Ministers of a party, but the Ministers of the Queen. It is not, I believe, a course which this House will endorse or approve; but of this I am sure, that it will be a far more honourable and satisfactory thing to us, even if we should fall after having done our best to preserve the honour of Europe, to serve the interests of our Allies, and to maintain the faith of treaties, than it will be to hon. Gentlemen opposite to succeed to power at the expense of their country's good name, and without having any different policy of their own to advocate by availing themselves of the chapter of accidents. I have seen with surprise the different tone which is adopted by hon. Gentlemen towards our own country, from that adopted towards France, Russia, and other Powers. Not a representation was made, no advice was given by us which was not given by them; and, before January, Russia and France had declared that under certain circumstances they might be induced to take part with Denmark against Germany. Those Powers have seen their own reasons for not adhering to that intention. We, too, were willing to accede to it if they would have aided us. We did all we could for Denmark short of going to war alone and lighting up the flames of war and bringing about a convulsion in Europe, which no one would desire to see, and which it was our object to prevent. If we had had the assistance of Russia and France in stopping the war, we would have acted; and the only cause why we did not act was because Russia and France, for their own reasons, declined to give any aid. And yet the conduct of France and Russia has been held up as just and honourable, while the conduct of our own Government has been attacked and reprobated. It is perhaps well for France and Russia that they have not blue-books or published despatches, and that all the secrets of their negotiations are not laid open for Parliamentary discussion. In those countries there might be found some parties equally patriotic with the hon. Members opposite, who might suggest a reverse of the picture. Parliamentary government has inestimable advantages, for the sake of which one may put up with some inconveniences; but if any reasons could be found under any circumstances for thinking that Parliamentary government laboured under disadvantages as compared with Despotic government, they would be found in discussions like the present. The history of important negotiations, conducted honestly and in good faith, has been laid before the country. They have not been successful from causes beyond our control; the negotiations did not rest with us, but were shared in by other nations; but because an effect may be produced upon the position of political parties in this House, we are told, while Russia is justified, while France is praised, that the honour of England has been sacrificed, and the just influence of the country has been diminished. I believe that the honour of the country does not stand upon so slender a foundation. I believe the way to support the influence of the country is to do right, to give good advice to others, to act rightly, to keep to our engagements, and not to enter upon useless and unnecessary wars. Whatever may be at the present time the opinion of the House, I feel confident that the verdict of posterity will not endorse these imputations upon the Government, and, through it, upon the nation which in these transactions it has represented.

Lord JOHN MANNERS: Sir, there are two facts which have presented themselves in the course of this debate. We are now approaching the close of the third night of the debate, and as far as I know only one independent Member has been found to vindicate the policy of the Government. The other fact is, that the hope of external aid in debate having failed, recourse has been had to extreme audacity on the part of the Treasury Bench. When the other night the Chancellor of the Exchequer denied that England had lost any prestige or moral power, and alluded to the ribald trash of some obscure French journals as the only quarters where such suggestions would be found, I thought the statement approached the sublime of audacity. When, too, the Chancellor of the Exchequer asserted that from the moment that the Government discovered that France and Russia intended not to cooperate with us in giving material aid to Denmark, no further menace or threat could be imputed to our Government—I thought that too was a bold and audacious statement. I own that when I heard the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs quote the Despatch of January, which has been so often referred to as a despatch calculated to light up the flames of war, and assure the House that that despatch was written with the direct intention of enabling England to back out of every warlike promise, and that it was addressed to Austria, Prussia, Sweden, and France, in order to clear the ground so as to enable England to release herself from her engagements—I thought that, too, was a bold and audacious statement. But I must say that the hon. and learned Attorney General has improved upon those statements, for he has referred to that very despatch, not in the same sense as the Under Secretary of State did—not to prove that England intended to back out of her warlike promises—but to show that she had magnanimously done more than she had promised to do. What the aid given to Denmark consisted in the hon. and learned Gentleman did not say. I am incapable of understanding what good Denmark could derive from that despatch if no material assistance was to be given. But the hon. and learned Attorney General, finding fault with the terms of the Address which is proposed, says that the only policy he can extract from it is, that under no circumstances for the future ought England to interfere in any European quarrel by giving advice. I think he has failed to understand the language of the Motion, and the policy of those who support it. What we say is this—It is not right for England to hold out threats upon the one hand, or to give encouragement, direct or indirect, on the other, unless she is prepared to carry out those threats or to fulfil those promises. We heard in the very temperate observations of the hon. Member for the County of Kildare (Mr. Cogan) some reference to the general political aspect of the question. He spoke as a Liberal Member and as a Reformer—and I am thereby reminded of the circumstances under which this Motion has been brought before the House. It is now five years since the noble Lord opposite came into office upon the faith of doing two things—that he would carry a democratic Reform Bill, and that he would raise the name and fame of England to a pitch which it had never reached under the wise, moderate, but firm management of Lord Derby. With the first of these considerations we are not now concerned; but with respect to the latter, the country—nay, the whole Empire—is entitled to ask how have these boastful pledges been redeemed by those who were so ready to censure, to condemn, if not to impeach the Government of Lord Derby for not going to war single-handed against France on account of some Portuguese vessel, whose very name, I doubt not, all have forgotten. I would ask, how has the honour and character of England been upheld by them in these transactions? The Chancellor of the Exchequer tells us we must not refer to foreign newspapers. But, go to what source you will, from every foreign newspaper, from every foreign capital where the unfortunate Englishman—the *Civis Romanus* of former times—happens to reside, from every foreign Court to which you address your sterile complaints and unavailing supplications, and you will receive a complete, if not a satisfactory, answer. At home, in every place where men congregate, there is but one answer to that question. The very Speech put into the mouth of the Royal Commissioners at the opening of the Session admitted that whereas in 1859, when you succeeded to the management of affairs, you found England on friendly terms with all the Powers of Europe, in 1864 she stands in a position of impotent isolation. In this situation of affairs the House of Commons, the grand inquest of the nation, is called upon to decide the question—How you have conducted the negotiations arising out of the Treaty of 1852? And here I may say that considering the place in which that treaty was signed—considering that the noble Lord at the head of the Government was the real author of the treaty—considering the facility with which, if needs be, England might have interfered, otherwise than diplomatically, to carry out the objects of the treaty—considering, lastly, the promises and declarations made by England—it might have been antecedently expected that when England condescended to beseech and implore the German Powers to respect their obligations under the treaty, some deference would have been shown to her wishes. Why was it otherwise? Why did not only great Powers like Prussia and Austria reject your advice, but why did small States like Wurtemburg and Saxony rebuke your interference? Sad and startling as the effect might be, the cause is not far to seek. During great part of the last century the foreign policy of this country was administered by two very different but equally remarkable men—Sir Robert Walpole and Lord Chatham. Sir Robert Walpole's system was that of peace—his enemies said (and that at last proved fatal to him), "peace at any price." Aided by a good understanding with an equally pacific Minister in France, he for many years carried out his policy and maintained peace. But what was Sir Robert Walpole's language to foreign Powers? Was it haughty, dictatorial, insulting, menacing? No! His language reflected his policy, and Sir Robert Walpole descends to posterity with all his faults as a great and consistent Minister. Lord Chatham's mind was cast in another mould—

"No joys to him pacific sceptres yield—
"War sounds the trump—he rushes to the field."

But his contemporaries recognized in him the man of vigorous language and of equally vigorous action; and posterity has ratified the eulogies of his contemporaries. It has been reserved for Lord Russell to combine in a Mezentian alliance a parody of the language of Chatham with an exaggeration of the policy of Walpole. I know it is said, and most justly, that we are not concerned with Lord Russell alone, but with the whole Government of which he is a Member. I fully admit this; and far be it from me to follow the example set by the noble Earl himself in 1855 and endeavour to make one Colleague responsible for the faults of the Administration. But I think Lord Russell is responsible in 1864 for one great source of weakness which was wanting in 1855. I mean that system of bombast and bluster which has never save in one instance been followed by vigorous action, and which has become the laughing-stock of Europe. Can we forget the vehement and pertinacious denunciations of the French Emperor and the French Government uttered in this House upon the annexation of Savoy and Nice, when the noble Lord electrified the House and the country by declaring that we must henceforward turn to other alliances? Well, Savoy and Nice now form part of the French empire; but where are those other allies? "Conspicuous by their absence." Again, can we forget that despatch in which the noble Earl threatened Italy with the vengeance of England if she presumed to encroach upon the territories of the Church? Yet all the Papal territory that is not defended by French arms is now Italian soil. Can we forget the importunity with which the noble Lord beset the French Government to abandon their protectorate of Rome? Yet the Papal rule in Rome is still supported by French bayonets, and the invitation to Malta is not yet accepted. But above and beyond all this is the rash individuality of the noble Lord, conspicuous in the causes which led to the collapse of his Polish policy. We have heard to-night from the Under Secretary of State, that he is in possession of what he calls the secret history of the failure of his Polish policy. What the secret history may be I cannot profess to understand, and to do the hon. Gentleman justice he did not give us any proof of the truth of his marvellous statement; but I think, without diving into these hidden events, we cannot forget how in the speech made last September by the noble Lord to the farmers of a Highland valley—a speech containing threats and insults addressed now to all the Radicals, and now to all the Russias—we cannot forget how the noble Earl arrogating to himself the Power claimed by Mediæval Popes, proceeded from his chair in Blairgowrie to depose the Emperor Alexander and release his Polish subjects from their allegiance; and more than that—how, animated by the discriminating applause of his Highland hearers he proceeded to put his threats into execution—on paper, and fired off his memorable despatch to St. Petersburg. A single hint, however, from the Minister of the Sovereign about to be deposed was sufficient to convince the noble Earl or his Colleagues of his imprudence, and induce him to withdraw the inky thunderbolt, and substitute in its place a mere blank cartridge. After all those proofs of the impotence of the noble Lord's most vehement language and most determined threats, can we wonder that Germany, when she had to consider the probability of England opposing her in this matter of Schleswig-Holstein, came, on very good grounds, to the conviction that from England, as at present governed, she had nothing worse to fear than a shower of acrid despatches and a few bouncing speeches? It is remarkable from the papers laid on the table, how soon this conviction entered the minds of those who were managing the affairs of Germany. I will not dwell on despatches which have been already quoted, but there is a letter from Sir Alexander Malet very early in 1863, in which he points out that the threats employed by Her Majesty's Government—for threats he held them to be—had produced a very small effect indeed upon the minds of those who then guided the councils of Frankfort. But, Sir, I have said that I think it unfair to charge the noble Earl alone with the failure of those negotiations; and I must say that, having been in the House on the memorable July morning last year, when the First Minister of the Crown made the declaration to which so much reference has been made, I cannot acquit him of singular blindness as to the dangers which Europe was even then running from this quarrel between Germany and Denmark. My hon. Friend the Member for Horsham (Mr. Seymour FitzGerald) then called attention in very emphatic terms to the dangerous condition of that question, and the noble Lord having uttered that which has been so often quoted in this House, proceeded to say—

> "I do not myself anticipate any immediate danger or, indeed, any of that remote danger which the hon. Gentleman seems to think imperils the peace of Europe arising out of the Danish and Holstein question."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxii. 1252.]

The noble Lord made this statement, that he was conscious of no danger near or remote on the 23rd of July, many weeks after warnings of the most serious character had been received from Foreign Courts and from our own Ministers abroad as to the imminent danger which existed. The hon. and learned Gentleman (the Attorney General) himself quoted a warning which had been received from Sweden. Sir Alexander Malet some weeks before had written a very forcible paper, and the French Government in the month of May called serious attention to the threatening aspect of the question. And yet, in spite of all these warnings, the noble Lord could rise in his place towards the end of July, and say that he saw no danger, however remote, to the peace of Europe from this complicated question! I know the apologists of the noble Lord who manages the affairs of the Foreign Office say—What could he do yoked in that unfortunate coalition with men nearly all of whom he had deserted or denounced in turn—how could he be expected to carry on these great negotiations successfully, remembering that ten years ago, under very similar circumstances, a coalition drifted into war with Russia? I admit that similar causes have led to a similar failure, and I say that now it is the duty of the House to judge the conduct of the Government, and, if it finds the charge brought against them has been proved, not upon any of the considerations that have been urged by the hon. and learned Attorney General or the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs to forbear giving a plain and straightforward verdict. We are told that the dignity of the country will suffer if the House of Commons give emphasis to that which is admitted to be the universal sentiment of the country. On the contrary, I think that if the House of Commons fails to record its verdict, and takes refuge behind any screen which may be conveniently raised, the House will fail in the discharge of one of its most important and sacred duties. The time has come when the House must express an opinion as to the conduct of the Government, and say whether that conduct has been characterized by all that weakness, all that vacillation, all that indecision which would justly call for condemnation on its part. Two courses were open to the Government. They might have said, with France, "We will not interfere to protect Denmark from Germany;" or, by a bold and vigorous policy in the outset, they might have stifled this iniquitous aggression in the bud. But they did neither one nor the other. "Letting I dare not wait upon I would," they failed to intimidate Germany, and they still more lamentably failed to support that unfortunate country, of which they professed themselves to be the friends. We have been told, indeed, that no promises were made to Denmark, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other night asserted that after England discovered that no material assistance was to be expected from the other neutral Powers the English Government made use of no threats to Germany. But I say that long after that discovery was made recourse was had to the most important and the most determined threat that could be offered—the Channel Fleet was summoned to the Downs. No threat uttered after January! No promise held out to Denmark! Why, what was the language in one House of the noble Earl himself, and in the other of the noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty? The noble Earl, in language which has been already quoted, explained the meaning of that striking event, and the Secretary to the Admiralty, whose statement, I am bound to say, produced far more commotion than the speech of the noble Earl, said, in answer to a Question put by my right hon. Friend the Member for Droitwich (Sir John Pakington)—

> "The Channel squadron was now in the Downs. The ships were very nearly completely supplied, and were perfectly ready to proceed to any part of the world in twenty-four hours. With respect to the iron ships, although they had not been docked since their return from their winter cruise, yet they had all been docked within a few months."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxiv. 1979.]

That was on the 2nd of May, 1864. Remembering the language held by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I feel some scruple in reading a quotation from an English journal; but in a City Article of *The Times* of May 4, I find the following statement descriptive of the effect produced by these announcements:—

> "The English funds this morning opened at a decline of a quarter per cent from the low prices of Saturday, and subsequently experienced a further fall. . . . The intimation that it will probably be found necessary to employ the British fleet to arrest the Prussians in their career of dishonesty contributed to the general heaviness, but at the same time there was a universal feeling of satisfaction that this method of dealing with offenders who have shown themselves totally incapable of being touched by any moral considerations has at length been resolved upon."

That statement appeared in the City Article of *The Times* newspaper of May 4, and I think, after that, it will require considerable boldness in any Member of Her Majesty's Government to assert that this summoning of the Channel Fleet to the Downs and the warlike intimations which followed that proceeding in both Houses of Parliament were, in reality, neither a threat to Prussia, nor—what in my mind is still more important—an encouragement to Denmark. How is it possible for us to shut our eyes to the fact that hasty orders were given for 70-pounders to be rifled, and that every effort was made to get the fleet into readiness to sail at a moment's notice? We know that until the Conference closed its sittings what I must now call a desponding hope was entertained by the Danes, that the encouragement given would be realized, and that they would see at last the long-promised Channel Fleet making its appearance in the Baltic. It is said, "You condemn the policy of the Government; but would you advise the Government, laying aside mere harmless, discreditable bluster, to proceed to action, when this would probably lead you into conflict with 44,000,000" of — I think I have heard them called—"insane Germans?" My answer to that hypothetical question consists, in the first place, of a denial of the hypothesis on which it is founded. I do not believe that if some months ago you had evinced a firm and determined policy you would have had to war with these 44,000,000 of what you are pleased to term "insane Germans." I would illustrate that position by referring to the one single act of vigour performed by Her Majesty's Government since they came into office—an act for which I suppose they have already asked pardon in the proper quarter, and of which I doubt not they are now most heartily ashamed—I mean their conduct in the affair of the *Trent.* There you had to deal with some 22,000,000 of what I suppose you would call equally insane Americans. But the result of the firm, definite, decided policy pursued in that case shows that a firm and definite policy leads not to war, but to peace. Now that the Americans have discovered the impotence of your threats, I fear we may live to rue the complacency with which throughout these dreary negotiations the noble Lord ate the leek proffered by Germany. At this time of night I could not presume to continue the observations which naturally occur to me; but I would sum up by saying that it appears to me the Government have neither known how to maintain the peace of Europe, nor how to vindicate the dignity of England. It seems to me that the one has been and is still imperilled, and the other tarnished, in the keeping of Her Majesty's Government. I own that I have perused these documents with pain and with regret, and that their perusal binds me to support the Address proposed by my right hon. Friend. That Address, I believe, expresses accurately the opinion of England; and of this I am quite certain—that those weary, dreary, hopeless, helpless pages through which we have waded do not express the spirit, the intention, and the mind of England. That spirit, I believe, to be as high, that intention as noble, and that mind as chivalrous as ever. Remove from the posts which they acquired on conditions they have not fulfilled, the authors of her present humiliation, and England will regain her pristine fame, and name, and power, become once more the moral bulwark of the oppressed against the oppressor, and resume her wonted influence for good in the Council Chambers of Europe.

Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. ONSLOW, in rising to second the Motion for the adjournment, said, that having carefully perused all the documents connected with the question, he desired to express his admiration of the conduct of Her Majesty's Government in having through a course of long, laborious, and difficult negotiations, steered Great Britain with consummate skill. They might possibly have employed a little threatening language, but the object they had had in view was one dear to the hearts of all Englishmen, the establishment of peace. Though the Conference and the proposal to settle the Danish difficulty by arbitration had both failed, yet the efforts of Her Majesty's Government were, in his opinion, well worthy the confidence of the House; and so long as the country was blessed with a Liberal Government, and so long as these Gentlemen sat on the Ministerial bench, the honour of England was secure. It was "all bosh" to talk of the decline of our prestige and power, for if the country were at all hated on the Continent that feeling only arose from the envy with which foreigners regarded our wealth, happiness, and power. It was well known that all the countries which had desired our injury had been disappointed and sold. He denied that the question was one of peace or war, because he was convinced that it was simply one of power and place.

Mr. HENNESSY: Sir, before this debate is adjourned, I trust I may be allowed to call the attention of the House to a circumstance which may, at all events, have the effect of inducing the members of Her Majesty's Government in future to pay the deference which I think is due to the Chair. I find that the noble Viscount at the head of the Government, on the 27th of April, 1855, in addressing this House used the following words:—"Every reasonable man must have been convinced that the charges made by the hon. Member were false and calumnious." Who was the Member referred to by the noble Viscount? The Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Sir, the noble Viscount was called to order by an hon. Member who then sat below the gangway. Your predecessor decided the noble Viscount was in order, and yet we have to-night been witnesses of an extraordinary scene in which the noble Viscount took a conspicuous part. [*Cries of* "Read, read."]

"Mr. Otway rose to order. He respectfully submitted the noble Viscount had used words which were altogether un-Parliamentary when he charged another Member with stating that which was false and calumnious."

"MR. SPEAKER: What I understood the noble Viscount to say was, that the charges made by the hon. Member for Aylesbury (Mr. Layard) were false and calumnious. [*Cheers.*"]

"VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Sir, I repeat what I was about to say. [*Loud cheering.*] The charges were utterly false and calumnious."

MR. HENNESSY: And yet, Sir, the same noble Viscount who used that language in the House towards the hon. Member for Southwark rose to-night, not only to call to order an hon. Gentleman who used a similar, and, indeed, identical phrase, but actually to call into question the decision of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Sir, I apprehend that upon the occasion quoted by the hon. Gentleman I applied those terms not to my hon. Friend the Member for Southwark, but to the charges which had been made by some other person. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] However, I should in any case, Sir, defer to your decision. I rise chiefly for the purpose of asking the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire, whether it be the intention of himself and those who act with him to bring this debate to a termination to-morrow? I think it is desirable to know whether it is to end to-morrow night, or whether it is to be continued on Monday? If, as I understand, it is the intention to finish the debate to-morrow, as by the forms of the House the Committee of Supply is the first of the Orders of the Day, and as it is competent for hon. Members to make preliminary Motions upon that Motion, I hope hon. Members who have notices on the paper will consent to their postponement, and allow the House to go into Committee of supply as a matter of form, so that the debate may be proceeded with early in the evening.

MR. DISRAELI: As far as I have been able to collect the general feeling of the House on both sides, I believe it is their wish that the debate should be concluded to-morrow. That is the general understanding.

Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

STREET MUSIC BILL—[BILL 186.]

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."

MR. AYRTON said, that the Amendments were so confusing that it would probably accomplish none of the purposes for which it was brought in. There was so much discord raging in that House, that it was impossible to introduce any harmony into it, but as it was extremly likely to be rejected in another place he should not trouble the House by dividing against it. He (Mr. Ayrton) repeated his opinion that the Bill was utterly unnecessary and absurd, and was a miserable instance of class legislation.

SIR WILLIAM JOLLIFFE opposed the Bill, on the ground that there were innumerable instances of terrible nuisances that were not affected by the Bill, and he Moved that it be read a third time that day three months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Sir William Jolliffe.*)

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 49; Noes 18: Majority 31.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read 3°, and *passed.*

COURTS OF JUSTICE SITE BILL.

[BILL 189.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Debate arising,

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Lygon.*)

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill read 2°, and *committed* to a Select Committee.

PILOTAGE ORDER CONFIRMATION (No. 2) BILL—[BILL 184.]

Order for Committee read, and *discharged.*

Bill *committed* to a Select Committee of Five Members, to be nominated by the Committee of Selection.

Ordered,

That the Petition of the Trinity House of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, which was presented upon Tuesday last, against the Bill, be referred to the Committee; and that the Petitioners be heard by their Counsel or Agents upon their Petition, if they think fit, and counsel heard in favour of the Bill, against the said Petition.—(*Mr. Milner Gibson.*)

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES (VOTING PAPERS) BILL.—CONSIDERATION.

Order for Consideration read.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Mr. VANCE moved the following Clause :—

"Unless at a general meeting of the Company it shall be otherwise resolved, the directors of such Company shall cause a list of the shareholders who are entitled to vote, with their registered addresses, to be printed annually or half-yearly as the directors may determine, distinguishing shareholders holding shares or stock to the amount of a director's qualification by an asterisk, and such list shall be sold to any shareholder on application to the Company at a reasonable cost price, not exceeding five shillings."

Clause *brought up,* and read 1° ; 2°.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON opposed the Clause.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Clause be added to the Bill."

The House *divided :*—Ayes 32; Noes 53 : Majority 21.

Bill to be read 3° *this day,* and to be *printed.* [Bill 195.]

ISLE OF MAN HARBOURS ACT AMENDMENT (DEFICIENCY OF DUES) BILL.

[Bill 185.]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient that any deficiency in the Dues of the Harbour of Port Erin in the Isle of Man, applicable to meet the Claims of the Public Works Loan Commissioners, should be charged on the Surplus Customs Revenue of that Island.

Resolutions to be reported *this day.*

TURNPIKE TRUSTS ARRANGEMENTS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Baring, Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made under an Act of the fifteenth year of Her present Majesty, to facilitate arrangements for the relief of Turnpike Trusts, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Baring and Sir George Grey.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°. [Bill 196.]

IONIAN ISLANDS COMMISSIONS ACT REPEAL BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Bill to repeal an Act to enable the subjects of the Ionian States to hold Military and Naval Commissions under the Crown ; to amend the Ionian Marriages Act ; and for other purposes, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Chichester Fortescue and Mr. Secretary Cardwell.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°. [Bill 197.]

House adjourned at Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, July 8, 1864.

MINUTES.]—*Sat First in Parliament*— The Marquess of Hastings (after the Death of his Father).

Public Bills — *First Reading* — Defence Act Amendment [H.L.]* (No. 193); Judgments, &c., Law Amendment* (No. 194); India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment* (No. 195); Street Music (Metropolis)* (No. 196); Indemnity* (No. 197).

Second Reading — Accidents Compensation Act Amendment* (No. 158).

Select Committee — On Railways Construction Facilities* (No. 160) ; Railway Companies Powers* (No. 121).

Consideration—Settled Estates Act Amendment* (Commons' Amendments).

Third Reading — Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment* (No. 167), and *passed.*

DENMARK AND GERMANY. THE ALLEGED CRUELTY OF PRUSSIAN SOLDIERS.

Earl RUSSELL : My Lords, my noble Friend (the Earl of Shaftesbury) the other evening asked whether any intelligence had reached Her Majesty's Government respecting the alleged massacre of wounded Swedes by the Prussian troops. At that time I stated that Her Majesty's Government had received no intelligence of such an occurrence. Since then I have made inquiries and have received telegrams from both Her Majesty's Minister at Copenhagen and Her Majesty's Minister at Berlin. Our representative at Copenhagen informs me that he has inquired of the Swedish Minister, and that there is no truth whatever in the report which has been circulated. Some four or five Swedish officers were killed, they were in Danish uniform and undistinguishable from the Danish troops. Our account from Berlin states that there was a report that an intention existed on the part of a portion of the army of trying by court-martial some of the Swedes engaged with the Danes, who had been taken prisoners. But it was believed at Berlin that the Prussian Government would not sanction the proceeding. I therefore trust there is no truth whatever in the story we have heard.

DENMARK AND GERMANY—VOTE OF CENSURE—RESOLUTION— (THE EARL OF MALMESBURY).

ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY.

The Earl of MALMESBURY : My Lords, I am sure that on grave occasions like the present but one sentiment pervades both sides of the House—namely, the hope that the debate which is to follow will do honour to the country and to the ancient assembly to which we belong. With this feeling I am sure that both sides of the House will deeply regret the absence of one who illustrates our debates by his ability, his wit, and his eloquence. To me personally it is a matter of still greater regret, inasmuch as I am here to represent him, although unworthy and unable to fill his place; and I must ask of my noble Friends behind me their utmost indulgence, inasmuch as it falls to me to move Resolutions which, had he been present, he would have moved in so much better a manner. My Lords, I trust that in doing so I shall not in the heat of debate say anything unfair to any Member of the Government, and that I shall not trespass upon your Lordships' convenience by too lengthened a statement.

My Lords, that being my wish, it is a matter of regret that anything like personal matters should at this moment be brought before your Lordships; but in a few words I must complain to the noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of a circumstance that is reported to have occurred in another place last night. It appears that the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs "in another place" ["Order, order!"]—has alluded to a Correspondence which he says was carried on by me upon a former occasion. I shall say no more than this, that if such a Correpondence exists, I wish, and have already expressed my wish, to the noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell) that Parliament should be made acquainted with its contents, and I trust that the noble Earl will produce it to this House.

My Lords, I turn now to the Resolutions of which I have given notice. I do not think that any of your Lordships will object to my first Resolution, namely,

> "That this House has heard with deep concern that the sittings of the Conference recently held in London have been brought to a close without accomplishing the important purposes for which it was convened."

It must be matter of very great regret to us all, that the Conference has failed, because the circumstances attending it have led to events which will, I am afraid, lead to still further disagreeable complications. First of all we have, I am afraid, lost the goodwill and good feeling of some very ancient allies. We have for many years been allied in very close friendly feeling with Germany and the German Powers, especially with Austria and Prussia. With one of these Powers we are connected by a Royal marriage. My Lords, it must be matter of deep regret to us all, that the events to which the Correspondence which we are about to discuss has reference have for the time completely divorced us from these alliances. Then, again, I am afraid that in consequence of these events we have to lament a great violation of public right, and a violation of—for I can call it by no other name—the Treaty of 1852—a treaty in the conclusion of which both political parties in this country took an interest and a part. This is a matter of very great consequence. The violation of that treaty sets a very bad precedent for the future. It is a great breach of the public law of Europe, and may at any time be quoted as an excuse for violence and wrong. Looking at the details of this unfortunate business, there is one feature in it which must be looked at with a certain degree of apprehension—I mean the appearance of, as it were, a new Power in Europe, the Diet of the German Confederation. It appears to me that that body has overstepped its former attributes, and has, in interfering with an European treaty, taken upon itself an authority which, especially under the peculiar circumstances of the case, it had no right to assume. In fact, my Lords, if the Diet is to be permitted to throw its whole weight against any treaty that may have been signed by Austria and Prussia, on the ground that the general interests of Germany will be interfered with if such treaties are maintained, I do not know who will make treaties with Austria and Prussia, or how any treaties are to be made with any of the German States separately with any hope of their being upheld and their objects carried out. There is another point of great consequence which the events that have occurred have brought before the world, namely, the introduction of a principle which, so far at least as its interpretation is concerned, is a new one; I mean the principle of nationality. And I must express my regret that the noble Earl has not in the many discussions which have taken place—either in the Correspondence or in the Conference—as far as I can ascertain, put a categorical question to the persons who maintain this principle, and asked them for a plain and simple interpretation of what they mean by "nationality." If by "nationality" they mean that a people may rise against a tyrannical Government—that Power abused is revocable — then all Englishmen will accept the principle; but it would appear—unless some other interpretation shall be given—that nationality now means that one nation has a right to invade another, for the purpose of assisting its discontented subjects to rebel. And this nationality is described to be the produce of, or to exist in consequence of, a certain majority in language or religion; and in some way, until now unheard of, to be the foundation which gives a right first to the revolted subjects to rebel, and then to a foreign Power to invade the territory and assist them. Nothing can be more dangerous to the peace of the world than such a principle as this as now defined. Nothing can be more perilous or render it more impossible to maintain peace. I do not know what, under such a principle, is to become of the smaller Powers of Europe. Take, for instance, Switzerland, in which three different languages are spoken — German, French, and Italian. If you were to follow out this principle, Switzerland, which has hitherto been respected as the very cradle of liberty and independence, would be divided between the three great Powers — Italy, Germany, and France. And what would become of our own country if brought under this principle? There are, at least, three languages spoken in the United Kingdom; and if languages are to form the distinction, England would be one country, Scotland another, Ireland a third, and, perhaps, Wales a fourth. I therefore regret that in the many discussions which have taken place the noble Earl has not insisted upon some interpretation of this principle, which seems to me to be pregnant with mischief, in order that we may understand what nationality really means in a political and international sense. Lastly, we must deeply regret the failure of this Conference, from the natural feeling which Englishmen entertain at seeing a very ancient country—a country which has existed for more than a thousand years, whose former monarchs were our monarchs, and whose existence, as compared with that of its invader, Prussia, is as the cedar to the fig tree, invaded, dismembered, and annihilated, under circumstances of gross and unparaleled cruelty and barbarity. That must cause us to feel not only regret at the failure of the Conference, but the warmest indignation when we remember the circumstances to which I am about presently to allude; and I regret to say that the war, since its recommencement, has been carried on in the same shameful manner in which it was before. It is now my duty to show that I am right in my second Resolution, in which I lay the blame for these things on Her Majesty's Government, and declare—

> "That it is the opinion of this House, that while the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government has failed to maintain their avowed policy of upholding the integrity and independence of Denmark, it has lowered the just influence of this country in the councils of Europe, and thereby diminished the securities for peace."

My Lords, before I go into the Correspondence, which I will do as shortly as possible, quoting as little as I can, and as fairly as I can, to the noble Earl opposite and to myself, I must anticipate a question which has been asked elsewhere, and, probably, will be repeated in this House—a challenge to us to declare what our policy is, and what we should have done if we had been in office? Now, I think that a most preposterous and unfair question. Preposterous, because it is impossible for an Opposition to declare what it would do when a question of war or peace is at issue, and while in ignorance of the means at the disposal of the country for carrying on a war, of the Allies on which it could depend, and of a thousand details, without a perfect knowledge of which no man would dream of entering into a war unless he was insane. If that were a fair question, I think I might quite as fairly ask what would the Government do if they occupied the place of the Opposition?—although there is one thing which it is not difficult to predict they would do, and that is, endeavour to turn us out as soon as possible. I, therefore, candidly tell your Lordships that if we, situated as we are, and ignorant of the matters to which I have referred, were to say we were prepared to go to war, we should be unfit to conduct the affairs of the country. Let us to-night, then, say nothing upon that point. That is the reason why those upon whose support we rely in proposing this Resolution are not, I believe, at all anxious at this moment that any Government should proceed to war. And one thing appears to me to be perfectly palpable, that no moment could be more inopportune for going to war than the present. I do not say that the time has not passed when by risking a war, war might have been prevented. Of that I am even convinced, and it is not I only who say so. I have heard it stated by numbers of persons who are good judges of the circumstances to which I have alluded—I have heard it stated by Germans themselves—men as eager to maintain their objects in

Denmark as any men could be—that if the Government had taken a firm tone and made a strong demonstration at the outset, war would have been averted. I think, too, I can show your Lordships that that statement was justified. The noble Earl and also the noble Duke who sits on the Government benches (the Duke of Argyll), drew an analogy between the circumstances which have taken place with respect to Denmark and Germany and those which occurred in 1859 in Italy, and also between the Correspondence which I then carried on and that which was carried on in the present instance. The noble Earl was good enough to give me credit for the way in which I endeavoured to preserve peace, and for the policy I pursued. I can assure the noble Earl that praise from a man so eminent as he is is exceedingly pleasing to me; but I can hardly help recollecting that the noble Earl was one of those who accused me, and tried, and condemned, and, I may say, hanged me for that policy. The noble Earl was one of those who drove us from office on the ground of our foreign policy, and who did so before they had read a single one of my despatches, for the papers had not at the time been laid on the table. That, perhaps, was my fault; but I must do the noble Earl the justice to say that, having condemned and hanged me, as a conscientious man he cut me down before I quite ceased to exist. There is, however, a great difference between the result of his policy and that of the Government to which I belonged. In the policy carried on by the noble Earl he has had the misfortune to have no assistance whatever, and to have possessed no influence whatever over our Allies. That was not the case with respect to the Italian question; because, although it is true that Austria, with a stupidity perfectly unpardonable, rushed to her own fate, and lost one of the fairest provinces of the empire, yet we had influence enough to prevent France and Piedmont from advancing, and the whole question would have been if not settled, at least discussed in peaceful Conference if Austria had not followed her insane course. I do not accept the analogy, therefore, to which I have referred. We had influence sufficient, at all events, to prevent two great Powers from rushing into war; but in this case the noble Earl seems to have had no influence with any Power whatsoever. Am I not right, then, my Lords, in saying that the Government has failed in upholding the independence and integrity of Denmark? Schleswig, which was part of Denmark Proper, and which has been so for some centuries, and not only Schleswig, but Jutland, are now in possession of the Germans; and so complete is the failure of the noble Earl's policy, that it fell to him to carry out the painful and almost humiliating task of being himself the person to propose in the Conference the dismemberment of a kingdom the integrity of which he had declared essential to the welfare of Europe, and dear to the feelings of the people of this country. The noble Earl was obliged to propose in the Conference the division of Schleswig into two parts, and was compelled to submit to a refusal of his proposition on the part of the triumphant Germans. Denmark, indeed, might say to England, in the words of the dying Mercutio to Romeo—"Why the devil came you between us? I was hurt under your arm."

Now, my Lords, I think this state of things has been brought about by the default of Her Majesty's Government. What I accuse them of is this—that of not having made up their minds on any definite course of policy, and of not keeping in view, as a mark from which their eye ought never to have been taken, the invasion of Schleswig. With what I may term the municipal differences in Denmark we had nothing to do. But this was an International question, and this was the point at which England had a right to interfere, even by force, if she thought proper to do so, and this point ought to have been constantly before his eyes. The noble Earl, and the Cabinet of which he is a Member, ought to have been prepared a month before with the course which in that event they intended to pursue, completely warned as they must have been of what was taking place by their Ministers abroad.

My Lords, the first great fault which the noble Earl, in my opinion, committed, was that he made himself too much of a partisan, and did not maintain that independent character which would afterwards have been of great service to him as an arbitrator and mediator between the parties. He plunged at once into the municipal question. We know the noble Earl's aptitude and power in regard to the making of constitutions and laws for the internal government of a country. In his time he has made himself immortal by a Reform Bill, of which I will say nothing but that it appears to be liked by others better than by himself—for others have accepted it, but he has never ceased endeavouring to alter it. The taste for Reform had not left him when he entered the Foreign Office. I should, however, have thought that his experience of the Foreign Office would have shown him that there was quite enough to be done in dealing with the matters which come within the scope of that Department without seeking other fields of business, anxiety, and labour. That, however, was not the feeling of the noble Earl. He had not been long at the Foreign Office when it occurred to him that the great cure for all the evils existing in the case of Germany and Denmark was to propose a Reform Bill. On the 29th of April, 1861, I think he proposed a new Constitution for Denmark and the Duchies. Against that Constitution I have nothing to say, except that it closely resembled that Constitution which he afterwards advised the Danes to give up. That Constitution, like his own Reform Bill, did not please the noble Earl very long; and finding himself at Coburg, and having perhaps less to do than if shut up in the Foreign Office, he constructed another Reform Bill; and on the 24th of September, 1862, he produced what he considered would be the panacea for the existing state of things. The consequence was—as your Lordships may easily guess — that he pleased neither party. The Danes did not like one of these Constitutions; the Germans said it was impossible for them to assent to the other. Thus the noble Earl was placed rather in the position of a partisan than of a judge between Denmark and Germany. He had cut the ground from under his own feet as an independent English Minister to whom both parties, in the event of their being unable to agree, could have referred for an impartial opinion. This was soon followed by a memorable circumstance which bears vitally on the whole question, to which we may attribute much of what has been called Danish obstinacy, which greatly complicated matters, and to which I am firmly of opinion we may attribute the general failure of this unhappy business. I allude to the speech of the noble Viscount at the head of the Government on the 23rd of July, 1863, in which he declared that if Denmark were attacked he, for one, believed that she would not stand alone. That speech was not unprepared; it was made after notice had been given to him of the intention to ask him a question; and the only possible meaning to be put upon it was that which I believe the noble Viscount intended at the time. I recollect well the effect of that speech. Everybody believed it to mean nothing else than this — that if Denmark were invaded, England would assist her. I have been told — or at least I have heard it said—that the noble Lord in that remark meant to allude to Sweden; but it is impossible, because the question put to the noble Lord which gave rise to the answer and the context of the noble Lord's speech, delivered on the 23rd of July, 1863, shows that the noble Lord intended England when he made use of those words. The result of such a statement, solemnly made in Parliament by the Prime Minister of England was, that it was looked upon throughout the recess, and it was dwelt upon by Denmark as of serious meaning, and that it would be carried out in the event of Austria and Prussia entering her territory. That speech must, I think, have greatly increased the difficulties of the Foreign Secretary when he had to press the Danes to give up one thing after another—the Patent and the Constitution, to allow the Eider to be crossed without resistance, and to submit to every possible degradation; and he must have felt the difficulty in the reliance of the Danish Government on the material assistance of England. In the autumn which followed this memorable speech, the King of Denmark unfortunately died unexpectedly and after a short illness; but even before his death the consequences of these differences between Denmark and Germany were apparent. Here again the noble Earl showed that dilatoriness, and I may almost say carelessness, which in a great measure has been the cause of the failure of his efforts. On the 1st of October, Sir Augustus Paget informed the noble Earl that the new Constitution for Denmark was about to be submitted to the Rigsraad in conformity with the Royal Message. Sir Augustus Paget told the noble Earl then, that it was a matter much to be regretted that constitutional changes should be made just at that moment, and that they would be sure to produce great irritation in Germany. Before this the noble Earl knew that the Constitution had already been a matter of discussion, and that it involved the question whether Denmark had kept faith with Germany or not? Again, on the 13th of October, Sir Augustus Paget wrote to the noble Earl enforcing on his attention the danger of this Constitution, in producing irritation in Germany. From all the information which was forwarded to him it was to be expected that the noble Lord would have taken a strong line; but instead of that he replied to Sir Augustus Paget on the 21st of October, that the question was entirely an International question, and could not form a subject of Federal interference. After that the noble Earl took great pains afterwards to induce the King to withdraw the Constitution; but for two months before that, all the noble Earl said was that England would be glad if it were not signed; but he never pointed out the consequences which would ensue from the advice of England not being taken. I should like to show your Lordships some of the warnings which were conveyed to the noble Lord by his different Ministers abroad. Your Lordships will remember that after the late King of Denmark had died, before signing the Constitution, the new King was pressed by his subjects and his Ministry to sign it. The noble Earl attempted feebly to dissuade him, but he did it, and thence arose all those further troubles which resulted in the invasion of Schleswig. These are the warnings which he received from abroad. On the 16th December, Sir Augustus Paget wrote to the noble Earl informing him that the Danish Government had been summoned to withdraw their troops from Holstein, and that in all probability they would be withdrawn with the exception of the *tête-de-pont* of Frederickstadt, which was the key to the position in Schleswig, and about which, therefore, it was right that some arrangement should be made. On the 14th December, Sir Andrew Buchanan wrote from Berlin, that Austria and Prussia had declined to give any explanation as to the nature of the arrangements which they would accept from Denmark; that they had merely stated generally that they would require the fulfilment of the engagements contracted by Denmark in 1851, and had declared that Schleswig must be withdrawn from the Constitution before the 15th of January. He goes on to say that the Austrian and Prussian Governments had thus followed out the whole policy of the Diet, of which Denmark had so frequently complained. The noble Earl got another warning from Lord Augustus Loftus at Munich, on December 23rd, who told him that the separation of Schleswig from Denmark would be the annihilation of the Danish Monarchy; "and the maritime position of Schleswig is of European importance, as it commands the port of Kiel, which was one of the chief reasons why its position was coveted by Germany." There can be little doubt that the object of the invasion is to take possession of that port. Then, again, Sir Andrew Buchanan writes on the 14th of January—

> "I shall not, therefore, characterize the grounds on which M. Bismark rests his defence of the intended invasion of Schleswig. It will be more reasonable to inquire whether there may not be other causes for that measure, which, if not unobjectionable, present it in a less odious point of view than as a mere wanton interruption of the peace of Europe and a needless infliction upon Denmark of the horrors of war."

My Lords, the noble Earl received further information on the subject from Lord Wodehouse, who had been sent to Copenhagen, and who, writing on the 3rd of January, says—

> "He was desired by the King to declare that the occupation of any part of Schleswig by the Federal troops would be treated by Denmark as an act of war, which must at all hazards be resisted by force. If the Danes were driven by superior numbers out of Schleswig, they would continue their existence in Jutland; if they were compelled to retreat from Jutland, they would fight to the last extremity in the Islands, until Copenhagen itself was in the hands of the enemy."—No. 4, 495.

In the same month Sir Alexander Malet writes—

> "The tension of the public mind is very great, and I am bound to say that there is a wonderful indifference to our representations, while they are at the same time resented as interfering with a cherished project."—No. 4, 516.

Now, my Lords, with those representations before us, I think we are perfectly justified in saying, in the words of the Resolution, that through the policy adopted by Her Majesty's Government the just influence of this country has been lowered. I have shown your Lordships the warnings which the noble Earl received, though I am sure that a man of his quickness of intellect could not have failed to perceive the state of things even without such representations. But, notwithstanding all his means of information, there seems to have been some fatality about, which prevented him from seeing matters in the right light. If he ever intended to defend Denmark from an attack on the part of the German Powers, no doubt the time for him to have done so was when he received those warnings in the middle and the end of December. But what were his replies to all those warnings? On the 24th of December he writes—

> "It would be no less impossible for Her Majesty's Government to enter into any engagement, that if the Federal troops should not limit their operations to the Duchy of Holstein, but should on some pretence or other extend their opera-

tions to the Duchy of Schleswig, Her Majesty's Government would maintain an attitude of neutrality between Germany and Denmark."—No. 4, 413.

Now, one would expect that the noble Earl would have taken his stand on the broad question of the Treaty of 1852, and the great International question, and the balance of power, because the German Powers took to themselves the right to abrogate the treaty signed by five or six Powers, on the ground, forsooth, that Denmark had not kept faith in respect of the engagements which she had entered into with the German Powers by a separate agreement, in which none of the signatary Powers were guarantors. The noble Earl ought to have made his stand on International law and the faith of treaties if he meant to defend Denmark at all. Sweden at that time was strong in her determination to assist. If at the time to which I refer the noble Earl had come forward with a declaration that a certain number of troops and a certain portion of the British fleet would support the Danish army if the German Powers invaded Denmark, he would, no doubt, have had Sweden with him, and with 100,000 men on the Eider ready to receive the invaders I am perfectly convinced that not a single German would have crossed that river. But, my Lords, I am not now going into the question, whether the noble Earl ought to have given such assistance. I am only saying that if ever he meant to interfere actively, that was the time for action; and I am contending further, that if it was considered right by the noble Earl to maintain peace and not to run the risk of war—a risk which, I think, my Lords, was very small indeed—he ought to have said at once to Denmark, "We wont help you; you have not kept your faith in some small matters; but, whether great or small, because you have not kept your faith you must take the consequences." That is the language which, I think, the noble Earl ought to have used if he really never intended to offer material assistance to Denmark. I hope, my Lords, I shall not be accused of anything like vanity if I refer to a despatch which I wrote in 1852 to the Danish Government, when I was informed by Sir Henry Wynn, our Minister at Copenhagen, that he observed some symptoms of an intention on the part of Denmark to slide away from the engagements she had contracted under the Treaty of 1852. At that time there were great intrigues in Denmark, as there are now; and the Treaty had not been signed six months when I was told that some leading persons were trying to persuade the King not to fulfil his engagements, and that he was likely to follow their advice. In that despatch to Sir Henry Wynn, dated December 14, 1852, I said—

"You will not conceal from M. de Bluhme and from all persons called upon to exercise an influence in the decision of the question, that if his Danish Majesty should from whatever cause find himself unable to carry out the engagements he has contracted, Her Majesty's Government must hold His Majesty and that section of the Danish people who will have been the cause of such inability alone responsible for any dangers which may thence arise to the security of Denmark and the integrity of the Danish dominions." —*Correspondence*, 228.

My Lords, I think it is evident that the noble Earl had not made up his mind to any policy whatever; and this want of resolution on his part perfectly explains the faltering tone of his despatches, and the difficulties into which every day he plunged deeper. Now, there is one very remarkable proof of this—namely, a conversation which the noble Earl had with Count Bernstorff, the Prussian Minister in this country, on the 14th of January, twelve days before the meeting of Parliament, and fifteen days before the invasion of Schleswig—an invasion which had been threatened for the previous three months. The Prussian Minister called upon the Foreign Secretary, and the noble Earl wrote an account of the conversation which took place on the occasion to Lord Bloomfield. He says—

"I had a conversation a short time ago with Count Bernstorff on the subject of the proposed occupation of Schleswig by Prussia. He said he had not fully understood the observations I had made in a former conversation. That the proposed occupation, if it were to take place, would be done under the regular authorities and by the regular troops of Prussia; that no danger, therefore, could be incurred by the King of Denmark; and that when he should have complied with the just demands of the German Powers the Duchy of Schleswig would be again placed under his sceptre. I had spoken on a former occasion in the sense that Denmark would resist such an occupation, and might be aided by Great Britain. He wished to have an explanation of what I had then said. It is to be observed that, in speaking to Count Bernstorff on the occasion alluded to I had expressly declared that I could not say what the decision of the Government might be, as the Cabinet had not yet deliberated, and consequently not submitted any opinion to the Queen; but that judging from the general current of feeling in Parliament and in the nation, I thought an invasion of Schleswig by Germany might lead to assistance to Denmark on the part of this country."—No. 4, 534.

From this conversation it is clear that at the date of his interview with the Prussian

Minister, twelve days before the meeting of Parliament, the noble Earl and his colleagues had not made up their minds as to whether they would give Denmark material assistance or not. At that time the German troops were actually about to march into the Danish territory, and to realize that invasion which had been threatening some three months previously. Do not let me be misunderstood. I do not say the Government ought to have resolved on assisting Denmark; but I am pointing out the time at which they might have assisted her effectively, if assistance were to be given to her at all. I may be wrong in that; but I cannot be wrong in this: here we have the noble Lord's own account with the Prussian Minister, by which it appears beyond a shadow of a doubt that, up to that time, Her Majesty's Ministers had not made up their minds as to whether they should assist Denmark or not. The noble Earl concluded the conversation with Count Bernstorff in this way—

> "Count Bernstorff adverted shortly but pointedly to the dangers which might be incurred by Europe if Germany and England should ever become enemies. I fully admitted them, and as fully regretted their existence; but I said that, since the month of May, Great Britain had warned Austria of these dangers; that Prussia and Germany had likewise been warned; but that the voice of England was unheeded, and little time was now left for counsel, wisdom, and moderation; I hoped it would not be thrown away."

That is exactly what the noble Earl did; and his policy may be very shortly epitomized. To Denmark he said, "Take care what you are about;" to Germany, "Take care what you do;" and beyond that the noble Earl did nothing. Now, while this Correspondence was going on and while events were proceeding to a crisis, what had become of Russia and France, who signed with us the Treaty of 1852—those mighty Allies from whom the noble Earl expected assistance? They did nothing. In his difficulty the noble Earl turned to his Allies and could not find one. I am not going to defend their conduct, because, as co-signataries of the Treaty of 1852, it was their duty to take more active steps with a view of effecting an arrangement of the question between Denmark and Germany, than those which they really took. But I am afraid we shall find that there were reasons, equally attributable to the policy of the noble Earl, which indisposed these Allies from coming—I will not say eagerly, but willingly forward to assist him. The proof of this may be found, I think, in the answers given by France on several occasions when she was appealed to by the noble Earl; but, at all events, France cannot be accused of having acted unfairly towards the Danes, because General Fleury, who went to congratulate the King on his accession, and met Lord Wodehouse at Copenhagen, distinctly and categorically told the Danish Government that France would not help them. France, therefore, cannot be blamed for any of those illusions which were held out to Denmark by England. As to the Danes themselves, not only have they been encouraged to resist the demands, just or unjust, whichever they may be, of Germany, by the speech of Lord Palmerston, but I think they were also encouraged to do so by the language held to them at different times by our representative. When Sir Augustus Paget had a long conversation on the 10th of December with M. Hall, the Danish Minister, trying to persuade him to give up the Constitution, he finds M. Hall obstinate, and says—

> "I replied that Denmark would, at all events, have a better chance of securing the assistance of the Powers alluded to by retiring beyond the limits of the Confederation, than if she provoked a war by resisting what might be considered the legitimate authority of the Diet on Federal territory."—No. 3, 365.

Now surely, in private life, if a man gives you advice in this way, the inference is that if you follow the advice, and the adversary still persecutes you, you will receive assistance at the hands of your adviser. Then, again, in a conversation with M. Hall as to the revocation of the Constitution—a proposal which the Danes asked six weeks to consider—and which was not acceded to—Lord Wodehouse says—

> "If the time were too short before January 1 to pass a repealing Act, I felt confident that Her Majesty's Government would urge upon Prussia and Austria to extend the term they had named, and it could hardly be supposed that so reasonable a request would be refused."—No. 4, 418.

Further on he said—

> "It was my duty to declare to him (M. Hall) that if the Danish Government rejected our advice, Her Majesty's Government must leave Denmark to encounter Germany on her own responsibility."—No. 4, 418.

"If she rejected our advice!" Surely, that was not a prudent way for our representative to express himself. But while this advice would have been very good if it had come six weeks sooner, it was given too late; and I say, therefore, that, notwithstanding the warnings of many months—I may say even the warnings of some years—with respect to this question, and notwithstanding the danger became daily more imminent, he took no strong means to prevent it. He never told the Danes that he would not help them, or the Germans that in a certain contingency he would oppose them. With such a policy, it was impossible that what has happened should not have happened; and I have shown it to be quite true that the Cabinet, within a fortnight of the invasion, had no idea of what they intended to do respecting it.

My Lords, I now come to another question of much importance. It is perfectly well known to those who have conversed with Frenchmen of any rank that they were deeply offended by the noble Earl's refusal of the Emperor's proposal of a Congress—by the manner of refusal rather than the act; that this refusal for a time alienated France from us, and was one of the causes why the noble Earl did not get the assistance which he wished. As to the Congress it strikes me that the noble Earl did not look at events with the sagacity which sometimes distinguishes him, and as to which (his policy in the American war, for instance) I have always been ready to do him justice. That France has not held back from any want of sympathy for Denmark is evident from the strong and pithy language used by the Emperor in reference to that country when he was submitting his proposition for a Congress. In replying to this proposition the noble Earl said that negotiations were in progress between the signataries to the Treaty of 1852, and that the addition of Spain, Portugal, Turkey, and other Powers, as deliberating Powers, would scarcely improve the chances of peace. I must say that, for the sake of an epigram, the noble Earl acted imprudently in risking our relations with the French Government. Instead of seeing the situation in the same grave light as the Emperor of the French, the noble Earl answered his proposal by a sort of jesting language, which was very ill-timed, and could have but one result—to offend the Sovereign to whom it was addressed. No doubt it did offend the French Government. I am not speaking of the Emperor personally, because His Majesty is far above that kind of feeling; but I say the language of the noble Lord has offended the French people who have elected him as their Sovereign, and in his peculiar position nothing could be more ill-judged than for the noble Earl to have placed him before the French nation as a person who may be safely answered with such language. Before this your Lordships all know the Correspondence which took place about Poland; you all know the impression of the Emperor and of the French people that the English Government went so far respecting Poland that they ought to have gone further, and that they left the Emperor in the lurch. That is openly stated by French politicians. I am not going to argue that Her Majesty's Government were wrong in not going to war for Poland. On the contrary, I think we did perfectly right in not making war for Poland, for, much as I feel for that unfortunate people, I never could see what means we had of rendering them material aid. I, however, say that Her Majesty's Government should take more care in their Correspondence—with the Governments of France and Russia in particular. The sort of Correspondence which has recently been carried on with the various Powers has left an impression throughout Europe that we are constantly in the habit of holding out hopes of assistance to weak States and menaces to other Powers without meaning to carry out our threats; that all we say ends in smoke, and that we end by doing nothing at all. The Cabinet had not made up their minds towards the end of January as to what they would do respecting Denmark; but the Germans had made up theirs, and they invaded Schleswig. My Lords, I will not attempt to describe the hardships which were inflicted upon the unfortunate Danes, who appear not to have been at all prepared for the struggle, but to have evinced that want of readiness for war which is the notorious vice of democratic Governments. They were totally unprepared, and they therefore succumbed to the superior resources of their opponents. Then came proposals for negotiations, protocols, and notes—and lastly the Conference. And with what results? From the first meeting of the Conference the Plenipotentiaries appear to have been floating as it were in a balloon. They had no basis; and at last the noble Earl, to whom I must give the credit of leaving no stone unturned to arrive at a peaceful solution of the question, when such a result was no longer attainable, was obliged to submit to the humiliation of offering a proposal for the dismemberment of the Danish monarchy and finding that proposal refused.

I think, then, my Lords, that I am right in saying that the just influence of this country has been lowered abroad. I think I might prove it; but it would be a disagreeable and painful task to do so. I might refer to the foreign newspapers to show to you what are the opinions of foreign nations with regard to this country now—I do not speak of German papers, which naturally have a hostile feeling against this country, but I speak of the French newspapers—and I never, in my recollection, saw England spoken of in those organs as England is spoken of now. In former years I have heard England spoken of with hostility, envy, and malice, but with a certain degree of respect and fear. But we are now spoken of by those papers—I do not mean those who have been our habitual opponents, but by the *Débats* and papers of that character—we are spoken of by them as the betrayer of our friends, cowards, and expressions such as these. Well, my Lords, how then is it possible to say that we are not lowered in the eyes of Europe?

My Lords, I have detained you now longer than I had intended to do. It is very difficult to condense a subject of such importance in making a statement. I think it will require no further argument on my part to show the position in which England stands in respect to this Correspondence.

Once more I must refer to the speech made by a noble Lord (Viscount Palmerston) in another place. I should like your Lordships to compare it with the last speech he has just made in Parliament on this occasion, and I shall merely invite your Lordships to draw your own conclusions, and you must feel as I do, that our country is deeply humiliated in the eyes of foreign nations. The speech which the noble Lord made on the 23rd of July, 1863, is this—

> "It is an important matter of British policy to maintain the independence and integrity of the Danish monarchy. I am convinced at least that if any violent attempt to overthrow this right, and interfere with that independence, those who made the attempt would find in the result it would not be Denmark alone they would have to contend with."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxii. 1249, 1252.]

On the 27th of June, 1864, the same noble Lord speaks in these words—but at this time Denmark was dismembered and abandoned, and the Germans in possession of Schleswig. He says—

> "The contest is as regards Schleswig, and not as regards the independence of Denmark, or the safety of the capital, or of the Danish Monarchy. I do not mean to say, therefore, and I think it right to put in this reservation, if the war should assume a different character—if the existence of Denmark as an independent power in Europe should be at stake—if we had reason to expect to see in Copenhagen the horrors of a town taken by assault, the destruction of property, the sacrifice of the lives not only of its defenders but of its peaceful inhabitants, the confiscation that would ensue, the capture of the Sovereign as a prisoner of war, and other humiliations of that kind—I do not mean to say if any of those events are likely to happen, the position of this country might not be a subject"—for what? "for reconsideration. We might then think it our duty to adopt another course."

I think, my Lords, I need say nothing more. Contrast those two speeches one with the other, both speeches spoken by the same man, and in the same place, and that man the Prime Minister of England. And now I ask you, my Lords, am I right? The noble Earl concluded by moving to resolve—

> "That this House has heard with deep Concern that the Sittings of the Conference recently held in London have been brought to a Close without accomplishing the important Purposes for which it was convened:
>
> "That it is the Opinion of this House, that while the Course pursued by Her Majesty's Government has failed to maintain their avowed Policy of upholding the Integrity and Independence of Denmark, it has lowered the just Influence of this Country in the Councils of Europe, and thereby diminished the Securities for Peace" (*The Earl of Malmesbury*).

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: My Lords, we all knew before this debate began, and if we had not known it we should know it now, that the Resolution proposed by the noble Earl has not for its object to affirm any principle, or to settle any policy. The Resolution itself, as well as the speech of the noble Earl, have been carefully framed so as to avoid and evade all those obligations in respect to great questions of public policy which are not less incumbent upon Oppositions than upon Governments. This is a pure faction fight. ["No, no!" *and* "Hear, hear!"] Do not let my friends opposite imagine that I am making this a subject of complaint — faction fights are perfectly fair things—though I may think that foreign policy is not the ground on which these battles should generally be fought; because I hold that they tend to compromise the country in regard to its foreign relations. I am not going, however, to complain of this on the present occasion. My Lords, I am but too happy to find that our tongues are at last freed—that we are able to meet our opponents face to face, and to tell them what we have to say for ourselves, and something also of what we think of them.

But, my Lords, I must observe—and I beg the House's attention to the statement—that this Resolution is not so worded as to define the grounds upon which the Government is sought to be censured. Of course the gist of the Resolution is, that by the misconduct of the Government the influence and reputation of this country have been lowered, and at first sight the Resolution might lead the reader to suppose that the grounds stated for this condemnation are the failure of our policy with regard to Denmark. But a careful reading will show that no grounds whatever are assigned. I have my own theory, which I will explain to the House in a moment as to the wording of this Resolution; but I should like to ask the noble Earl who has just sat down a question. I know that the privilege of answering questions is generally confined to Governments, and is not shared in by Oppositions, but I hope the noble Earl will not object to enjoy by anticipation one of those pleasures which may so soon fall to his lot in office. It has been stated, upon what appears to be good authority, that this Resolution is the production of no less than sixteen persons. What I wish to ask the noble Earl is whether he will favour the House with their names. ["Oh, oh!"] If he will, I think that will explain all. I have no doubt whatever that among those sixteen right hon. Gentlemen or noble Lords there was a peace party and a war party. If the Resolution had been drawn, as this one appears to be at first sight, implying that the influence of this country has been lowered because we had failed to maintain the integrity of Denmark, such a Resolution would have pointed to a war policy, and I have no doubt that the peaceful section of the Committee would have said, as one of them has already virtually said, "We shall not vote for such a Resolution, because any policy that is in favour of war would, in our opinion, be a policy of insanity." Consequently, in order to meet that objection, and in order to make the Resolution absolutely void of all principle, the sentences have been connected by the word "while," so as to render what apparently was an expression of opinion merely the assertion of two facts.

My Lords, the noble Earl appears to suppose that we complain of him for not announcing the policy which he intends to adopt if he comes into office. I can assure the noble Earl that he has entirely mistaken the nature of our objections to his Resolution. We do not ask him what his policy will be if he comes into office. What that policy would be we know well enough already. He would go to the Parliament and the country for his policy, although he has sneered at us for so doing. What we do complain of, however, is that this Resolution does not tell us why he condemns us and what he would have done if he had been placed in our position. I listened carefully to the speech of the noble Earl, and I noticed that when he even touched upon the question of policy, he appeared at once to guard himself. "Do not let it be supposed that I mean we should have done so and so. I only mean that if such a thing had been done, such and such a consequence would have followed." This being the nature of the Resolution, and the present question being merely a trial of strength between parties, I trust I may be allowed to deal with it somewhat in its personal character. The case of the Opposition against the Government appears to be this — first, they say "You were quite right in not going to war." The noble Earl, whose absence we all so deeply regret to-night—[*Ironical laughter*]—I can assure noble Lords opposite that our regret is perfectly sincere—["Hear, hear!" *and laughter*] — for whatever may be our party feeling, we all respect the noble Earl and admire his powers; we wish the character and credit of the debates of this House to be maintained; and we regret his absence all the more because of the cause to which it is assigned. The case against the Government, then, appears to be this—"You were right not to go to war." Lord Derby said so distinctly the other night, although the noble Earl who has just sat down carefully avoided saying so.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: I beg your pardon: I distinctly said you were quite right in not going to war at the breaking up of the Conference.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: Very well; then the noble Earl agrees with his leader. He says — "You were right not to go to war upon the breaking up of the Conference." Now, I say that involves the further proposition that the honour and interests of England do not demand that we should go to war. If that be so, I want to know how it is you divide the honour of England from the honour of those who represent the Crown of England? If the noble Earl opposite would have been justified in not going to war, were we not justified in not going to war? I say the one proposition involves the other. The case of the Opposition, then, I apprehend, is this:—You, the Government, have involved yourselves by promises on the one hand, and by threats on the other; and though we do not say the honour of England is concerned, we do say that personally the present Government is compromised, and it would be better we should come into office, as we are at least free from the charge of making those promises and holding out those threats." That, my Lords, is a very pleasant theory for noble Lords opposite; but with the permission of the House I propose to examine how far it will stand investigation. My Lords, very early in October last there was a very remarkable conversation held at Copenhagen between the English Minister at that capital and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of that country. It was a conversation which involves the whole secret of subsequent transactions. At that time the new Constitution, which has been the immediate occasion of this unfortunate war, had not been passed, but it was being prepared by the Government of Denmark. The British Minister remonstrated earnestly with M. Hall against the passing of that Constitution. He also at the same time urged the Government of Denmark to revoke the Patent of March. These were subjects intimately connected. Now, I beg the House to observe the language of M. Hall. As to the Patent, he asked, "Will England promise—if we revoke the Patent—will you give us an assurance of her support?" The reply of the English Minister was immediate—his answer was that he could not even forward such a request, as he was sure it would be of no use. Then, as to the Constitution, M. Hall's language was substantially this—"I know there is a war coming upon us from Germany, which I do not wish to avoid, as being inevitable at some time; there can be no better moment for us." What was his reason for saying that? Did he say he relied on the support of the English Government? Not at all. He said—"We do not expect the support of the English Government, but we rely upon the public feeling of England, which is being aroused on our behalf." Now observe the date at which this conversation was held. It was held in October, before the death of the King, and before the Schleswig-Holstein question had attracted such universal attention—before the press of this country teemed with those articles on the subject of Denmark, which, however generous, sometimes exhibit very little knowledge of the details of the Schleswig-Holstein dispute. How, then, was it that M. Hall relied not on the Government of England—but upon the public feeling of England being roused on behalf of Denmark? Allow me to reply—and I do so without hesitation—that M. Hall pointed in that conversation amongst other things, and chief amongst other things, to certain proceedings which had taken place in your Lordships' House. Now, my Lords, in what I am about to say, do not let me for a moment be misunderstood; do not let it be supposed that I think myself entitled to complain, or if I were entitled that I am disposed to complain, of what may be said or done in this House by the independent Members of your Lordships' assembly. My Lords, during the ten years I have had the honour of sitting on this bench there has been more than one occasion upon which I have myself been deeply grateful for the language which has been held by noble Lords, independent of party in this House. I say there have been occasions—aye, more than one—when services in the cause of Europe, and the cause of liberty and freedom in Europe, which could not have been rendered by the Government, and would not have been rendered by the official Opposition, were rendered in this House by independent Members of it. My Lords, I will specify one example of what I mean. When, immediately after the close of the Crimean war, the attention of the world was directed to the atrocious proceedings of the Austrian Government in Italy, upon which subject those who were Members of the Government were necessarily silent, and when, I am afraid, the sympathies of the noble Lords opposite were not sufficiently alive to the interests of the Italians to induce them to speak, the voice of remonstrance, of warning—aye, of threat—was raised by two noble Lords, one of whom is now no more, and the other I deeply regret to see is not present in the House to-night. My Lords, I refer to Lord Lyndhurst and the Earl of Ellenborough. I shall not soon forget the observations which were made by my noble and venerated Friend, Lord Aberdeen, then at the head of the Government, when he listened to the famous speech in 1856 from Lord Lyndhurst, on the wrongs which were inflicted on the Italian people, and when he distinctly pointed out to Parliament and to England that those evils were of such a character that they could not be remedied except by the last resource of war. I well remember the observation made by Lord Aberdeen on the significance and effect of such a speech coming from such a man in your Lordships' House. It is often said that this House is a cold and unimpassioned assembly, and it may be so in some degree; but there are subjects upon which your Lordships seem to respond more immediately to the feelings of the people than even that other assembly which is in intimate contact with the people. So it was upon the Question of Italy. I do not know whether the debates in this House had much influence upon opinion in this country, but I know that they did exercise much influence abroad. Speeches of this character, coming from independent members of the House, from men of great name—of great repute, of mature years, are supposed in foreign countries to speak the mature opinions of the English people. Why, then, do I say that M. Hall trusted to what had been said in this House, and not to the Government? I know he did not trust himself to the Government, for in that very conversation he told us he did not do so. I have now to refer your Lordships to what took place on a remarkable debate in the month of May last; and I wish to remind the House of the circumstances under which it took place. In September, 1862, my noble Friend at the head of the Foreign Office had proposed, for the settlement of the Schleswig-Holstein dispute, a constitution, which the noble Earl opposite, absurdly enough—I hope he will excuse me for saying so — called a Reform Bill. This constitution, however, was supposed to be too German in its tendency and adverse to the interests of Denmark. Now, what happened at the beginning of the next Session of Parliament? Your Lordships will not probably have forgotten the attack made on my noble Friend by the noble Earl (Derby). Do you not recollect the joke, "Can't you let it alone?" and I thought the attack of the Opposition was to be made, not that we were doing this or that, but that we were interfering at all in the matter. In the month of May following, the subject was brought forward by Lord Ellenborough in a powerful and eloquent address. Upon that occasion, Lord Derby came forward most handsomely, and said—

> "I imputed to him (Earl Russell) that I thought he had interfered gratuitously, and without sufficient cause, for the settlement of the Schleswig-Holstein question. I certainly was not then aware of the length and elaboration of the diplomatic correspondence which had taken place, and I was not aware how entirely the noble Earl's interference was justified by the consent of the different Powers."—[3 *Hansard,* clxx. 1755.]

These words, I think, entirely dispose of a multitude of the arguments directed against us in this debate. We did not interfere gratuitously. We were asked on all sides to interfere; on the one hand and the other we were asked, in every form of suggestion and request, by all the parties to this dispute, to assist in procuring its settlement. But now, my Lords, I must quote what Lord Derby said with regard to the main Question. These were Lord Derby's words, and I beg the House to listen to their import and to answer whether M. Hall was not justified in his confidence and reliance, not on the language of the Government, but on the language of the Opposition. Lord Derby says—

> "The integrity of Denmark is of vital importance to this country."

I say no language so exaggerated as this has ever fallen from any Member of Her Majesty's Government. Lord Derby goes on to say—

> "It is policy as well as justice to support against the claims of ambitious nations her fair and equitable rights. It is our duty, as it is our policy, to protect her against aggression; and although, God forbid, that last extremity should be forced upon us, yet, I say, if the question arises whether Denmark should lose its integrity, and be frittered away. I say there is no alternative that would not be preferable in point of fact to a peace which would be considered so disastrous and so destructive to Denmark."

Those were the words of the noble Earl, and in words as distinct as these he held out hopes to Denmark. And yet these are the men who come here and tell us that we alone, as distinguished from them, have held out hopes to Denmark. They tell us that we have placed the country in a position of humiliation, because we have not assisted Denmark, and that they are free to take office to-morrow and to desert Denmark, whose integrity they have declared to be of vital importance to us. My Lords, I will say more. My own firm conviction is that the Danish Government and the Danish people—and I do not blame them for it—have been speculating on a change of Government in this country. Poor Denmark! She has been expecting, not that we should assist her, but that, for declining to assist her, we should be driven from office by a Vote of Want of Confidence, and then that noble Lords opposite would assist her when they came into power. Instead of which she finds us assailed by a Motion of Want of Confidence because we have ever said a word in her behalf and endeavoured to form an European alliance in her defence. Denmark, entertaining these expectations, has been betrayed, not by us, but by the language of noble Lords opposite.

Having said so much on the question as between the Government and the Opposition, I wish to add a word upon a point to which the noble Earl only alluded slightly—the contrast that has been drawn between the position of France and that of England. I must do the noble Earl the justice to say that he treated this branch of the argument in a spirit of much greater fairness than others who have attacked the Government; but as this was a heavy point of attack upon us in another place, let me say that I do not see how the assertion can be accounted for, that the position of England is humiliated in consequence of the course we have adopted towards Denmark, whilst the position of France is perfectly upright, fair, and honourable, except by those party feelings which lead men to attack their own country through the existing Government. I do not know how this contrast can be drawn between the two countries. We were co-signataries of the same treaty. We were bound by precisely the same obligations. I will go a step further, and, speaking for myself, declare my firm conviction that England has no selfish or material interests whatever in the question. I deny the proposition of Lord Derby, that the vital interests of this country are concerned in the maintenance of the integrity of Denmark. I deeply sympathize with the Danes. There is no Member of this House, I venture to say, who sympathizes with them more deeply than I do; but I say that we in this country have no selfish or material interests whatever in the maintenance of the Treaty of 1852. I do not say the same of France. I think France has a material interest in preventing the advance of the German Confederation along the waters of the Baltic. As to England dreading Germany as a naval Power, the very notion of it is ludicrous. Lord Ellenborough said last year, in the debate to which I have already referred, that a German fleet would be no great source of strength to Germany; but, even if it were, I say it is quite as likely to be friendly to England as the Danish fleet has been. Again, I ask, what is the position of the two countries? England has recoiled before the risk of war with the whole of Germany when that war must be carried on alone. France has recoiled before the fear of a war with Germany which would have been carried on in close alliance with England, one of the greatest Powers of Europe. France has recoiled before that war when her own material interests were nearly concerned, at a time when England who had no interests was prepared to join her. I am not blaming the Emperor of the French—he is at perfect liberty to be the judge of his own interests and actions—but I say that the contrast drawn between the positions of England and of France is simply ridiculous, and founded upon a gross misrepresentation of the relative position of the two countries.

Referring to France in another point of view, the noble Earl said that France, through General Fleury, had given full notice to Denmark that she would on no account give her material aid in this struggle. The noble Earl no doubt quoted that statement from the blue-book; but it is evident that his study of the blue-book cannot have been very close or complete, because he will find that we made immediate inquiry into the truth of this report, and the French Government immediately contradicted it. They said it was very possible General Fleury might have advised Denmark not to let slip any opportunities for peace at that moment, because at that moment the French Government did not mean to act. But the French Government distinctly stated that nothing had been said which did not leave the hands of the Emperor perfectly free.

Lord CHELMSFORD: Can the noble Duke tell us the date of that despatch?

The Duke of ARGYLL: It is at page 443. I come now to the speech of the noble Earl, which I confess I have very great difficulty in following. I could not, to say the real truth, detect the trace of an argument throughout—I do not know what he was at. At one moment he seemed to say that we had interfered gratuitously, and against that I have only to quote the opinion of his chief (the Earl of Derby), who says we were fully justified in interfering. At another moment he said we held out hopes to Denmark and threats to Germany. It is perfectly true that over and over again we intimated to Germany the dangers which must result from the course she was pursuing, and I hold that we were perfectly justified in holding this language and in pointing out these dangers. But not one word did the noble Earl mention of the attempts made to engage France with us in joint action on this great European question. I say that every one of these intimations to the German Powers was strictly parallel with similar intimations made by France, and that they all had reference to the attempts we were then making, and which it was thought might be successful, to induce France to undertake joint action along with us. At the time we were making these endeavours to secure joint operation, which might possibly end in war, it was our bounden duty to warn the German Powers of the danger they were incurring; and we should have forfeited our duty as Ministers of the English Crown if we had not held out such intimations to the German Powers. Then again, it has been said that all this time we were plotting war. But if there be one principle which has been accepted in this country by all parties more decidedly than another, it is that joint action by England and France in all the great questions of European difficulty is the surest means by which the danger of war can be averted. The noble Earl repeatedly referred to a particular time when he thinks we ought to have adopted a more decided policy. He of course warned the House—as he always took care to do—that he did not say he would have done this himself; but he thinks that if it had been done peace would have been secured. What was the particular juncture at which the noble Earl suggested, though he did not advise, that we should have gone to war? When the German Powers were about to cross the Eider? Think of the position that England would have been in. He did not say a word about France. He said England might have done this, and would have done it with complete success. What was the time of year when the invasion of Schleswig took place? It was in the month of February, when hard frost was prevailing, and the Baltic was entirely inaccessible to our ships. What probability of success, then, had England at that time if she went to war with Germany? In such circumstances England, with her 30,000 or 35,000, or at the outside, 40,000 men, would have been called on to meet the united German force of perhaps 250,000 men, which would have been ranged against her in a single week or ten days. For it must be remembered that we had to deal not with the policy of M. Bismark or Count Rechberg, but with the fanatical feeling which inspired the whole population of the German States. What probability—nay, I will ask, what possibility is there that such a course would not have staved off war? It is very easy for those who are not in a position of responsibility to say they would have adopted this course or that. Early in this Session my noble Friend (Earl Grey) on the cross benches expressed a confident hope as to the result which would have attended such an interference on the part of England. I can only say that I always envy the strength of my noble Friend's convictions. I often wish I could be as certain of things I see with my own eyes as my noble Friend is of the most distant and contingent possibilities. I venture to say that if you go into the probability of war or peace being secured by the efforts of England against united Germany, it is almost absolutely certain that we should have been obliged to go to war with the whole of Germany, having but a very small land force, and with the Baltic inaccessible on account of ice. The noble Earl opposite (Earl of Malmesbury) hinted, though he did not say, that this was the policy to which he would have committed the Government. I beg to remind him of the words of a noble Lord who is likely to be a colleague of his, that such a policy would have been a policy of "insanity."

There is one part of the subject I wish to deal with before I close. I wish to speak of those opponents of the Government who condemn us, not on the ground which the noble Earl has avowed, that of wishing to drive us from office that he may occupy our position himself, but who oppose us on a definite ground of principle and of policy. These noble Lords are the advocates of a war policy. And again I say I deeply regret the absence of Lord Ellenborough, who has spoken in that sense more than once with all the vigour of his great powers. I do not deny that there is in the country, I will not say a large party, but a great number of persons, who feel bitterly disappointed that England has not gone to war for the sake of Denmark. This is a feeling which has much of my sympathy, and all of my respect. I confess that in dealing with this subject I feel that the fate of the Government is a matter of very small importance. What is important is that the English people should be satisfied that if we have refrained from war, it has not been merely because we have recoiled from difficulties and dangers to be incurred by ourselves, but from much higher considerations—considerations connected with the peace of Europe and the difficulties which lay in the way of enforcing the cause of justice. I beg noble Lords who participate in this feeling to consider what it is that men mean when they talk of going to war for Denmark. It is commonly said that going to war for Denmark means going to war to support the Treaty of 1852. But those who speak thus seem to have forgotten that practically the Treaty of 1852 has long ceased to be a living question—at all events since the first meeting of the Conference it has ceased to be so. It was not by us but by the Danes themselves that the treaty was abandoned. [" Oh, oh !"] I shall be glad if the noble Lord will answer me in a more articulate manner when I sit down, but I must maintain the position which I have stated. How many of your Lordships have read and carefully studied the Treaty of 1852 ? It has often been said that it was a treaty of recognition and not of guarantee, and this, at least, is now generally understood. But this is not the point on which I now wish to dwell. It was a treaty of recognition, but what was it that it recognized ? It was a recognition of a personal union between the Crown of Denmark and the Crowns of the two Duchies, and not of a union of the countries or their institutions. It was simply a recognition that the King of Denmark should also be the Duke of Schleswig and Holstein—a recognition of what has been called a personal union. But directly the Danes entered the Conference they said—" We will have no personal union; we will not be satisfied with a personal union." Now, my Lords, I am not blaming the Danes for taking up this position. On the contrary I think that they were perfectly right in doing so. It was said last year by Lord Ellenborough that Schleswig was a province which had belonged to Denmark for 400 years. That is perfectly true in one sense, but not in another. It is true that it was a fief of the Danish Crown, but for many hundred years it was divided between the different occupants of the throne, and it was not until the year 1720—the date of our own guarantee of part of Schleswig—that the whole of that duchy was united to the Crown of Denmark, and then it was united solely by a personal union. Remember that as long as Denmark was a despotism a personal union was a real union, because, as far as regards external relations with foreign countries, a despotic Sovereign wields the whole power of all his crowns, and in this case the King of Denmark had all the power of the Duke of Schleswig and the Duke of Holstein. But the moment you introduce responsible, liberal, or democratic Government, the case is entirely altered. Personal union ceases to be union for any practical purpose whatever, and unless the three Parliaments agree, the King of Denmark has not, as he formerly had, the power of the three kingdoms united. Now observe the facts of this case. Liberal institutions were adopted in Denmark, the Government of which became not only liberal but highly democratic in the year 1837. The moment that that took place the two populations were brought into contact, and the jealousies and rivalries between the two nationalities and the two peoples had free course to come into collision. What were the facts with regard to the Duchy of Schleswig ? At the very first general election—and I take these facts not from a German authority, but from a work of great ability and research written by a Danish partisan, M. Gösch, a gentleman connected, I believe, with the Danish Legation in this country—a large majority of the local representatives were what were called Schleswig-Holsteiners, that was, they were hostile to more than a personal union between the Duchies and the Kingdom. They were, in fact, opposed to the existing Danish Government. The Parliament lasted for six or seven years, and at the next general election the majority in favour of the autonomy of the Duchies, as it was called, was still larger, and at the present moment, the division of parties stands, I believe, as 16 to 27. The noble Earl talked about nationality as if it were a mere question of language and races. Why, we are dealing with separate provinces, having their own institutions, their own national life, their own desire for political autonomy. It is not a mere question of languages and nationalities. The people of the Duchy of Schleswig—I speak of Schleswig especially—wish to keep together. They would not have objected—they do not, I believe, object—to a merely personal union with Denmark; but the Danes say, "We wont have that; we must have you incorporated in the kingdom." That this is a true interpretation of the facts is shown by the language used by the King of Denmark himself in the Patent of 1846, referring to the question of succession, which was afterwards settled by the Treaty of 1852. His Majesty said in that Patent—

> "More particularly, we hereby assure our faithful subjects in the Duchy of Schleswig, that we do not intend by these letters patent in any way to trespass upon the autonomy of the Duchy, such as it has hitherto been recognized by us, nor to make any alteration in those other relations which at present connect it with Holstein. We, on the contrary, hereby renew our assurance that we will, for the future, as hitherto, protect our Duchy of Schleswig in the enjoyment of the rights which belong to it as an inseparable, but yet independent part of our monarchy."

There is the testimony of the Danish Monarch himself that the Duchy of Schleswig was contending for its own autonomy; that it was under his Crown, but was an independent part of the monarchy, and an independent part of the Danish State. Now, if you are to fight for Denmark in the present war, you would be going to war to force the Schleswigers not to be united, as formerly, by a personal union, but to be incorporated with Denmark. Is that an object for which England could go to war? I will put aside all question as to our power to meet alone the whole German Confederation; I will put aside all questions as to the danger and inconvenience which might be incurred by England in such a war; I will even go the length of supposing that it was within our power easily to effect our object; and I ask, is it an object which we have a right to go to war to effect, or which we have the smallest chance of effecting with any regard to justice or good policy? I apprehend that there can be but one answer. It is not an object that we could propose to ourselves; I believe it is an object that we could not have effected. And I am satisfied that, when the people of England find that this is the only result for which they would have contended if they had gone to war, they will see that the Government has abstained from war not merely from selfish or unworthy considerations, but because we really had not an object which it was within our right or competence to contend for.

My Lords, I hope that it will not be supposed that in anything I have said I intend to bear hard against the Danish Government or the Danish people, much less that it will be imagined that I have the slightest sympathy with the course taken by the great German Powers. I believe there is not a single partisan of Germany in your Lordships' House. We may think, and we do think, that the Danes have committed great errors and great faults, but we are also of opinion that those errors might have been corrected without violence, and certainly atoned for without blood. Moreover, we especially condemn the conduct of the Prussian Government, because we believe that they have hurried on this war from the worst and most selfish motives. I believe that it is very much in order to enable the present Government of Prussia to trample more effectually upon the liberties of their own people that they have put themselves at the head of this fanatical movement of the German people, and that they have deluged the North of Europe with blood. I say that a greater crime was never committed by any Government; and I would earnestly appeal to the Prussian people, whether they will allow their Government to go on sacrificing and trampling on their liberties, under the pretext of engaging the national feeling of Germany in a crusade against a weak and helpless Power.

As the noble Earl has referred to a speech which was delivered by my noble Friend Lord Palmerston the other day, in laying the papers upon the table of the House, and severely animadverted upon the tone adopted by the noble Lord, I wish to say one word with respect both to the present position of this country and to the future. All that the Government of England has said, or ought to say, was that we did not think it right to commit this country to war merely for the purpose of settling the Schleswig-Holstein dispute; but that should new objects be developed, or should the war take a new direction, we and those who might succeed us in office would hold ourselves free to deal with any conjuncture which might arise as to them, or to us might seem fit. That was all that was said by the noble Viscount in another place, and all that was said or implied by my noble Friend the Secretary for Foreign Affairs in your Lordships' House. Nay, more, I maintain that the language held by the English and by the French Government on this point are all but identical. The French Government, in writing to decline the proposition which was made to them in January in reference to joint action in support of Denmark, said they were not prepared at that conjuncture to enter into any engagements to promise material aid to Denmark, or to incur any risk of war with Germany; but they distinctly reserved to themselves, in the event of the war taking a new direction, and the balance of power in Europe being imperilled, the right of dealing with that altered condition of affairs as they might deem advisable. This is the position taken by the two Governments, and it is a position, I contend, consistent with the honour and dignity of this country.

My Lords, I should deeply regret—but more, I must say, for the sake of this House than of Her Majesty's Government—that this meaningless Resolution, involving no principle and no policy — not even condemning the Government on any specific grounds—should be placed on the Journals of the House of Lords. But I will frankly own that, whatever may be the result of the Vote which is to be given to-night, we are not ashamed of anything which we have said or done. Neither are we ashamed of having forborne to do anything from which we have refrained. I do not regret that we have interfered in this question as we have done, because it was, I think, our bounden duty to take that course. I do not regret that we advised Denmark to fulfil all her promises to Germany. I do not regret that we distinctly intimated to her our opinion as to the particular measures which we thought a violation of the stipulations into which she had entered; or that we warned the German Powers of the dangers that would arise if France and England should be compelled to take up arms against their aggressive movements. I am not sorry that we endeavoured to form a close alliance with France, and to rally her to our support, because my firm conviction is, that if she had advanced as we invited her to do, this war would not have been waged nor all this blood shed. I do not regret that we invited—hoping against hope—the great Powers of Europe to a Conference in London, to see if we could settle this question by means of negotiations; or that, having failed in that endeavour, we refused to commit England to a war in which she had no immediate interest, and from which we could expect no results adequate to the evils which it would entail. Above all, I do not regret that we have resisted that temptation to which you (the Opposition) now are yielding—the temptation of identifying our own personal sympathies and our own party objects with the honour and interests of our country.

LORD BROUGHAM said, he would not enter into the details of this Question after they had been so ably handled by his noble Friends on both sides of the House. But he should not feel easy if he did not express his opinion upon the state of foreign countries and our policy as connected with them. The aspect of affairs was far from cheering either in the New world or in the Old. In the New, a cruel civil war to excite our reprobation and our pity; in the Old, much which it was natural to deplore, but much which it was necessary to condemn. We saw a nation that had from a man, falsely and unreflectingly called great, inherited with his dominions his profligacy and cunning, but little of his capacity. It has been seized with a love of wealth and power, and for its gratification has trampled on the weak and truckled to the strong, serving as the tool of the Muscovite through a course of treachery and cruelty unprecedented even in the history of Russian oppression and Polish suffering. Backed by Austria on no possible principle, on a war of intent hard to conceive, unless it be that she dreamt of gaining influence with the German Courts, ruled by their mobs fanatical for war, and hoped to make such influence a counterpoise to her difficulties in Italy and her worse embarrassments in Hungary. Thus seeking glory in war, Prussia had not gained the shadow of it, but she had grasped the substance of plunder. Were we to stand by silent and see her butchery and pillage of a gallant people? We should then really be humbled. If we had not felt indignation, we should have been under a delusion. If we had not expressed indignation, we should have incurred everlasting disgrace. People talk of humiliation. There is nothing humbling in being unable to prevent wrong by staying the wrong-doer; but it is humiliating to stand by in silence. All Europe knew that we could not make war single-handed against half or two-thirds of the Continent. To have rushed into such a war, how just so ever the grounds of it, would have been utter insanity. We had a right and a duty to abstain from this, and also a right and a duty to express our indignation. We were not bound, as Mr. Mills has well said, to be chivalrous, but we were bound to be honest and speak out. If the language in which we expressed our honest feelings was strong, stronger than usual in diplomatic intercourse, no harm could be done. Threats, or anything to be construed into threats, we had no right to use, seeing we were prevented by our insulation from acting. He did not find by examining the papers that any such had been used, and he spoke the more confidently on this that he had for the moment been misled by clamour at home and abroad to doubt whether menacing language had not been employed. The examination of the Correspondence and the whole case had convinced him to the contrary, and he gave it as his deliberate opinion that there had been no threats used by his noble Friend (Lord Russell). So it was the grossest fallacy to pretend that promises had been given to Denmark. This was urged from an expression of his noble Friend in the House of Commons (Lord Palmerston), that Denmark should not stand alone if Germany attacked her. But the expression was used in a statement that Russia and France viewed the matter as we did, and consequently the expression only meant that others as well as ourselves would stand by the Danes. He deeply lamented that France had not at the proper moment interfered. She owed incalculable benefits to her wise and politic ruler, whose aversion to all that might slacken her great and rapid progress in the peaceful arts and affect the existing material prosperity she was enjoying, could not be doubted. But he felt confident, as confident as one could be of any event which had not happened, that her interposition at first would have proved effectual without the least risk of hostilities. That the Conference had ended without general pacification he deeply lamented, owing to the refusal of arbitration. He had said, on the first announcement, that there were three ways of refusing an offer to refer:—one was plainly and frankly to say No, as the Danes had done; another was to say Yes, but on condition of a two months' armistice, a thing altogether out of the question; a third was to say Yes, but on condition of not being bound by the answer. These were only roundabout refusals, and, therefore, the German Powers had refused quite as plainly as the Danes.

Lord Brougham

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE: My Lords, I naturally feel considerable reluctance in intruding upon your Lordships on a question of this gravity and importance; but that reluctance is greatly increased when I find myself obliged, for the first time for many years—if not in my life—to differ from the noble Lord at the head of the Government, and I believe I may say, as far as foreign politics are concerned, from my noble Friend the Foreign Secretary. Since 1827 I have always looked for guidance, when I needed it, on foreign politics to my noble Friend at the head of the Government; and I can conscientiously say that I have on every occasion voted with my noble Friend on these affairs, not merely out of deference to his authority, but from a conscientious feeling that I was right in so doing. On the present occasion I regret to say that I cannot support the policy of the Government. When the Resolution of the noble Earl opposite was proposed, I felt myself in considerable difficulty; but with the whole tenor of his speech I entirely agree. He says, if I understand him rightly, that the Government have brought on war, and have led the way to the present unfortunate state of things by their vacillation, indecision, and weakness. In that I entirely agree; but I am forced on this occasion to give my opinion, not upon the noble Earl's speech, but upon his Motion. I was astonished to hear the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll), talk of this as what in Irish phrase might be termed a "faction fight." Would it have been becoming in this House to receive in silence the papers laid before us, accompanied as they were by such a speech? On the contrary, we were specially invited by the Government to examine those papers and to give our opinion, and we were expressly told not to be in a hurry. I have examined the papers, and I am bound to say that I do think that they show that these affairs have been greatly mismanaged, and that it is owing to that mismanagement that there is a war, and that Denmark has been almost swept off the political map of Europe. But, my Lords, I cannot vote for the Motion of the noble Earl opposite, because, though undoubtedly it is a censure upon the Government, and as such must be taken, if it is carried, yet its terms are such I cannot support. I do not think, in the first place, that it expresses the truth; and if it does so, that truth is not which this House ought to blazon to the world.

I do not think that the influence of England, properly exercised, is one jot lowered in the eyes of Europe. The influence of this country depends on her power, and never did the power of England stand higher than at the present moment. We have the finest fleet in the world; we have an army, which, although small, has never been found inadequate for any necessary purpose; we have financial resources which seem almost inexhaustible; and the commerce of the country, so far from being an impediment to our going to war, adds immense weight to us in any war. If any country with which we have commercial relations happened to go to war with us, it would suffer by the interruption of commerce relatively and comparatively far more than England. We have shown that we can suffer a great interruption to our manufactures and commerce without our resources being impaired. I think, therefore, that the Resolution of the noble Earl, whether drawn up by a council of sixteen, as the noble Duke told us, or by an individual, is mistaken in asserting that the isolation of the English Cabinet implies a want of solid power on the part of England. I perfectly agree there is an isolation at the very moment when we require combined action.

My Lords, in order to justify my remark that those affairs have been mismanaged, I do not think it necessary to go back to the long period which the noble Earl has referred to; but I must observe that I was astonished to hear the terms in which the noble Duke spoke of the Treaty of 1852. The noble Duke was a Royal Commissioner who sat in front of the throne when a Royal Speech was delivered, in which no less than three paragraphs were devoted to that treaty. Why, my Lords, we have heard of that treaty as the sole ground on which Her Majesty's Government called on the other Great Powers for their co-operation in the matter. They went to France and said, "You were a party to the Treaty of 1852." They went to Russia and said, "You were a party to the Treaty of 1852." They went to Prussia and Austria, and said, "How can you set aside the terms of the Treaty of 1852?" And, after all this, the noble Duke comes forward and says, it is not what you can call a binding treaty.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: I beg the noble Marquess's pardon. I said the Danes had given it up themselves.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE: I do not doubt it. The Danes have given it up! Why, it is torn to shreds. And that was the treaty which was to have preserved the integrity and independence of Denmark. What has become of the integrity and independence of Denmark? About a fortnight ago I observed in this House that, before very long, Denmark would become either a province of Germany or part of a Scandinavian empire. I little thought then how near was the time at which my words would be realized. The noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) undertook tonight to hold out a similar expectation to that put forward on a previous occasion by my noble Friend the Secretary for Foreign Affairs—that if those wonderful fleets of the Austrians and Prussians should go to Copenhagen and force harsh conditions and a treaty on Denmark, the Government will reconsider the question of assistance. Well, I have no doubt they will if they should be in office; but I venture to think that when those fleets are before Copenhagen there will be still less inclination in this country for our going to war than there is at this moment, when, I apprehend, there is not a man in the country who thinks we ought now to go to war. My Lords, the time for going to war is past; but, looking back, we find there have been different times at which different tones were taken by Her Majesty's Government in respect of the question of peace and war; whereas, as I contend, you ought never to have spoken a word about war without being fully prepared to follow up your words by acts. It is of a want of decision and determination I accuse my noble Friend at the head of the Foreign Office. It is impossible for any one to read the papers and not see that sometimes the Government were inclined for war. It is impossible not to see that not only the Cabinet collectively, but the noble Earl himself at different times, were, at different times, of different dispositions as regards this question. I beg to have it clearly understood that I do not, by the Amendment I propose to move, or by any observations of mine, mean to assert that at any time the noble Earl in any despatch, or the English Government by any word, spoken by our representatives here or abroad, gave any pledge or promise that England alone, or in alliance with other Powers, would support Denmark in a war. If that had been done, I entertain no doubt whatever that my noble Friend and the Government would have redeemed their pledge; but the question is, have you not, by your whole conduct, given Denmark reason to suppose that you would go to war in her behalf, and afterwards abandoned her in her present unfortunate position? I assert that such is the case. If I were asked at what time the Government might with advantage have declared their intention to go to war—supposing that at any time they had an intention of taking that step—I would name the 18th of September, when Mr. Grey had the interview with M. Drouyn de Lhuys, the particulars of which he reports to the noble Earl in a despatch of that date. I do not wish to read passages from blue-books, and therefore I shall merely state that, on the occasion to which I refer, a proposition was made by Her Majesty's Government to the Government of the Emperor of the French, that a joint representation should be made to the Germanic Confederation on the subject of the threatened Federal execution in Holstein. France refused because, as M. Drouyn de Lhuys said, if the two nations made such a representation they must "go further." He reminded Mr. Grey of the position in which France and England had put themselves with Russia in respect of Poland, and he stated that France could not join in a formal representation and there stop short. The noble Duke has told your Lordships truly that England and France can command the peace of the world; and if the Government were determined to meddle as much as they did—I do not say whether they were right or whether they were wrong in doing so—when they were saying at Frankfort that they could not see the Federal occupation with indifference, they should have held the same language with the French Minister, and acting on his observation about going further, they should have asked France to combine with England to insist, even by war if necessary, on the fulfilment of the conditions of the Treaty of 1852. Had they done so, they would have placed themselves in a position to keep the peace between the German Powers and Denmark, no matter how fanatic the German people and their Governments might have shown themselves to be. There would have been no such hostilities and no such destruction of the Danish Kingdom as have since taken place.

My Lords, the noble Duke has spoken of the contrast which has been drawn, he thinks unfairly, between the conduct of England and the conduct of France. Well, a contrast has been drawn, and I think with good reason. France was straightforward all through, but England was not so, because her mind was not made up. The death of the late King of Denmark occurred at a very critical moment, and I think that is the important epoch from which we should look at what has been done by our Ministers. The differences which had existed between Germany and Denmark before that occurrence had been of long standing—had been increasing in acerbity, and had been daily getting more dangerous; but, as has been said by the noble Earl opposite, every one knew—every statesman and every newspaper writer knew—that what was at the bottom of the dispute was the wish of Germany to possess the Duchies and the port of Kiel. What was the language held by my noble Friend (Lord Wodehouse), when, on the accession of the new King, he, like the representatives of other Powers, was sent to Copenhagen, not on a mere complimentary mission—though, of course, that was the pretence—but to take a part in matters connected with the Schleswig-Holstein question, and to observe what was going on? My noble Friend, in a remarkably able and clear despatch to Earl Russell, recounts what had occurred at an interview which he had with M. Hall, the Danish Minister, and says he told M. Hall that if Denmark did not listen to the advice of Her Majesty's Government we should leave her to the responsibility of meeting Germany alone. I do not say that this bound England positively to go to war, but the expression, "If you do not take my advice I leave you to act on your own responsibility," surely can leave on the minds of Englishmen no doubt that the inference must be, "If you do take my advice, you will not be left to act on your responsibility." Well, then, it is said with truth, "But M. Hall did not take our advice." No doubt. But M. Hall was turned out of office because he did not take the advice of England, and the King risked almost his throne—certainly he forfeited for a time his popularity—to bring in a more conciliatory Minister, who, after M. Hall had prorogued the Estates, and when it was impossible constitutionally to revoke the Constitution, took the necessary steps to convoke both Estates again in order that the advice of England might be legally followed. Had the Danes not a right to suppose, therefore, that they would not be left to encounter Germany alone? But is this all? There is a despatch which shows that our Minister at Copenhagen was instructed to keep something back from the Danish

Government. But secret diplomacy will not do for England. I am happy to say it is a game at which English Ministers always fail, and they always will be defeated by persons less scrupulous than themselves. Now, I think every word ought to have been shown to the Danish Government; there should have been no mystery whatever. But, in the papers, Lord Napier reports a remarkable conversation which he had at St. Petersburg with Prince Gortschakoff on the 26th of January, in reference to a despatch which Lord Napier was ordered to communicate to that Minister. The despatch appears to have been communicated by telegram, and the Prince remarked that it was better to wait for details—

> "There were, however, two points, said Lord Napier, on which he wished to be particularly informed. First—What was the nature and extent of the material assistance which, in the contingency indicated, Her Majesty's Government designed to afford to Denmark? And, secondly—Did Her Majesty's Government make such assistance conditional on the co-operation of all or of any of the Powers parties to the engagements of London? Would they act with all, or with some, or would they even act alone?"—No. 5, 622.

Thus it appears that there was a contingency indicated in which Her Majesty's Government proposed to afford assistance to Denmark; and not only was there a question of armed and material assistance, but it was even a question left open whether our Government would not act alone. Of course these communications at St. Petersburg became known at Copenhagen, and will it be contended after this that we have not encouraged the Danish Government in their hopes of receiving material assistance from us? It is quite true that, on the 4th of February, the noble Earl made a speech here in which he distinctly stated that he was not inclined to give material assistance to Denmark. But if this were his fixed intention, why had he not said so at once to the Russian Government? Why was there any doubt? Why was there any concealment? The words of the noble Earl in this House were—

> "We have given at no time any assurance or even hope of material assistance to Denmark. The Danish Minister at Her Majesty's Court has repeatedly said to me, 'We expect no material assistance from England, but we do expect sympathy.' That is the extent of our engagements as regards Denmark."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxiii. 57.]

Now, if all the noble Earl's language had been like this, there could have been no doubt as to his meaning, but he goes on to add—

> "What the future may bring forth it would be rash for me to say. . . . . . . I do ask your Lordships that we may be permitted to decide upon events as they arise, and to take such measures" [not excepting military measures, your Lordships will see] "as we may think best for the peace of Europe, for the welfare of Denmark as a separate and independent nation, and for the real good of the Germans as a great Power."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxiii. 57.]

This is materially different from the language of France, although it is quite clear that the French Government reserved to itself the right to act at any moment as it might think best for itself. We say we shall do what we think right to secure "the welfare of Denmark as a separate and independent kingdom." Now, on the 11th of February, the Danish Minister at this Court made a formal application for aid. This was after the noble Earl's speech from which I have just quoted; and we will now see what M. Bille wrote to Earl Russell a week after that speech. He said—

> "But the Danish Government need not look so far back in the past to gain the assurance that the active assistance of England will not fail them under the present circumstances. The Treaty of London, in contempt of which the German Powers are at the present moment invading a Danish country, is especially due to the invariable interest which England takes in the maintenance of the Danish monarchy. And of all the great Powers, England has always been that which has endeavoured with most perseverance to remove the prospects of a collision. Recently, too, the Cabinet of London gave it to be understood at Frankfort, that in the case of an attack of Schleswig, Denmark would not be left alone in the contest. Germany has thought she could continue her course and pay no attention to these words, but the Danish Government have not failed to see in them the expression of a determination which the British Government will put in execution with all the energy which characterizes the English nation."—No. 5, 677.

There is no use in going back to the words of the noble Viscount the First Minister, and I do not agree with the noble Earl opposite as to the importance which he attaches to words spoken under totally different circumstances from those we are now considering. But from the despatch to which I am referring, and which was written on the 11th of February, Her Majesty's Government seem to have allowed it to be understood at Frankfort, that in case of an attack upon Schleswig Denmark would not be left alone in the contest. Am I to be told, after such a despatch, that Denmark had no expectation of help from England? Well then, on the 19th of February, the noble Earl writes to Sir Augustus Paget in these terms—

"With regard to the request that friendly Powers should come to the assistance of Denmark, Her Majesty's Government can only say that every step they may think it right to take in the further progress of this unhappy contest can only be taken after full consideration and communication with France and Russia. These Powers are as much interested in the maintenance of the integrity of the Danish monarchy as Great Britain; and Her Majesty's Government may fairly have recourse to their advice and concert in any measures to be taken for the preservation of that integrity. In respect to the act of guarantee of the Duchy of Schleswig of 1720, inasmuch as the Austrian and Prussian Governments have made a solemn declaration that they have no intention of disturbing the integrity of Denmark, it is not necessary at the present moment to examine the question of principle—that is, the validity of the guarantee itself."—No. 5, 704.

As far as the papers go, I believe that this guarantee of 1720, to which the noble Earl here refers, is perfectly valid at this moment. My noble Friend at the head of the Foreign Office does not say whether he will or will not defend the integrity of Denmark; but he says that, in case of certain contingencies, which have not yet arisen, the present decision of the Government may be reconsidered. I do not think, for my own part, that we ought to look too narrowly at the literal interpretation of words spoken here and there, but that we ought rather to consider the influence which they may have been calculated to exercise upon Denmark. Well, in March the fleet was moved: was not this in contemplation that Denmark was not to be left alone? On the 9th of March Earl Russell, in connection with the Conference, wrote a remarkable despatch to Sir Augustus Paget at Copenhagen, desiring him to check the expectations of the Danes in reference to material aid from England. The portions of the despatch to which I refer are as follows:—

"I must request you, before you require on the 12th instant, that the answer should be given on that day, to state to M. Monrad and M. Quaade the very great imprudence, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, of throwing away a fair chance of settling a question in regard to which the whole of the Powers of Germany are ready to contend in arms against Denmark, and neither France, nor Great Britain, nor Russia, nor Sweden are ready, in present circumstances, to fight in her support. . . . Had Her Majesty's Government been willing to bind Great Britain to afford material assistance to Denmark, Her Majesty's Government would have had the right, in return for that assistance, to prescribe the manner in which Denmark should fulfil her engagements to Germany. But, as Her Majesty's Government have never offered material aid, so, on the other hand, they have never gone beyond offering advice to Denmark with the most sincere desire to enable her to maintain her integrity and independence, but without any promise of material support."—No. 5, 780.

About the same time, however, the fleet was moved; and the noble Earl, when questioned in this House on the 8th of March as to the cause of this removal, said—

"All I can say is, that the Government will best consult, according to their own opinion, the honour and interests of this country. They will not make war when the safety and the interests, the integrity and the independence of Denmark can be secured otherwise; and they will not neglect any means by which that safety and independence can be secured. With regard to the fleet, some ten days or a fortnight ago, with a view to have that fleet at command, it was directed to rendezvous at one of the home ports, so that orders might be at once conveyed to it. If it were thought necessary to give any orders to that fleet, it would be at once within our reach, and certainly I could not expect that any fleet of Austria or of Prussia would venture to encounter the squadron of Her Majesty."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxiii. 1632.]

Might not it be a fair inference that Denmark was to expect material assistance from England after this declaration, the news of which would reach Copenhagen about the same time as the despatch to which I have just referred? In reference to the intention of the Austrian fleet to go to the Baltic, Lord Russell said, on the 11th of April, when questioned upon the subject—

"My noble Friend alluded to the Austrian fleet going to the Baltic; that is a question on which Her Majesty's Government have made representations to the Austrian Government. At present the Austrian Government have promised that they have no intention to send their fleet into the Baltic. They say they are about to send their fleet into the North Sea to protect the commerce of the German Powers, which is very extensive. That is a legitimate object. England is quite free to act in such cases, and while we will not act without it is absolutely necessary, and while I am fully conscious of the power of England, yet we do not wish to hurry into war without necessity; and, for my own part, I think that a pacific policy is our true policy."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxiv. 764.]

But why should not the Austrian fleet have gone into the Baltic if the noble Earl was not at that time prepared to take active steps with the English fleet to prevent it? At that time a state of uncertainty prevailed in all quarters, whether it was to be war or peace. I might refer as witnesses to the conduct of the Government to any merchant upon any stock-mart in Europe, or to the whole of the public of the metropolis. Why, in all places of resort for intelligent and educated men in Europe, the question has been from day to day, and from week to week—"Is England going to war or not; why does not the Government make up its mind on the subject?"

My Lords, I must say that I never heard any speech in Parliament which caused me more distress than that delivered the other night by the noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. His argument was that Denmark's strongholds were gone, and that it was now too late to fight. That, however, did not prove, that if we had ever thought of going to war we ought to have done so before we had arrived at our present difficulties. The noble Earl has urged that we ought not to go to war because both Russia and France refused to act with us, although those two Powers were quite willing to give Denmark the benefit of their advice. I, however, believe that, so far from that being a reason why we should not go to war, it is a convincing argument in favour of a contrary course, because those two Powers have been so far compromised that they certainly would not have acted against us. The noble Earl, however, came down to the House this day week and made a speech which, I will at once avow to him, dissipated the slightest idea I might have entertained of the possibility of going to war, and convinced me that the adoption of such a course would simply be an act of insanity. What are we now to go to war for? There is nothing left for which it is worth our while to engage in such a struggle. The Treaty of 1852 and the integrity and independence of Denmark have all alike disappeared. The only man in the whole country whom I have heard speak of war is the noble Earl himself, who came down to this House the other evening, and stated that the course of the Government might possibly be reconsidered in case certain contingencies occurred. In the case of the bombardment of Copenhagen, there is to be a reconsideration of the subject; but to go to war then would, in my opinion, be the height of insanity. The noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) chose to be rather merry when he spoke of the manner in which the noble Earl, the Mover of the Resolution, had avoided all reference to the course which he would have pursued if he had been placed in the circumstances which the Government have found themselves compelled to meet. Without dwelling upon the subject, I think that if I had been placed in such a position I would have acted in a more straightforward manner, and would have decided at the outset which course to pursue, and have announced it; whether I would have afforded Denmark protection, or entirely abstained from armed intervention. I may perhaps refer to some words of the noble Viscount at the head of the Government, spoken by him in 1823. The words I am about to quote are general maxims, and I think are even more applicable to the present time than they were to the events of 1823. Lord Palmerston said—

> "We had but two courses from which to choose—neutrality or war in conjunction with Spain; but whichever we had determined to adopt, it became us to adopt it decidedly and adhere to it consistently. Some, indeed, had proposed a middle course, and, strange to say, would have had us use threats in negotiation, without being prepared to go to war if negotiation had failed. Such a course would have been degrading. To have talked of war, and to have meant neutrality, to have threatened an army and to have retreated behind a State paper, to have brandished the sword of defiance in the hour of deliberation, and to have ended with a penful of protests on the day of battle, would have been the conduct of a cowardly bully, and would have made us the object of contempt and the laughing stock of Europe."—[2 *Hansard*, viii. 1453.]

In respect to this question, I have framed as mild an Amendment as I could devise; but I believe it is clear, embodying the opinion I entertain—that we have misled the Danish Government, and therefore that we are, in a great degree, the cause of the pitiable position in which Denmark is now placed. If we had said at first we would give no help, Denmark would have done what she seems to be doing now—she would have sent at once to Berlin to obtain the best terms she could make there. And I believe that if she had gone there at first and had expressed herself willing to adopt some such plan as the line of the Schlei, it would have been possible to preserve the Danish Monarchy from the dangerous position which it now occupies. I believe that by the course they, the English Government, pursued, they bewildered our own people, and misled the Court of Copenhagen. The Danes did not believe—no one believed—when they saw our fleet set in motion and our flag hoisted, that that fleet would return to our ports, and that our flag would be only employed to cover our own ships without taking any steps on behalf of Denmark. The Danish Government could not have supposed that the Ministers who had exhibited so much zeal, energy, and determination in their favour upon paper, would have left them in the hour of their distress without lending them a helping hand, or making one effort to save them. My Lords, I beg leave to move the Amendment of which I have given notice.

Amendment *moved,*

To omit all the Words after the Word ("convened") for the Purpose of inserting the following Words: ("That this House regrets that Denmark was allowed to expect from the English Government material Aid in support of the Objects of the Treaty of May, 1852"). (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*).

THE EARL OF CLARENDON: My Lords, I think the noble Duke near me (the Duke of Argyll) has so ably defended the course of the Government from the attacks of the noble Earl opposite, and I also think that the noble Marquess who has just sat down (the Marquess of Clanricarde) has so little weakened the statement of my noble Friend, that I feel it quite unnecessary to attempt any vindication of the Government; for not only is my noble Friend much better qualified by a knowledge of the circumstances for that office, but I do not share the responsibility for the course they pursued during the time they were most active in the affairs of Denmark. Until very lately I knew no more of what was going on than any of your Lordships. Before I became a member of the Government I had no other data upon which to form an opinion than other Peers had; but having formed an opinion from the Correspondence which has been laid before your Lordship, I shall express my opinion upon this question as frankly as if I was addressing your Lordships from below the gangway. In doing so I shall refrain from quoting blue-books, because I assume that all who take an interest in the question have either read those ponderous volumes for themselves, or those who have not had the courage to do so, have read in the newspapers of the last few days the discussions in which all the important points have been fully brought out either for or against the Government. I proceed to state what was my opinion. It was that at the outset of these affairs—before "coming events had cast their shadows before"—I think the Government exhibited foresight and an appreciation of the gravity and European importance which those events might assume. I pass over the communications which took place, the remonstrances with the German Powers, the warnings to Denmark in the last three months of 1863. Most of those communications were, I think, judicious, and all of them showed an earnest desire to prevent war by bringing about an amicable settlement of disputed points. Those efforts would have been successful if they had been met in a corresponding spirit, and a real desire of conciliation on the other side. As time passed, the pressure and vehemence of public opinion in Germany increased, and the determination of Denmark to resist the demands that were made upon her was strengthened. The Government having exhausted all their efforts diplomatically to bring the question to a solution, in January last, applied to the two great Continental Powers, France and Russia, who were more interested than ourselves in maintaining the Treaty of 1852, which two other Continental Powers, who like us were parties to that treaty, seemed determined to disregard. The Government applied to Russia and to France to know whether, for the sake of maintaining the integrity of Denmark and the balance of power in Europe, they would join with us in giving material aid to Denmark; and, as your Lordships know, they applied in vain. What was the position of the Government in January last? If your Lordships will carry your minds back to that period you will, I think, make allowance for the extraordinary difficulties in which Her Majesty's Government were placed, not alone with having to deal with this question, but also having to decide in what manner they should deal with a question which more than any other in the modern history of Europe has been vexed by ramified complications as to the relations between the Duchies and Denmark, between the Duchies and Germany, and between the Duchies themselves—a question which for a century had perplexed the diplomatists and courts of Europe, and which was suddenly aggravated and brought to a climax by the unexpected death of the King and the rights and acts of his successor.

Her Majesty's Government having met with no response from France and Russia to their invitation — those two Powers having manifested almost complete unconcern — the fact that the treaty justified no sacrifice on our part, and Denmark not being an idea to fight for, the Government had to choose whether they would coldly imitate the stoical indifference of those two Powers, and folding their arms remain passive spectators of another partition like that of Poland, or whether they would do what the noble Earl opposite quarrels with them for not having done—to warn the German Powers not to cross the Eider —in which case he says there would have been little risk of war. That may be his opinion; but mine is that no course would have been more rash or more ineffectual. You could not have used such a threat without being prepared to act, and act immediately; and, as the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) has said, to send out our ironclads with perhaps 30,000 troops to meet the dangerous fogs upon the icebound coast of Denmark. Then, indeed, persistence would have been a point of honour with Germany. If it produced nothing else it would have produced German unity. The result of such a policy would have been absolutely to prevent Austria and Prussia, backed by the enthusiasm and the armed force of all Germany, quailing before our menace even if they had been disposed to do so. They would have determined, not only to chastise the Danes, but to secure a portion of the sea coast which has been so long an object of desire to the German democracy. We might, indeed, have protracted the struggle, but we should have been at war with all Germany. We should very soon have exhausted all our means of offence or retaliation; and we should have blockaded the ports of the Baltic and Adriatic, with far more real injury to our own commerce than to those with whom we made a case of quarrel. We should have called into life and action all those restless spirits that swarm all over Europe, and we should soon have found ourselves giving direct or indirect assistance to revolution in Hungary and Galicia, and to the efforts which Italy would make to obtain Venetia. The embers now smouldering in the principalities and the other provinces of Turkey in Europe would have burst into flame; and, in point of fact, ours would have been the hand to set fire to the combustibles now scattered about Europe. I ask your Lordships whether a junction with revolution would have been a rightful occupation for England to engage in with her world-wide interest, and with her duties, not only abstract but genuine, to the cause of civilization, peace, and humanity all over the world. We should, moreover, have engaged in this contest singlehanded, while France would have stood by, a watchful but not indifferent spectator, waiting till events decided into which scale she ought to throw her sword. And with what object should we thus have set fire to the four corners of Europe? For the purpose of assisting Denmark to uphold a treaty and to repel unjust aggression. I have not the least doubt that if we sent out an expeditionary force to any particular point on the continent of Denmark, it would have held and occupied the place to which it was sent; but would it have dislodged one man of the 100,000 or 200,000 men that Germany would have sent into the territories of Denmark? Would they have produced a different feeling in Germany with regard to the Duchies? Would they have altered the intention of those German Powers who were parties to the treaty? I suppose there must have been some limit to the duration of our military occupation of Denmark and of our naval support. Let me ask your Lordships what would be the prospects and condition of Denmark after that force was withdrawn? It seems to me that those who say we ought to have gone to war before the invasion of Schleswig, or that we ought to go to war now, either have not so well calculated the consequences as to make either their advice or their censure of any importance, or else are men who wish to make political capital for themselves by tall talk—if I may use an Americanism—and desire to obtain the vulgar praise by advocating a policy from which they themselves would in office be the first to shrink. My Lords, we all feel, and have felt, the greatest sympathy for the Danes; our desire, our temptation to go to their relief has been very great. But, my Lords, sentiment is no pretext for war, which can be justified only by the very strongest sense of duty; and unless some obligation upon the Government amounting to a duty can be shown, the Government ought not to have assisted Denmark by going to war. The moment the question came to be thoroughly understood, from one end of England to the other, there was not a doubt upon the subject. Prior to the year 1852, the date of the Treaty of London, no one pretends that we had any treaty engagements binding us to support the Danes. My noble Friend admits that the treaty simply bound us to recognize King Christian as King of Denmark, but did not bind us to guarantee the Danish dominions. We should have been no more justified in going to war for such an object than in going to war for the defence of Poland because we were parties to the Treaty of Vienna. But while Her Majesty's Government abstained from going to war, would they have been justified if they had made no exertion—if they had looked on calmly while a great wrong was being perpetrated—if they had taken none of the measures which were in their power for the protection of Denmark? In that case I think they would have greatly deserved to be censured, and I myself, if sitting below the gangway, would have joined in such a vote. What was to be done, I think, was done honestly and in good faith. My noble Friend, like many others both in and out of Parliament, accuses my noble Friend the Secretary of State of using the language of menace, and of using too strong expressions in his despatches, when he had no intention of carrying these menaces out. In considering these the time is very important, because my noble Friend had then no reason to believe that France would be left alone in this business, and that other Powers who were equally bound with ourselves would have shrunk and slunk away from their obligations. I must say I think this charge comes with singular inconsistency from the very persons who charge my noble Friend with not having held strong language, and with not having assumed a decided attitude at the beginning of the war. But I do not think any honest Englishman will blame my noble Friend for having exerted his utmost efforts to avert from Denmark the calamities of war; or, having gone through all the despatches, will stay to question whether one particular expression was too strong and another too weak—whether the right word was always used in the right place—but will sympathize with the Minister writing under the deep anxiety that a British Minister should always feel when labouring in the cause of peace. My noble Friend who brought forward the vote of censure this evening (the Earl of Malmesbury) must remember how bitterly he was censured for his unsuccessful interference at the outset of the war between Austria and France—

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: And turned out. [*Laughter and Cheers!*]

THE EARL OF CLARENDON: Not for that particular cause, nor for that policy only, though, of course, my noble Friend takes what belongs to himself. I remember that my noble Friend laboured so energetically that his policy was called "fussy," and his despatches, though they may all have been necessary, were certainly numerous, being from January to June in that year at the rate of a despatch and a half a day; and yet he did not succeed in averting war. I can, however, assure my noble Friend that if any vote of censure had been brought against him for the manner in which he conducted affairs at that time he should have had my vote heartily given, for I thought his policy sound, I thought that he was ill-treated, that he failed from no fault of his own, and that to attack him on the ground of want of success would have been an unworthy proceeding. I now say the same thing in reference to my noble Friend behind me (Earl Russell). Reading the blue-books three months ago I formed the same opinion of the conduct of my noble Friend. It is perfectly true that his efforts to maintain peace have failed, and that the Conference has failed; and I know there is nothing so popular as success, and that the want of success is a great boon to political opponents, who are always seeking whom they may devour. Yet I must say I do not think, under the circumstances, it would have been possible to act otherwise than was done by my noble Friend; and I think that the conduct of my noble Friend and his Colleagues has been thus far successful—that it has met with sympathy and approval on the part of the country. The country feels satisfied with the conduct of the Government because they have not allowed England to be dragged into war without a sufficient cause. They have resisted all those temptations, I will call them, which have been more active in this case than at any time I remember; they have disregarded all the provocations, all the appeals—some honest, some very much the reverse—which might have led men to act upon their feelings, to the sacrifice of their duty, and because—I say it boldly because conscientiously—they have secured peace without dishonour to this country. Nobody can re-echo more cordially than I do the sentiment expressed by Lord Derby a few evenings ago, that "much as he loved peace, he loved England far more;" and in that feeling I declare that if I believed peace to be inconsistent with the honour of the country I would advocate war. But there is no reason why we should have war; we are merely bound by treaty with five other Powers to recognize a certain state of things whenever it shall happen. I shall not now discuss whether that treaty was a wise one or not, or how far the rules of prudence and foresight were observed in regard to the stipulations laid down, to which we are not more bound than any other Power, and which we have less means than any other Power of carrying out. But, I ask, why should we alone depart from the policy of non-intervention, which it is the duty of this country as far as possible to observe? My noble Friend (the Earl of Malmesbury) said that advice was given to Denmark. But no advice that was not for her interest was ever given to Denmark, and to that advice no conditions were annexed. Over and over again Denmark was told that she was not to expect material assistance from us, and I do not know how words could be made more plain. Lord Wodehouse said the same when he went to Copenhagen, and the Danish Minister himself admitted that that was the case. My noble Friend and I constantly told the Danish representatives here that no material support was to be expected from England; and on the very last evening before M. Quaade left this country I had a conversation with him, and asked him whether my noble Friend and I had ever varied in our assurance that Denmark could not expect material aid from this country, and whether I had not also urged him to disregard the representations made by persons here for their own party objects, that the pressure of public opinion would compel the Government to go to war for Denmark. M. Quaade admitted that we had assured him more than once that England would not give Denmark material assistance, and that we had never varied in our language. And not being able to give, and Denmark knowing that we should not give her, material aid, my noble Friend did that which was the next best; or perhaps a better thing still, he induced the Powers who signed the Treaty of 1852 to meet in Conference. There were great delays before the Conference assembled—delays originating in the first place with the Danes themselves, who would not give an answer for fear of complications at Copenhagen—and those delays are among the circumstances which in this matter are most to be deplored. The Conference has been treated both in this and in the other House of Parliament with something like contempt, as certain beforehand to be a failure. It may possibly have been a failure, because no arrangement favourable to Denmark was likely to be admitted. But it was the only chance of preventing the absorption of the Danish peninsula; and it was reasonable to expect that when the representatives of the great Powers of Europe were assembled in order to make peace, their labours would not terminate without result. I will ask any candid man whether the protocols do not justify the calling together of the Conference? Why, my Lords, six weeks' escape from the horrors of war—six weeks' time given for reflection, would alone be a sufficient justification for such a measure. Besides that, the territorial question was narrowed down to a few square leagues; and being so narrowed it was in a state in which arbitration would have been an honourable and satisfactory termination. Arbitration was practically refused by the German Powers; it was absolutely rejected by the Danes; but my noble Friend and myself and the representatives of the neutral Powers were so anxious to save Denmark from the result of hostilities, which we knew could only be fresh loss and disaster, that we should not have abandoned our attempts to bring about a satisfactory termination had not the Danes, in consequence of their anxiety to resume the blockade, refused to give another day. I believe that never before in the history of Conferences and Congresses were the representatives limited to a certain number of hours, which was practically the case in this instance, and therefore we were placed at a great disadvantage. That frontier line, the proposal of which to the Danes was, my noble Friend thinks, a humiliation to them, was one which I should have been exceedingly glad if they could have procured, because it is impossible to maintain the treaty by restoring Holstein to Denmark. It would be to Denmark a *damnosa possessio.* She never could restore her authority over subjects determined to resist it, and would have to rule over a people more and more hostile to her rule. The Danes were left to act as they pleased, but I cannot but regret that they refused the line of frontier—unsatisfactory and insufficient as it was—that was proposed to them by the British Plenipotentiaries. It would have left them Alsen and Duppel and the north of Schleswig, and would have obtained for them a guarantee from the Confederation never to interfere with that territory; and that portion of northern Schleswig would have formed a sort of neutral ground by which German interference would have been kept at a distance; whereas now the Confederation will be brought up to the imaginary frontier of Jutland, and Denmark will have to contend against the absorbing influence, the wealth, the intelligence, and the activity of Germany. The noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Malmesbury) has attributed the failure of my noble Friend to prevent war, and the failure of the Conference to restore peace, to the imperfect relations which existed between England and France. Upon that I wish to say a few words, because I think that to a great extent it is true. My opinion is that the Danish Question never would have taken its present development, and that the German Powers would have acted very differently, if they had not believed that there existed a coolness between the two Governments of England and France. This is only a fresh proof of the importance, which cannot be exaggerated, of a good understanding between England and France, not alone as regards the magnitude and increasing proportion of their reciprocal interests, but more especially with regard to those matters of dispute which are constantly arising in different parts of the world, and the solution of which depends upon the light in which they are viewed by England and France. I do not think that there could be a better illustration of that than the *Trent* affair, in which I have no hesitation in saying that, to the opportune and unsolicited expression of opinion on the part of France, England and the United States were mainly indebted for a termination of the quarrel honourable to both parties. Again, my Lords, I believe that the war with Russia was mainly attributable to the obstinate disbelief of the Emperor Nicholas, that England and France could ever be brought to act cordially together. Now, I admit that there was a soreness and irritation between France and England, not unnatural, very much to be regretted, but in reality without foundation. It began, as my noble Friend said, with respect to Poland. We all know that France would have gone to war with Russia in defence of Poland if Austria and England would have joined her. Our co-operation, therefore, was of very great importance. We have not, perhaps, the same chivalrous and romantic feeling as the French. We did not think that it was our duty or our interest to go to war for Poland. But the Government would have been wholly unable to resist the pressure of public opinion last year, and to avoid making some attempt to mitigate the horrors which were being perpetrated in that country. That attempt was made by England in conjunction with France: but we could go no further. We declined the overtures of France for a war with Russia; and I believe—and I have good reason for saying so—that there is not now a reasonable Frenchman who does not consider that we did France a good service by not undertaking ourselves, or encouraging her to undertake, the Quixotic enterprise of marching 200,000 men across Germany to attack Russia, the people of which would have risen as one man with even greater energy and patriotism than they displayed in 1812. The next matter to which the noble Earl alluded was the Congress. He said that we had insultingly refused to take part in the Congress proposed by France, and that if England had not so refused the result would have been to prevent those complications in the North of Europe that have since arisen. Now here again I believe we did France good service, although at first the course which we adopted produced some irritation. I have not the slightest doubt that the Emperor spoke truly what he thought when he said that the Congress was a work of necessity, and that its result would be pacification; but he overlooked not only the obstacles to the reconstruction of the map of Europe, but the impossibility of the task. I think that it was too much to expect that the Sovereigns of Europe would meet in Congress at Paris upon no other basis than the International law of Europe. It was too much to expect that the desires of the Congress would be submitted to unresistingly, and without the very wars which it was invited to prevent. The difficulties were not diminished by the manner in which the proposal was laid before Europe, without any warning or notice, or any communication with the Powers who were called upon at once to say "Yea" or "Nay." It was declined by my noble Friend in a manner at which I think that no offence could be taken, because reasonable people do not take offence where no offence can possibly be intended. My noble Friend's answer did not contain all those flowery phrases and honied words which were to be found in other replies, and the true value of which no one better understands than the Emperor. My noble Friend, feeling that such a Congress would not induce Russia to give up Poland, Austria Venetia, France Rome, or England Gibraltar, and that it would never have been brought to declare that the International law of Europe was "a worn-out and tattered rag," feeling that the cause of peace and good understanding between nations would be prejudiced rather than promoted by such a Congress, felt it his duty frankly, honestly, and without disguise, to declare his opinion; and I believe that there is no reasonable man in France who will not now admit that our course was neither unwise nor unfriendly, and ought not to impair the good relations between the two countries, upon which the relations and policy of other countries so greatly depend. We should be very wrong if we inferred from the existence of any irritation arising out of these circumstances, that France has been less active than ourselves in the cause of Denmark, or that the Emperor has been animated by the petty and spiteful spirit which is attributed to him. The French Government have been perfectly candid and straightforward throughout the whole affair. They have seen from the first that the cases of England and France were not parallel; that whereas we could give naval assistance to the Danes, France could only give military assistance; that she must be prepared to make war on a gigantic scale with United Germany, and that in the present happily peaceful disposition of the French nation that would be an impossibility, unless it was understood beforehand that for that war France would seek for compensation. But what that compensation was Europe in general, and France in particular, perfectly well understood. To suppose that the Emperor did not wish for a peaceful solution of affairs by the Conference, and that he thwarted our efforts to arrive at such a result, would be an entire mistake. The communications between the two Governments throughout the whole time that the Conference was sitting were of the most friendly and confidential character. The Protocols are before your Lordships to attest not only the cordiality but the ability and good sense with which we were assisted by the French Envoys. I may say the same of the representatives of the other neutral Powers. Our relations with all the other Powers of Europe — save the two German Powers—are upon the same footing. I would, under those circumstances, ask my noble Friend in what consists the loss of influence of which he complains? He has quoted French newspapers in support of his statements; but it is not on authority of that description, I hope, that your Lordships are to be called upon to affirm this Resolution. It is not on the diatribes of foreign correspondents, re-echoed here by the parties with whom they have originated, that we are to ground the opinion that England made promises to Denmark which she failed to keep, and that she is become reduced to the position of a third-rate Power. I do not complain of what is written and said abroad in regard to England, because we sometimes say ten times worse of her at home; but I treat such idle attacks as those to which I am referring, and which I will not raise to the rank of calumny, as sheer nonsense. England, my Lords, does not lose caste by not rushing into war without sufficient cause. The statesmen of England know well her resources, both moral and material. They know the enormous development of which her material power is capable, and they are alive to the irresistible force of public opinion. They are well aware how slow the English people are to believe in the necessity of going to war, but how they can, when occasion arises, unite as one man in the defence of the honour and interests of the nation. I therefore utterly disregard all such taunts as have been thrown out against us, come from what quarter they may; they can be of no importance unless they served to goad the Government into the adoption of a course for which there would be no justification; and I trust your Lordships will not this evening give them any weight by allowing them to influence your minds so far as to induce you to record it as your opinion that this country has fallen from her high position among the great Powers of Europe.

LORD CHELMSFORD: My Lords, I listened attentively to the speech of the noble Duke who spoke in the early part of this debate (the Duke of Argyll), and I must confess that I did not perceive that he dealt with a single point on which the Resolution of my noble Friend near me is based. Perhaps the noble Duke thought it more prudent to avoid ground which he could not touch without danger. But although he kept aloof from the real question at issue, he made one or two observations to which I wish shortly to address myself. The noble Duke suggested that the Resolution of my noble Friend was the production of sixteen gentlemen, whom he called upon him to name, who he thought were probably divided into a peace and war party, inasmuch as different portions of the Resolution in his opinion showed some such difference of view. Now, my Lords, the noble Duke will, perhaps, allow me to ask him a question on the same subject as to Her Majesty's Cabinet, which, omitting the noble Earl who has just spoken, and who only lately joined the Government, is, I believe, exactly composed of sixteen persons. Will the noble Duke tell me whether there is not a peace and war party in the Cabinet? And will he be good enough to name those who are thus divided? I think these are questions which I have as good a right to put as the noble Duke has to demand similar explanations with respect to the preparation of this Resolution. The noble Duke also said something about a "faction fight," and he informed us, if I am not mistaken, that he meant before he sat down to tell us what he thought of the Opposition. He did not, however, perform his promise, and we are still in ignorance what he thinks of us; but with respect to the observations which he made about a faction fight, I would simply say, that if the policy of a Ministry is to be impeached, it is not likely that their friends are the persons who would be the first to move a vote of censure upon them. What many of the friends of the present Government think of them at heart it is not for me to conjecture; but I cannot help thinking that if their votes were on the present occasion given by ballot—a system of voting, however, to which I object—they might not be found to be quite satisfactory to those whom they generally support. The noble Duke went on to contend that he had a right to know what the policy was which the Opposition would have pursued had they been in the place of the Government. I entirely deny that the noble Duke is entitled to an answer to that question, which is not in the slightest degree raised by the Resolution before the House. If the noble Duke had asked what line of policy we would not adopt, I think I could answer him satisfactorily. I have no objection to tell him that in dealing with the two contending parties we should not have held out to one of them, and that the weaker, hopes and expectations which were only meant to be dashed to the ground, leaving the Power whom we had induced to rely upon us in a worse condition than before. And we should not, on the other hand, have used menacing and insulting language to the aggressive Powers, which by our conduct afterwards we should have proved meant nothing, and which, therefore, could produce only disregard and contempt. Such, we say, is the policy which Her Majesty's Government have pursued, and such is the policy which by this Resolution we propose to condemn.

My Lords, in order that the question at issue may be narrowed within reasonable limits—for there is some danger of our losing ourselves on too wide a field in the discussion—I would first of all consider the state of affairs at the time of the accession of the present King of Denmark on the death of his predecessor, on the 15th of November last. Your Lordships are aware that the succession was recognized by the Treaty of London of the 8th of May, 1852. The object of that treaty was expressly stated to be the maintenance of the integrity of the Danish monarchy. I observed a few days ago in a leading journal rather a curious argument on this subject. It stated that, inasmuch as Holstein and Schleswig were no portion of the Kingdom of Denmark, if those Duchies were torn from that Kingdom its integrity would still be preserved. The very terms of the treaty, however, I think, refute any such argument, because it is expressly described as an arrangement by which the succession to the whole of the dominions united under the sceptre of the King of Denmark should devolve on the present King, then Prince Christian. In all the discussions that have taken place on the question of the integrity of Denmark, that State has been regarded as embracing both the Kingdom and the Duchies. Now, the great Powers of Europe, and almost all the minor States with the exception of six, were either originally parties to that treaty or subsequently acceded to it, and Austria and Prussia affixed their signatures to it without any reservation or qualification. This is a point which it is important to bear in mind, because in the course of the discussions which have since taken place it has been asserted both by Austria and Prussia that they signed the treaty with a reserve (it must have been a mental one) against the incorporation of Schleswig with the Kingdom of Denmark; and as to the claims of the Confederation over the Duchies, I think I cannot show better what were the obligations contracted by that treaty than by quoting the words of the noble Lord the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, who said—

> "Her Majesty's Government have seen with surprise and pain the language which has been held at Berlin with regard to the Treaty of London of May, 1852. The Powers who signed that treaty, or who subsequently acceded to it, must recollect that they bound themselves thereby not to Denmark alone, but to Great Britain, France

Russia, and Sweden, who were parties to it, and to all the other States and Powers whose accession thereto was asked for and obtained, and that the declared object and purpose of that treaty was not to regulate the reciprocal relations of Denmark and Germany, but to serve as an arrangement essential for the general interests of Europe."

The succession thus secured was unfortunately burdened by some unhappy legacies left by the late King. The first of these arose out of what are generally called the engagements of 1851-2; and these arose out of circumstances strikingly similar to those which have since occurred. Holstein and Schleswig had for a long period of time enjoyed a community of administration with respect to their local affairs separate from the Kingdom of Denmark, but never formed a constitutional unity. The King of Denmark proposed to give a free and independent Constitution to Holstein, and also, by a common free Constitution, to unite Schleswig with the kingdom in closer bonds of union. The Diet, under one of the laws of the Confederation, which prohibits any State belonging to it from changing its Constitution without the consent of the Sovereign and the Constitutional Representatives, interposed and demanded the revocation of this Constitution. The King of Prussia was then named the Minister of the Diet for Federal execution. Holstein was occupied. Schleswig was seized upon as a material guarantee. The brave Danes resisted; but after a fight of nine hours they yielded to overpowering numbers, and military possession was taken of the whole of Schleswig. An armistice followed, which lasted till the Treaty of July, 1850—that treaty was followed by the engagements of 1851-2, and ultimately by the Treaty of London. With regard to those engagements, I will quote the noble Earl's own description. He says—

> "The engagements of Germany and Denmark towards each other in 1851 were singularly obscure and indefinite. They were contained neither in treaty nor in a convention, but in notes and despatches exchanged between Denmark on the one side, and Austria and Prussia on the other, to which the two parties assigned a different degree of force and validity."

But there were two points of those engagements on which there can be no doubt — one was an agreement on the part of Austria and Prussia for the abolition of the community of administration which had subsisted between Schleswig and Holstein; the other was an engagement on the part of Denmark not to incorporate Schleswig in the kingdom, or to take any steps tending thereto. There was another fatal legacy left by the late King of Denmark, in the Constitution which he had framed for the kingdom and Schleswig, and which was complete with the exception of his signature. The position of the present King with regard to that Constitution was one of great embarrassment. It is well described by Sir Augustus Paget—

> "It ought to be taken into consideration that this project had been drawn up and brought to maturity without any participation on the part of His Majesty, who, it was well known, was opposed to the policy it indicated: on ascending the throne His Majesty had found it complete, less his signature, which, unless he was compelled to encounter a revolution, and to risk his crown without support from any quarter, it would be impossible for him to withhold."

But that which immediately endangered the security of Denmark was the Royal decree with respect to the constitutional position of Holstein, which was issued on the 30th of March preceding the late King's death. That Constitution was extremely favourable to Holstein, and again I should wish to describe it in the words of Sir Augustus Paget, who says:—

> "Such being the meaning which, from the reading of the document itself and the explanation which has been given to me by the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs, I attach to the proclamation of the 30th of March, I cannot but come to the conclusion that it is neither injurious to the interests of the Duchy of Holstein, nor calculated to place the Duchy in a position of inferiority towards the other parts of the Danish monarchy. I believe, on the contrary, that it is the creation of a state of things of which few countries in Continental Europe would be disposed to complain, or with which Holstein itself might well be satisfied if its ideas were confined to the protection of its legitimate interests and national welfare."

It may be well asked why there was such a desire on the part of Austria, Prussia, and the Diet to have that Constitution revoked? Austria and Prussia objected to it because it gave free and liberal institutions; for the noble Lord opposite (Lord Wodehouse) will recollect that in the course of his mission M. von Bismark told him distinctly that Germany would never be on good terms with Denmark as long as the present democratic institutions of Denmark were maintained. The Diet were opposed to it, because it severed the tie between Schleswig and Holstein; and the States of Germany hoped, by keeping up the connection between them, to draw Schleswig under German influence by means of Holstein. This was the state of things at the time of the King's death.

Another circumstance occurred, which it is important to bear in mind in considering the policy of the Government. A few days before the death of the late King the French Emperor had made a proposal to all the Great European Powers to meet in a general Congress for the purpose of settling any disputes which had arisen and were likely to disturb the peace of Europe; and among these were particularly specified the affairs of Denmark and Germany. Your Lordships can have no doubt that if at this critical conjuncture there had been a cordial concert and co-operation between the French Emperor and the English Government, it was highly probable that none of the disasters and calamities which have since befallen Denmark would have occurred. For that I have the admission of the noble Earl who has last spoken—a Minister of great experience, and as likely to be well informed on the subject as any Member in your Lordships' House. For months before the death of the King of Denmark the Diet had had under consideration this Patent of the 30th of March with respect to the Constitution of Holstein, and it was quite evident from their deliberations, and the proposals made by Austria and Prussia, that the Federal Execution would be made the pretext for extending the claim over Schleswig and dismembering the Danish monarchy. Of course it did not escape the sagacity of the noble Earl, that from the first the Diet had these ulterior views, that (to use his own words)

> "Some of the Powers of Germany showed an intention of availing themselves of the execution and the occupation in Holstein and Schleswig as a means of creating a revolution in those Duchies with a view to the dismemberment of the Danish monarchy."

On the 9th of July a summons was issued from the Diet to the King of Denmark to revoke the Patent of the 30th of March within six weeks. At this critical moment your Lordships will remember the remarkable speech made by the noble Lord at the head of the Government on the 23rd of July at the close of the Session. It was not a sudden impulse of the noble Lord's generous nature. He had ample time for deliberating what he should do and what he should say, for notice had been given him by an hon. Friend of mine (Mr. Seymour FitzGerald) of his intention to put the question. The noble Lord, therefore, was prepared to give an answer; and before the assembled House of Commons and, I may say, in the face of Europe, he said—

> "The hon. Gentleman asks what is the policy and the course of Her Majesty's Government with regard to that dispute. As I have already said, we concur entirely with him, and I am satisfied with all reasonable men in Europe, including those in France and Russia, in desiring that the independence, the integrity, and the rights of Denmark may be maintained. We are convinced—I am convinced at least—that if any violent attempt were made to overthrow those rights, to interfere with that independence, those who made the attempt would find in the result that it would not be Denmark alone with which they would have to contend."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxii. 1252.]

This was not uttered in the spirit of prophecy, it was a promise and pledge. ["No, no!" "Hear, hear!"] It was so understood by the Danes, and was so meant by the noble Lord. It is most important that we should bear this declaration in mind when we come to consider whether hopes and expectations were not held out to Denmark, because it will give point to all the subsequent language of the noble Earl however guardedly expressed. In a despatch written on the 13th of October, the noble Earl endeavoured to impress on the Danish Government that "they should not forcibly oppose the threatened Federal Execution unless it were extended to the Duchies." What is the meaning of this? Is it not that they should forcibly oppose the Federal Execution if extended to Schleswig? And can any one believe that the noble Lord meant that Denmark should do this alone and single-handed—that the Danes should encounter alone the overwhelming force of the German Powers? The noble Earl well knows that when the war did commence the Germans brought 68,000 men into the field against whom the Danes could only muster between 30,000 and 40,000 men. It was idle to suppose that Denmark would rush single-handed to her own destruction. Again, on the 22nd of October, 1863, the noble Earl says—

> "It seems to Her Majesty's Government that Denmark, with a due regard for her own interest, should at once withdraw the Patent of the 30th of March, and rest her opposition to Federal Execution on the ground that it involves interference in matters relating to the constitution of the Danish monarchy and in the affairs of Schleswig."—No. 3, 171.

My Lords, we must always bear in mind, with reference to the hopes and expectations held out to Denmark, the warnings which at this time the noble Earl was addressing to the Diet, as to its claims upon Schleswig and the right and duty of England to interfere. At page 124 of the Correspondence you will find him stating that—

> "If the Diet take steps for a still further object, and invade Holstein for the purpose of compelling the King of Denmark to acknowledge certain rights, which the German Confederation claim as belonging to Schleswig, by virtue of the arrangements of 1851-52, the Diet will be entering upon a grave European question, as to which they have no exclusive competency of decision, and on which it belongs quite as much to every other European Government to form an opinion and pronounce a judgment."—No. 2, 124.

Again, on the 29th of September, 1863, the noble Earl says—

> "The aim of the Execution consists unmistakably in carrying out the Diet's decrees—that is to say, to establish between the said Duchies, together with Schleswig and the Kingdom of Denmark Proper, a general Constitution, connecting them by a common union. It is impossible for Her Majesty's Government to shut their eyes to the gravity of the proposition which the Diet have to consider. Her Majesty by the Treaty of London of May 8, 1852, is bound to respect the integrity and independence of Denmark. The Emperor of Austria and the King of Prussia have taken the same engagement. Her Majesty could not see with indifference a military occupation of Holstein, which is only to cease upon terms injuriously affecting the Constitution of the whole Danish Monarchy. Her Majesty's Government could not recognize this military occupation as a legitimate exercise of the powers of the Confederation, or admit that it could properly be called a Federal Execution. Her Majesty's Government could not be indifferent to the bearing of such an act upon Denmark, and upon European interests. Her Majesty's Government, therefore, earnestly entreat the German Diet to pause, and to submit the questions in dispute between Germany and Denmark to the mediation of other Powers unconcerned in the controversy, but deeply concerned in the maintenance of the peace of Europe and the independence of Denmark."—No. 2, 145.

Well, my Lords, how were these notices—threatenings I suppose we must not call them—regarded by Denmark herself? My noble Friend opposite (Lord Wodehouse), in a conversation which he had with M. Hall, the Danish Minister, was told by him that they had come to a decision not to offer resistance in Holstein in consequence of the representations of Her Majesty's Government. In answer to this communication the noble Lord said—

> "It would be most imprudent to precipitate a war by resistance to the Execution; but he was careful to explain that Her Majesty's Government would not take upon themselves the responsibility of the determination which might be arrived at by the Danish Court."

After having distinctly advised the Danish Government not to resist the invasion of the Duchies, after the Danes had abandoned Holstein upon the representation of the noble Earl—the noble Lord, acting for Her Majesty's Government, seems here to have backed out of the consequences of the advice which had been given, and upon which the Danish Government had acted down to that period. At this time unfortunately the King had put the finishing hand to the Constitution of the 18th November. I regret very much that this was done. I recognize the difficulties with which His Majesty, who had not been a party to the Constitution originally, had to contend; but I am compelled to admit that if this Constitution was not an actual incorporation of the Duchies, it was a step tending directly towards that incorporation, and therefore it was a violation of the engagements of 1851-2. This increased the embarrassment of affairs, and they became more complicated by the revival of the claims of the Prince of Augustenburg to the succession of the Duchies, which was countenanced by the Diet. There was, therefore, the question of the treaty, and there was the dispute about the succession; and just at this critical moment, the noble Earl, not having before given an answer to the invitation of the Emperor of the French to join in a general Congress, thought fit on the 25th of November, only seven days after this complicated embarrassment had arisen, and when it would have been most important to secure the goodwill and co-operation of the Emperor of the French—at this most critical moment the noble Lord thought fit to send a refusal which, though not intended to be uncourteous, seems to have been in the style usually adopted by the noble Earl who, as has been explained by the noble Earl opposite, is not in the habit of flattering in his correspondence. The prejudicial effect of this refusal is shown by the account given of an interview with M. Drouyn de Lhuys on the 29th of December, 444, in which Lord Cowley was compelled to remark that

> "It would be a grievous thing if the difference of opinion, which had arisen upon the merits of a general Congress, were to produce an estrangement which would leave each Government to pursue its own course."—No. 4, 444.

The embarrassment of the position no doubt rendered it extremely difficult to know how to deal with the question; but Her Majesty's Government recommended, very properly, that the Patent of the 30th of March should be revoked. The Patent was revoked on the 7th of

December; but at that time the noble Earl had already been warned by Sir Augustus Paget, that "in sacrifices no concessions, no fulfilment of engagements would satisfy the German Governments, that they were bent upon the dismemberment of the Monarchy of Denmark that they might place the Duchies with the ports belonging to them in the hands of a Prince devoted to Germany." The noble Earl had got the Patent of March revoked, and supposed that he had done a great thing; but Austria and Prussia refused to be satisfied with the concession. They said to Denmark, "It is too late; you have violated your engagements of 1851-2; you must revoke the Constitution of the 18th of November." Then the noble Earl strongly recommended Denmark to revoke that Constitution, saying that, if she rejected this advice, Her Majesty's Government must leave her to encounter Germany on her own responsibility. Now, what is the meaning of this language, "If you do not do this, we must leave you to your own responsibility?" Does it not mean, "If you do it, you may expect support?" What other meaning could be attached to these words? M. Hall upon the noble Earl's advice to revoke the Constitution said—

> "The revocation of the Patent had been asked for—it had been granted; the evacuation of Holstein had been urged—it had been agreed to; if the constitution was annulled, some other concession would be required."

And the noble Earl thought it reasonable that

> "Denmark should know the limits of the demands of Germany, and be able to bring to a close this long and wearisome dispute."

Austria and Prussia had immediately, and in the most peremptory manner, demanded the revocation of the Constitution in forty-eight hours, and the noble Earl was to solicit for more time, or their proceedings would endanger the Danish throne. He advised Denmark to summon the Rigsraad at once in order to obtain a repeal of the Constitution, telling her that if she did not adopt that course she would have no chance of averting a contest with the German Powers. At the same time he appealed to Prussia and Austria, and said, "Do not press Denmark so hardly; give her a little time; allow her six weeks to enable her to repeal the Constitution in a legitimate manner." But the German Powers were deaf to entreaties. They refused to listen to them. They launched the thunderbolt of war against Denmark; Holstein was occupied; Schleswig was taken as a material guarantee; and an advance was made into Jutland.

And then, my Lords, a proceeding took place which I must confess appears to me to be the very worst feature in that policy of the Government which we are called upon to condemn. Your Lordships must bear in mind that this invasion of Schleswig had been characterized by the noble Lord at the head of the Government as "an iniquitous aggression." Austria winced under that expression, and asked for an explanation of the noble Earl, who with his accustomed argumentative courtesy said that "an unnecessary war must be an iniquitous war, and that, therefore, the expression of the noble Viscount was a correct one." But when concession after concession had been made by Denmark on the advice of Her Majesty's Government, and after hopes had been held out of material assistance, when Schleswig had been occupied as a material guarantee, and Jutland invaded under pretext of strategical necessity, when Denmark was lying helpless and bleeding at the foot of her conquerors, then—can it be believed?—the noble Earl and Her Majesty's Government attempted to justify to Denmark the possession—the forcible possession—which had been taken of the Duchies. You must remember that the noble Earl is dealing with what the Government considered an iniquitous aggression. Well, in a despatch addressed to Sir Augustus Paget, February 22, 1864, the noble Earl says—

> "Her Majesty's Government are, however, impressed with the conviction that the wish of the Danish Government for the evacuation of Schleswig can only be realized when that Government shall be prepared to give some sufficient security for the good and equal government of the subjects of the King of Denmark of German origin who may be resident in the Duchy. And Her Majesty's Government think it may be fairly asked, whether the Danish Government are prepared to do so, and also whether they contemplate the organization of the Danish monarchy on a different footing? Her Majesty's Government are very well disposed towards Denmark, and would willingly assist her in extricating herself from the difficulties in which she is now involved; but Her Majesty's Government cannot lose sight of the just claims of the German subjects of the King, and they desire to act in this matter in consort with the Allies of Great Britain."—No. 5, 727.

My Lords, I cannot trust myself to characterize this despatch as I think it deserves. It is calculated to call up a blush of shame upon the cheek of every Englishman. And then, to crown the whole, the noble Earl denies that Her Majesty's Government have ever done more than offer advice to Denmark. This is the language of the noble Earl in writing to Sir Augustus Paget, March 9, 1864—

> "Her Majesty's Government do not pretend to dictate any course to an independent State like Denmark which that State is not willing to follow. Had Her Majesty's Government been willing to bind Great Britain to afford material assistance to Denmark, Her Majesty's Government would have had the right, in return for that assistance, to prescribe the manner in which Denmark should fulfil her engagements to Germany. But as Her Majesty's Government have never offered material aid, so, on the other hand, they have never gone beyond offering advice to Denmark with the most sincere desire to enable her to maintain her integrity and independence, but without any promise of material support."—No. 5, 780.

It is true that the Government may have given no direct promise of material support, but do not the passages I have quoted convey a strongly-implied promise? Though the statement of the noble Earl may therefore be true to the letter, I venture to ask every honest man whether it is true in spirit? What, then, should have been the course of Her Majesty's Government? The noble Earl who spoke last (the Earl of Clarendon) intimated that the supporters of this Motion were crying out for war. We say no such thing. In our opinion the Government should have maintained peace; but we think that if they did not mean to assist Denmark they should have distinctly stated so, and should have followed the example set by the Emperor of the French, who clearly gave Denmark to understand that he had no intention to give her material aid in the conflict. The noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) taunted my noble Friend (the Earl of Malmesbury) with not having read the despatches, for (he said) if he had, my noble Friend would have seen that General Fleury's language had been contradicted by another despatch. Now, the fact is that there is no contradiction at all. According to Earl Cowley, M. Drouyn de Lhuys said—

> "The instructions given to General Fleury prescribed to him to conform his mission as much as possible to the conveyance of Parliamentary messages from the Emperor. Should he be obliged—and it was hardly to be avoided—to speak on political matters, he was to advise all possible concessions for the maintenance of peace. It might be that, with a view of furthering this pacific policy, the General had stated that the support of France must not be expected in the event of war; but he (M. Druyn de Lhuys) was positive that no declaration had been made by the General, which did not leave the Emperor free to take any course which events might render expedient."

If the noble Duke discovers a contradiction here, his mind is differently constituted from mine. You will find that up to the very last Sir Augustus Paget says to M. Monrad, "The prospect of Foreign support is by no means certain;" and, again, "I told him frankly and honestly there was very little chance of support." Why not have said plainly and honestly that no such support would be given? On this part of the question I ask your Lordships whether I have not established to your satisaction, that hopes and expectations of material assistance were held out to Denmark, and that those hopes have been cruelly disappointed?

My Lords, I now turn to the course pursued with regard to the aggressive Powers, as to which I venture to think there has been an exhibition of menacing and insulting language followed at times by very submissive conduct, alternations between heat and cold, between weakness and violence, calculated to bring discredit upon the Government and upon the country. It was known perfectly well from the first that Austria and Prussia were making the Federal Execution a pretext for their own designs upon Schleswig. But they spoke in the most plausible manner. The noble Earl talked of "invasion," to which they objected, "Oh, no! It was not invasion; it was only occupation." This puts one in mind of ancient Pistol, when accused of stealing,

> "Steal! convey, the wise it call!"

Then they say, "A Federal execution is not a hostile proceeding. It may wear the stern face of war, but this is but a mask, and if you look beneath it you will see only the mild countenance of material guarantee." The independence and integrity of Denmark is ever upon their lips; our proceedings, they would say, may look like dismemberment, but it should be remembered that a broken bone often becomes stronger when re-united, and though the tie between Denmark and the Duchies may be severed for a time, the *nexus* will be stronger after our operations. "It is better for Denmark," say they, "that we should take the matter into our own hands, because if we leave it to the Diet there will immediately ensue the proclamation of the Duke of Augustenburg." But I should like to know what Denmark has profited by this Jacob's voice with Esau's hands? Now, in this state of things, what was the course of the noble Lord? It was a succession of threats and of submission, of violence and of forbearance, without any settled policy. He begins by a little warning to Germany to look at home. He says to Lord Bloomfield—

> "You will communicate these views to Count Rechberg, and tell him that if Germany persists in confounding Schleswig with Holstein other Powers of Europe may confound Holstein with Schleswig, and deny the right of Germany to interfere with the one any more than she has with the other, except as an European Power. Such a pretension might be as dangerous to the independence and integrity of Germany as the invasion of Schleswig might be to the independence and integrity of Denmark."

Then the noble Earl tries what a threat will do, and in a memorandum read to M. Bismark he says—

> "Should Federal troops enter Holstein on purely Federal grounds, Her Majesty's Government would not interfere; but should it appear that Federal troops had entered the Duchy on international grounds, Her Majesty's Government may be obliged to interfere."

Then the noble Earl seemed to think that he had gone too far, and in order that all apprehension of war might be removed he writes to Sir Andrew Buchanan on December 1, 1863—

> "I have to state to you that the line of policy to be pursued by Her Majesty's Government in the questions at issue between Denmark and Germany is perfectly clear. That policy is to advise Austria, Prussia, and the other Powers who signed the Treaty of London, to adhere to their engagements, and to advise Denmark to observe all the engagements which she has taken to Germany."—No. 3, 393.

Now as the engagements of Denmark were, in the opinion of the noble Earl, "singularly obscure and indefinite," and Austria and Prussia considered themselves released from their Treaty obligations, this advice was safe at least, though not very practical. I do not, however, object to this advice. But what I do object to are the alternations and oscillations which the noble Earl exhibited. This being announced as his clear policy, he next writes to Lord Bloomfield, on the 8th of December, and tries the effect of advice as to the limits of the Federal Execution—

> "As the Diet seems determined to proceed with the proposed execution in Holstein, Her Majesty's Government consider it to be of great importance that the objects of that measure should be distinctly defined, and that it should be strictly limited to the enforcement within the Duchy of Holstein of the rights which the German Confederation alleges to have been disregarded by the Danish Government. In conformity with this principle the Federal commanders should be strictly prohibited from extending the execution to any parts of the frontier in respect to which any doubt may exist as to whether it belongs to the Duchy of Holstein, and that, more particularly at Rendsburg, no doubtful or mixed territory should be occupied by the Federal troops."—No. 3, 343.

His advice being received with the most perfect indifference, the noble Earl next tries the influence of a little ambiguous threatening in his despatch of the 24th of December—

> "The Danish Government will, it is understood, offer no resistance to the entrance of Federal troops into Holstein; but that those troops, having entered Holstein on the ground of Federal rights, should be used for depriving the King of Denmark altogether of the Duchy of Holstein, and for transferring that Duchy to another claimant, would be a proceeding of which Her Majesty's Government could not possibly approve. It would be no less impossible for Her Majesty's Government to enter into any engagement that if the Federal troops should not limit their operation to the Duchy of Holstein, but should on some pretence or other extend their operations to the Duchy of Schleswig, Her Majesty's Government would maintain an attitude of neutrality between Germany and Denmark. But Her Majesty's Government are fully alive to the perils of the present state of affairs, and are sensible of the critical character which attaches to the next step to be taken with regard to them."—No. 4, 413.

This despatch certainly does not adhere to the "clear policy" of advice which was said to have been adopted by Her Majesty's Government. But the threat which it contained not having answered, the noble Lord administered another dose with an additional ingredient of insult. Your Lordships will find the following words in a despatch of the 31st of December—

> "Her Majesty's Government do not hold that war would relieve Prussia from the obligations of the Treaty of 1852. The King of Denmark would by that treaty be entitled still to be acknowledged as the Sovereign of all the dominions of the late King of Denmark. He has been so entitled from the time of the death of the late King. A war of conquest, undertaken by Germany avowedly for the purpose of adding some parts of the Danish dominions to the territory of the German Confederation, might, if successful, alter the state of possession contemplated by the Treaty of London, and give to Germany a title by conquest to parts of the dominions of the King of Denmark. The prospect of such an acquisition may, no doubt, be a temptation to those who think it can be accomplished; but Her Majesty's Government cannot believe that Prussia will depart from the straight line of good faith in order to assist in carrying such a project into effect. If German nationality in Holstein, and partially in Schleswig, were made the ground of the dismemberment of Denmark, Polish nationality in the Duchy of Posen would be a ground equally strong for the dismemberment of Prussia. It appears to Her Majesty's Government that the safest course for Prussia to pursue is to act with good faith and honour, and to stand by and fulfil her treaty engagements. By such a course she will command the sympathy

and approval of Europe; by a contrary course she will draw down upon herself the universal condemnation of all disinterested men."—No. 4, 445.

I entirely approve of this sentiment; but what I say is—do not be continually altering your tone; stick to your policy if you have one—but it is perfectly clear that you have none at all. I believe neither at this time nor at any time have the Government had a fixed policy. This will be apparent in the next despatch. It appears the noble Earl had stated to the Prussian Ambassador that Denmark might possibly be aided in the war by Great Britain. An explanation of this statement was asked for; and the explanation, as given by the noble Earl, was certainly an extraordinary one. He says—

> "I had a conversation a short time ago with Count Bernstorff on the subject of the proposed occupation of Schleswig by Prussia. He said he had not fully understood the observations I had made in a former conversation. That the proposed occupation, if it were to take place, would be done under the regular authorities, and by the regular troops of Prussia; that no danger, therefore, could be incurred by the King of Denmark, and that when he should have complied with the just demands of the German Powers, the Duchy of Schleswig would be again placed under his sceptre. I had spoken on a former occasion in the sense that Denmark would resist such an occupation, and might be aided by Great Britain. He wished to have an explanation of what I had then said. It is to be observed that in speaking to Count Bernstorff on the occasion alluded to, I had expressly declared that I could not say what the decision of the Government might be, as the Cabinet had not yet deliberated, and consequently not submitted any opinion to the Queen; but that, judging from the general current of feeling in Parliament and in the nation, I thought an invasion of Schleswig by Germany might lead to assistance to Denmark on the part of this country."—No. 4, 534.

I pass over the want of caution of the noble Earl in speaking in this unguarded manner without the sanction and authority of the Cabinet. But it evidently appears from this conversation that the noble Earl and the Government were waiting for the utterance of Parliament, and the opinions of the nation, and endeavouring to discover the direction of the wind before they could make up their minds as to the policy which they ought to pursue. Now, I ask your Lordships again if I have not established this second part of my case — that there has been insulting and menacing language, followed by weak and vacillating conduct, which induces foreign Ministers to regard the representations of the Government with indifference and contempt.

I will not trouble your Lordships with any observations with regard to the overtures which were made to France and Russia to induce them to join us in affording material aid to Denmark, but I must be permitted to say a few words upon the subject of the Conference. Now, I entirely agree that the Government was perfectly right in endeavouring to procure the concurrence of the great Powers in some arrangement which would settle the unfortunate Danish Question; and I regret as much as any one that the Conference was a failure: but I think the experience of the noble Earl might have convinced him that this failure was probable, because the Conference met without any definite or certain basis. What were the circumstances in connection with the Conference? The noble Earl originally proposed that the Conference should assemble without a basis. Denmark proposed that the Treaty and the engagements of 1851-2 should form the basis of the Conference. But this was refused by Prussia and Austria, who stated that such a proposal would have been accepted by them, before the commencement of hostilities, but that things had now gone too far, and much more would be required. Then the noble Earl proposed "that the basis of the Conference should be simply to find the means of restoring to the North of Europe the blessings of peace." What but failure could be expected from such a vague and indefinite basis? It was, indeed, the very ground on which the noble Earl objected to the proposal of the Emperor of the French for a Congress. In his answer, he said—

> "Her Majesty's Government would feel more apprehension than confidence from the meeting of a Congress of Sovereigns and Ministers without fixed objects ranging over the map of Europe, and exciting hopes and aspirations which they may find themselves unable to gratify or to quiet."

And now, my Lords, I come to the last scene in this strange eventful history, presented by the extraordinary desire which the Government have shown to lead the public to believe that there is in some secret corner of their heart the lurking intention of going to war in the event of the occurrence of some indefinite contingencies. The noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) who has given an explanation of their conduct, said that the Danes were trading upon the hope of a change in the Government. Is that the secret motive, then, of the inconsistency of the Government in having peace on their lips, but holding out a dim prospect of distant war, that the Danes may not be altogether thrown into the arms of their opponents? On the 27th June, the noble Earl delivered a speech, in which he said—

> "It is the opinion of Her Majesty's Government that we should maintain the position which we have occupied, and that we should be neutral in this war. I do not mean to say that contingencies might not arise in which our position might become different, and in which our conduct might be altered."

The contemplated events were decently veiled by the noble Earl under the word contingencies; but the noble Lord at the head of the Government rudely tore off the veil, and exposed the events which would provoke interference in the most open manner. He said—

> "If the war should assume a different character, if the existence of Denmark as an independent Power in Europe should be at stake, if we had reason to expect to see at Copenhagen the horrors of a town taken by assault, the destruction of property, the sacrifice of the lives not only of its defenders, but also of its peaceful inhabitants, the confiscation which would ensue, the capture of the Sovereign as a prisoner of war and other humiliations of the kind—I do not mean to say that if any of these events were likely to happen, the position of this country might not be a subject for reconsideration."

I can hardly believe that the noble Lord was speaking in earnest, and yet the subject is one too serious and painful for jest. I feel if anything were needed to add to the humiliation inflicted upon this country by the policy of the noble Earl it is this declaration.

And now, I think, I may confidently ask your Lordships whether the justice of the Resolution proposed by my noble Friend has not been completely established—whether the policy of the Government has not failed to secure the integrity and independence of Denmark—whether we have not been humiliated in the eyes of foreign nations? I think I may venture to repeat the words of Lord Chatham uttered in this assembly—

> "But yesterday and England might have stood against the world; now none so poor to do her reverence."

It is impossible for us to erase the bloody pages upon which the history of this Danish war is recorded; but we can refuse to be accessaries to the dishonour of our country, we can at least raise our voices in reprobation of a policy which has brought us to shame; and we may be able by our votes to-night to vindicate, though late, the honour and dignity of England.

LORD WODEHOUSE: My Lords, I am anxious to follow the noble and learned Lord, because if I could agree with him and with the noble Marquess who spoke earlier, that, in the course of the negotiations, promises had been made to Denmark by which she had been induced to engage in an unequal contest, I should say that not only ought the House to adopt this Resolution, but also to affirm that the honour of the country requires that Denmark should be sustained by us in the war. I shall endeavour to prove that we have given no such promise; that the advice we did give to Denmark was sound, and was given in conjunction with the Allies of England, who are equally responsible with us for that advice. There are three principal points upon which advice was given by Her Majesty's Government to Denmark. The revocation of the Patent of March 31, the question of resistance to the Federal Execution in Holstein, and the repeal of the Constitution of November 18. I will first refer to the Patent of March. The Diet having objected to that Patent as inconsistent with the engagements between Germany and Denmark, Her Majesty's Government advised the King of Denmark to withdraw it, and that advice was ultimately accepted. Was that advice accompanied by any promise of assistance? There is a despatch from Sir Augustus Paget, dated October 14, in which he gives an account of an interview with M. Hall, in which you find this statement—

> "M. Hall replied that there was one other condition on which the Patent could be withdrawn—namely, that England and France would give to the Danish Government a formal promise to support them against any further demands of Germany. I (Sir Augustus Paget) said 'I did not think much would be obtained by my forwarding this message.'"—No. 3, 161.

Therefore, no promise of support was held out as a condition on which the Danish Government were to revoke that Patent. The Danish Government, as I have said, ultimately accepted our advice; but although I should be sorry to say a harsh word against Denmark, with which I have strong sympathies, as all must have with those who are struggling against fearful odds, yet I must observe that that concession to our advice, as well as every other concession of the Danes, was made too late. That was the opinion of M. Hall himself. The Patent was revoked on the 4th of December; and M. Hall then observed to Sir Augustus Paget, that he feared it must be considered as a concession altogether illusory, because the passing of the new Constitution had rendered the Patent of little importance. The next point which was dwelt upon at length by the noble and learned Lord was the advice in which I had some share—the advice to Denmark not to resist Federal Execution in Holstein. In the first place, I would point out that that advice was not the advice of Her Majesty's Government alone, but it was first given by Sweden—a great Friend of Denmark; and it was also given at the same time, and, I believe, in the same manner, by France and Russia. Therefore the Government cannot be held solely responsible for the consequences of that advice, even if I were to admit that those consequences have been fatal to Denmark—which I do not believe, but rather say that the advice was sound and wise. My part in that advice was small. I did not arrive at Copenhagen until nearly the end of last year, and as early as the 25th of November, Sir Augustus Paget reported to the Government that M. Hall would give the same advice to the present King as he had given to the late King—that no resistance should be offered to the Federal Execution in Holstein. It has been represented, both here and upon the Continent, that it was on account of urgent pressure through me that the Danish Government made that concession, The fact is, that long before I went, the Minister had determined to give that advice, and at my first interview with M. Hall, he told me that it was already decided that no resistance should be made to the Federal troops. I now come to the very material point of the Constitution of November. The noble and learned Lord said he relied not only upon the letter, but also upon the spirit of the despatches relating to that subject, and he added that the spirit of all the communications to the Danish Government was that they would receive material aid. Speaking of what I know, I affirm that, not merely in the letter of what I wrote to my Government, but in the spirit of all the advice I gave to the Danish Government, and I believe of every word I spoke at Copenhagen, I gave the Danish Government no reason to expect any material aid from England. When I gave advice at Copenhagen I was always met with the natural question, "If we act upon your advice, what will you give us in return? Will you give us material support?" That was what I could not promise, and what I did not promise. The material despatch bearing upon this point is that in which I reported the interview I had with M. Hall, advising him to withdraw the Constitution. Let me just point out what that Constitution was. It has been represented as a kind of Reform Bill; and it has been said, what would have been the feelings of this country if, after the passing of the Reform Act of 1832, a foreign country had come to us just before the elections were held, and demanded that we should repeal that Act? I think a more just parallel would be if we unfortunately, in consequence of a disastrous war, had entered into engagements with some foreign country respecting the conditions upon which England should be united to Ireland, and then we had passed a Reform Bill changing the conditions of the union notwithstanding the remonstrances of the Foreign Power with which we had engagements. This Constitution was no Reform Bill. There were in it provisions of a liberal character affecting the electoral body, but that was not the spirit in which it was passed and was accepted by the Danish people. Sir Augustus Paget in one of his despatches points out that the excitement about the Constitution was not on account of internal reforms, but that it was chiefly valued by the Danish people because it was looked upon as a step towards the union of Schleswig with Denmark. The Germans, moreover, on that very account, remonstrated against it as a violation of the engagements of Denmark. It was in that spirit it was regarded by Her Majesty's Government, who had to consider what advice they should give. I must observe that when I went to Berlin, on my way to Copenhagen, with instructions to ask what were the demands of the Prussian Government, although I could not obtain any explicit statement from M. von Bismark, yet he did say that, if the Constitution of November were brought into operation on the 1st of January, the German Powers would consider themselves relieved from all their engagements to Denmark. It was, therefore, my object to prevent, if possible, this Constitution from taking effect. That was the position at the time I went to M. Hall. The advice that was then given was not tendered by England alone. The first step I took was to ask the Russian Minister to give me his support. He said he had general instructions to join in the advice I should give, but he would telegraph to his Government for specific authority. The French Envoy also communicated with his Government, and received for answer that he was to support the advice given by England. M. d'Ewers and I went together to see M. Hall, and it was then that I made the declaration which has been so much commented on. I told the Danish Minister that—

> "General Fleury had informed M. d'Ewers and me that he was instructed to tell the Danish Government that France would not go to war to support Denmark against Germany. It was my duty to declare to him, that if the Danish Government rejected our advice, Her Majesty's Government must leave Denmark to encounter Germany on her own responsibility."—No, 4, 418.

That advice was not tendered to Denmark singly. A little further on your Lordships will find that M. d'Ewers made a similar declaration.

> "M. d'Ewers pointed out forcibly the perilous situation in which Denmark was placed. He was instructed to declare in explicit terms that Russia must leave to Denmark the responsibility of the consequences which might ensue from the rejection of our advice."—No. 4, 418.

The statement of the French Government, that they would not take part in a war between Denmark and Germany, was not the unconditional declaration which might be supposed from the despatch I have quoted. It is perfectly true that I understood General Fleury to make the statement in an unconditional manner, and that I so reported it to Her Majesty's Government. But Her Majesty's Government having referred the matter to Paris, a most explicit declaration was returned, that the French Government did not acknowledge the accuracy of the representation of the language of General Fleury, but that, on the contrary, France was at liberty to take any course she thought proper. Therefore, I contend that the French, Russian, and English Governments occupy the same position as regards this matter. As the point has been so much referred to, I would appeal to other testimony which I think most important, and that is the way in which this advice was viewed by the Danish Government itself. Sir Augustus Paget saw M. Hall the evening of the same day that my interview with him took place, and while the language I had used must have been fresh in his recollection. What did M. Hall say to Sir Augustus Paget? Sir Augustus Paget reports in his despatch of December 22, that M. Hall said, "There was no prospect of support if Germany continued her aggressions." There is a further despatch, in which I state I had several conversations with M. Hall, and repeatedly endeavoured to shake the resolution at which he had arrived; but M. Hall as constantly declared that I afforded him no equivalent—meaning that I did not promise him the support he desired. Let me refer to another passage in a despatch of Sir Augustus Paget's, which I am additionally anxious to quote, because a wrong interpretation has been put upon some words used by that Minister to M. Hall as to the position of Denmark if our advice was rejected. Sir Augustus Paget, writing on the 3rd of January, details a conversation which he had with M. Monrad—in which the latter, M. Monrad, repeated more than once that there was nothing left but to "lancer le peuple." "I replied," says Sir Augustus Paget, "by stating, as clearly and forcibly as I could, the immense advantage which it would be to Denmark if negotiations could be substituted for war; the support she might expect in the one case, and her enentire isolation in the other." Therefore it is evident that Sir Augustus Paget in pointing out the alternatives which were presented to the Danish Government could not have meant to allude to any offer of armed assistance in case they followed our advice, but to assistance in negotiation. I may further state that the Danish Government did not in fact follow this advice at once, as has been represented, but a considerable time after it was given, when circumstances had entirely changed. They did not make any promise to set about repealing the Constitution until after they had actually received from Germany a summons to that effect, upon pain of Schleswig being occupied within forty-eight hours. That summons was despatched on the 16th of January, and the advice I ventured to offer was given on the 20th of December. The noble Lord says that no time was allowed by Germany for the repeal of the Constitution; but it thus appears that nearly a month was given.

I have thus shown that the advice given to Denmark was given in conjunction with our Allies, and in no case was it accompanied by a promise of armed assistance. I wish now to say a few words on the policy of Her Majesty's Government. Of course, it was not possible for me to be acquainted with every stage of the negotiations, as these only came to my knowledge during a very short time; but taking the intention of the Government as exhibited by these papers, it appears distinctly that their endeavour in the first instance was to obtain for Denmark an opportunity for negotiation by interposing their good offices in the character of mediator. Up to the time of the King's death the Prussian Government itself was anxious that Her Majesty's Government should mediate between Germany and Denmark. But, after the King's death, matters became changed, and a much more serious state of affairs arose. The endeavour then made by Her Majesty's Government was to obtain, by concert and co-operation of the Allies of this country who had signed the Treaty of 1852, such an arrangement, to which the representatives of Denmark and of the Diet would be parties, as might settle the questions in dispute peaceably and fairly. When it was found that this could not be brought about, Her Majesty's Government took the further step of asking our Allies, whether they would give material aid to Denmark in conjunction with England, and whether they would take any steps to prevent the dismemberment of Denmark? Was not that a distinct policy—a distinct course for the Government to take? The answer of Russia was that she could not assist; and the French answer was equally decided. We have no reason to blame the French Government for the course they took in their own interests. But if the honour of England has been tarnished by the course pursued, why are we to consider that France stands in a different position? I take it that France has been largely influenced by a maxim which has guided her conduct from the time of Louis XIV., and that is never to quarrel with Germany when Germany is united; that is a very serious quarrel for France, and she always thinks twice before engaging in it. Her Majesty's Government being left in this position, were they to go to war alone for the purpose of maintaining the integrity and independence of Denmark? I think this House and the country generally are of opinion that Her Majesty and the Government came to a very wise decision—namely, that under the circumstances it would not be the duty of this country in a matter specially concerning the Continental Powers, to engage in a war alone for the support of Denmark. The Resolution of the noble Earl opposite affirms that the just influence of this country has been lowered, and that the securities for peace have been diminished. My Lords, I think the securities for peace are diminished, but I do not think they are diminished by the action or want of action of Her Majesty's Government; but because there has been a wanton disregard on the part of two of the chief Powers of Europe of a solemn treaty signed not many years ago—they are diminished because there is uncertainty and disunion among the great Powers, and that ancient accord which existed between them and preserved peace for so many years, has been broken and permanently impaired. It may be—and in my judgment it probably will be—the duty and policy of this country to abstain more than she has done of late from interference with the affairs of the Continent. But I would ask, considering the Treaty of 1852, which we had signed, and the parts successive Governments had taken in the negotiations between Denmark and Germany, was it possible for this country to abstain from diplomatic interference on behalf of Denmark? I maintain that that interference has not been by promises which bind us in honour to give material support to Denmark; and I ask this House to pause before they give the weight of their authority to a Resolution which affirms that the just influence of this country has been diminished by honest and persevering, though they may have been unsuccessful, efforts to avert from Europe the calamity of war.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: My Lords, there can be no doubt that this Resolution amounts to a distinct censure on Her Majesty's Government for the policy which they have pursued; but I have listened—and listened in vain—all the evening, to hear from any one of the noble Lords opposite anything approximating to a real defence of Her Majesty's Government. The noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) delivered a speech which, with great submission, I must describe as composed of personalities and miscellanies. He told us first that this was "a pure faction fight"—then he spoke of the sixteen Noblemen and Gentlemen by whom he said this Motion was concocted; then he informed us that with those who had principles in this matter, however misguided they might be, he could sympathise; but that he shrank from those who came here to wage a mere party warfare, and for them he could make no allowance. He then travelled into the subject of Italy, and into a great many other subjects into which I will not follow him; and finally he said that he would tell us what he thought, not only of this Motion, but of us who sit on this side of the House. My noble

Friend the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (the Earl of Clarendon) spoke in a very different strain; but the pith and point of his speech was, as it seemed to me, simply an argument on a hypothesis as to what would have been the result if there had been an intervention at the time, not when my noble Friend said that it ought to have taken place, but when he said that it was possible that it might have taken place. And, finally, my noble Friend who has just sat down, instead of a defence of the Government, to my astonishment—and I will say to my concern—has delivered a speech full of censure of the Danes and the Danish Government. I think that my noble Friend might have spared that. Considering the part which we have taken, I think our lips ought to have been sealed against finding fault with the Danish Government. Let it be borne in mind that there is not one single concession which we have asked of Denmark, with one single exception, which came quite at the close of the Conference, and was not unreasonably considered by the Danish Plenipotentiaries inadmissible, that Denmark has not at our instance agreed to. But the censure of the noble Lord is of a piece with the remark of the noble Earl the Foreign Secretary at the last meeting of the Conference, in which he stated to the world that it is the obstinacy of Denmark which has proved the insurmountable obstacle before which all the efforts and labours of this Conference have been rendered fruitless. My noble Friend the Chancellor of the Duchy used a phrase which struck me very much. He said that Her Majesty's Government had been labouring in this matter with honesty and with good effect. I do not for a moment doubt the honesty of intention either of my noble Friend or of any one of Her Majesty's Ministers; but I do most distinctly join issue with him on the assertion that they have laboured with good effect. Let me reduce the point to the standard of every day common sense. It is perfectly fair either in public or private life, when an individual for the first time miscarries or fails in the business which he undertakes, to give him the advantage of the supposition that some accident may have occurred, or that some unforeseen circumstances may have defeated his calculations. When even he has failed twice or thrice it is generous at least that he should have the benefit of the doubt; but when failure marks the beginning, the middle, and the end, when every single part of your policy is summed up in that one word "failure," then there is only one inference which Parliament can draw, and it is the duty of Parliament to give expression to it. To each particular measure which Her Majesty's Government urged upon Denmark the Danes have assented, and with what result? They urged the revocation of the Patent of March. The Patent of March was revoked—and what came of it? They pressed the repeal of the November Constitution. That Constitution was repealed—and what came of it? They entreated Denmark to retire from Holstein and submit to Federal Execution. Denmark knew perfectly well what Federal Execution meant, but at your urgent instance she acceded—and what good came of that? They urged Denmark to cede Frederickstadt, and consequently to surrender the whole defensible frontier. Denmark yielded most reluctantly—and what took place? The loss of the Dannewerke, the abandonment of Schleswig, and the final fall of Düppel. But this was not all. Again you pressed upon Denmark a Conference without a basis, and an armistice without equality of terms—a most one-sided and unequal armistice. Denmark, with the greatest reluctance, and at your urgent instance, accepted both the Conference and the armistice—and I say again, what came of it? Failure, failure, failure. The noble Earl the Chancellor of the Duchy indeed seemed to imply that it was from the very first a hopeless and despairing undertaking. But this was not always the view of Her Majesty's Government. Not long ago the noble Earl the Secretary for Foreign Affairs took me to task and reprimanded me with some sharpness, and with all the weight of his experience, for venturing to say that the Conference was a delusion, and that the armistice would lead to nothing. The noble Earl then appeared to think that I was very foolish; but, with great submission, I think that the result has rather justified my inexperience than his statesmanship. The great fault in the whole policy of Her Majesty's Government which at once strikes one is this—that they never at any time had any definite point; they never drew any line of which they were prepared to say, "so far will we go in this matter and no further." Each single position which they have successively taken up has been successively abandoned. You started by inscribing on your banner the independence of Denmark. You closed the Conference with a modest wish, a most modest wish—that that integrity and independence should be preserved. You started with the Treaty of 1852 as almost the condition of action—and that treaty received its *coup de grâce* from the noble Earl the Foreign Secretary, in the Conference, when he proposed what amounts in fact to a dismemberment of the Danish Kingdom. You started with the declaration of the noble Lord the Prime Minister, which will never be, as it never has been, forgotten in Denmark, that if the German troops invaded Schleswig, "Denmark will not stand alone." But Denmark does remain alone, and not a hand is raised to help her. You start with a very fiery declaration by the noble Earl the Foreign Secretary, when he warned the Austrian fleet not to venture into the Baltic, and hinted in no obscure terms at what the British fleet would do under such circumstances. You close, as my noble and learned Friend (Lord Chelmsford) has pointed out, with a speech from the Prime Minister in the other House, in which he explains what were the ulterior contingencies to which the Foreign Secretary here alluded, and tells you that when Copenhagen is taken by siege, when the town is subjected to the horrors of an assault, and the King of Denmark is a prisoner, then it will be time "to re-consider the whole of this question." But the truth is that I look upon this catastrophe not merely as the failure of a particular policy, but as the failure of the means which you have consistently and steadily employed towards your ends. You condemn, and justly condemn, the general who in war allows himself to be defeated simply because his powder is wet or his bayonets blunt; how much more justly ought you to condemn the diplomatist who is beaten on his own field of action because the language which he employs—the very essence of diplomacy, the rudiments of his craft—is calculated not to conciliate but to exasperate and excite. Yet this has been the case throughout these transactions. I do not refer to the terms of this or that particular despatch, but to the language which you have now used for several years. The noble Lord the Prime Minister was, I think it will be admitted, the first during the many years that he was Foreign Secretary, to import this new system of strong expressions into the diplomacy of the Foreign Office; but there was this, at least, to be said for the noble Viscount, that he generally backed up his language by strong action, and, at all events, his strong expressions were for the most part regulated by the conventionalities of diplomatic intercourse. But the noble Earl opposite has very much improved upon the noble Viscount. He has gone far beyond his model. We have heard from the noble Earl during the last two years denunciations against every one of the Great Powers in Europe. He has denounced France, he has denounced Russia, he has denounced Austria, he has denounced Prussia—and I am bound to say that the strength of his action has been exactly in inverse proportion to the strength of his expressions. The language which the noble Earl has used would, in a former generation, have been tantamount to a declaration of war. He has spared no threat, he has abstained from no menace. If, without offence to the noble Earl, I may say so, it really has struck me when I have read his despatches or heard his speeches, that they were not the calm, measured, and deliberate expressions of an English Foreign Minister, but they rather savour of the earlier recollections of the noble Earl. They are, in fact, electioneering speeches, addressed from the platform of the Foreign Office to the free and independent Governments of Europe. We indeed in England know how to appreciate them—we make the proper deductions and the right allowance for all that falls from the noble Earl; but it is too much to expect that this shall be done by foreign nations. At first they were startled—then they were bewildered; and now, when they find that no action follows, their language towards us is naturally becoming more and more contemptuous. May I recall to the recollection of the noble Earl an exquisite passage in one of the most charming of plays that adorns the literature of this country—I mean Mr. Sheridan's play of *The Rivals*. The noble Earl will remember the advice given by Sir Lucius O'Trigger to a gentleman who was very much inclined to talk, but was very unwilling to fight. "Sir Lucius, let me be in a rage. Let me be in a passion, dear Sir Lucius; if you love me, let me be in a rage;" and what is the answer? "Pho, pho; do things decently and in a Christian manner, and when you meet your antagonist let your courage be as keen but at the same time as polished as your sword." Now, if the noble Earl had borne that advice in mind, and if his policy had been as polished in its language as it was keen in its temper, the result would, I think, have been different. If, indeed, the noble Earl was unprepared to make use of his sword at all, he would, in my opinion, have better consulted his own dignity and the credit of the Government by keeping it in its scabbard, instead of idly flourishing it in the air. But I must draw a further moral from the present catastrophe; for the result of what has taken place is, that the whole of your foreign policy from beginning to end seems to have broken down. It is now some fourteen years since the noble Lord at the head of the Government declared in the memorable debate on Greek affairs, that the foreign policy of England was founded on the circumstances of each particular case. That fatal doctrine which was protested against by Sir Robert Peel in the last words which he uttered in the House of Commons, and which was denounced in your Lordships' House on the same occasion, has since then been taken up and carried much further by the noble Earl opposite, until at length your foreign policy has become a mere hand to mouth policy regulated by the supposed expediency of the hour, without any prescribed rules, and with no standard or principle whatsoever to which to adhere. The result is that you have stood by as witnesses, sometimes as unwilling accomplices, sometimes even as accessaries, of the wrong-doing which has been perpetrated in Europe during the last few years. During that time we have seen the sanctity of treaty engagements disappearing, forcible intervention in the concerns of weaker nations becoming too much the rule of more powerful States, the law of the strongest growing into the public law of Europe — till at length you find yourselves in the presence of a grievous calamity, the dismemberment of a small State, without a shadow of justice, without the colour of a pretext, by a greater State, because that greater State wishes to annex its territory. If this principle of dismemberment is to be accepted, I cannot see which of the minor States in Europe can be secure. In the words of Sir James Macintosh, employed on a not very dissimilar occasion, they will become an inexhaustible reserve, from which equivalents will be continually drawn; they will be the counters on the chessboard of European politics, to be given, to be taken, to be sacrificed, to be exchanged, in order to rectify a frontier, or to satisfy the ambition of some greater Power. But whatever the foreign policy of the noble Earl may be, he is much too great a master of Parliamentary tactics not to know that when he asks us to swallow this bitter cup of humiliation it is necessary that it should be accompanied by some condiment to make the draught palatable. And what, let me ask, is the condiment with which the noble Lord proposes to furnish the House and country? He holds out to us the equivalent of peace. But when the noble Lord talks of peace, he is not in the position to speak as the exponent of a peace policy. We shall hardly forget that he proposed, not peace, but war against Austria and Prussia, both to Russia and France. He has even endeavoured to disentangle the minor States of Germany from the larger ones, in order to proclaim war upon them. Whatever party the noble Lord's policy may please, it is not a policy which ought to satisfy that party which views war as indefensible and peace to be purchased at any price. My Lords, peace, if it is to be had, ought not to be bought by national humiliation. The great complaint which I make of the Government is that, so far from giving us peace, they, by their conduct, have brought us, to the injury not only of our credit, but of our material interests, to the very verge of an European war. I have said that peace ought not to be purchased by national humiliation; and in this respect the case of individuals and nations is very similar; for the individual or the nation which once suffers the chastity of its honour to be soiled will soon find, to its bitter mortification, that there is but a short step from insult to injury and from injury to open aggression. The argument of the noble Earl, when he told us that if we went to war we should find the floodgates of hostility open upon us in all directions, our commerce cut up, and every man's hand against us, is but a poor compliment to his own foreign policy. But if the argument be good for anything, it is an argument not against this particular war, but against all wars; it is an argument in favour of peace at any and every price. I can understand and respect, however little I agree with the conscientious logic of a limited school of politicians in England, who believe that war is wholly indefensible; but I do not understand and I cannot respect the part which Her Majesty's Government has taken in these transactions. I cannot bring myself to respect what I must call shabby policy, which in the case of a strong Power first provokes war and then recedes from it; which reserves the thunders of British hostility for China, for Brazil, for Japan, and the Kingdom of Ashantee; but which, when Russia throws back in our face the despatch we send her, or America threatens to intervene, bids us look on discretion as the better part of valour, and turn pale at the consequences which may follow on our imprudence.

My Lords, there is another point on which, with your Lordships' permission, I wish also to say a few words. It has been said, both here and elsewhere, that it is all very well to lay this Vote of Censure on the table of the House, but that those who bring it forward are prepared to declare no policy of their own. They say, "What is your policy?" My Lords, in censuring an existing Government as we propose, we do in reality state that in which our policy consists. Under the form of a retrospective censure we are indicating the course of future action. Sir Robert Peel, on a very memorable occasion, was challenged, and Sir Robert Peel refused to state his policy when he moved his Vote of Censure. But if Her Majesty's Ministers ask for any further explanation, we may fairly reply that they shall have it when they explain to us things which are as yet unintelligible —when they explain to us those many despatches which are omitted and manipulated and extracted and garbled, and which, under the title of a Danish Correspondence, are heaped together into a huge pile of unreadable papers; when they point out to us the reasons of the difference between their language and conduct; when they tell us how they reconcile their warlike manifestoes formerly with their peaceful professions now; and lastly, when they inform us what are those contingencies with regard to which they reserve to themselves liberty of action. When they tell us all this, then will it be time enough for them to ask to be further enlightened as to our policy. But what does this mode of argument prove? Why, it comes to this, that a Government has nothing to do but so to blunder and mismanage matters as to cut off all retreat, to make all escape either to the right hand or the left hand impracticable, and to leave nothing but a narrow groove in which their policy can move; and, then, in consideration of all this, that Government is to be absolutely freed from all Parliamentary censure, and, as a consequence, from all Parliamentary responsibility. We are indeed taunted with the uselessness of our vote to-night in a practical point of view. For my own part, my Lords, I cannot say that I look upon this Vote of Censure as useless. What may be the result of the division to-night is, I think, a matter of comparatively little consequence. This House has a duty to perform. It has, for generations past, been its special province to discuss questions of foreign policy, and when it has formed an opinion upon them, whether favourable to the Government or otherwise, to express their opinion freely and fearlessly. In justice to itself now this House is bound to express its opinion; nor could it on such an occasion as this be silent, without abdicating its rights and its duties. But there is also a duty which belongs to individual Members of this House—and as an individual Peer I venture to claim my right, and duty, and privilege — when a free, innocent, Christian country, allied to us in blood, in religion, in language, is ruthlessly and barbarously trampled down in spite both of the laws of God and man; and when I see this nation dragged into unwilling complicity into this foul deed—to clear my conscience, to express my abhorrence of the crime, to disclaim all participation in it, to wash my hands of this innocent blood, and to shake from my feet at least the dust of this national infamy.

EARL RUSSELL: My Lords, I am grateful to the noble Lord who has just sat down for having gone somewhat beyond the immediate subject of his Resolution, and travelled into some general considerations affecting the foreign policy of Her Majesty's Government. I must remark myself, that with regard to the foreign policy of the Opposition it would be indeed a most difficult task to discover what that policy is, or how any two of them agree in their notions of what our foreign policy should be. The other night the noble Earl who is not now present (the Earl of Derby) gave us his view of the state of affairs, which appeared to me to have this result —that it would be wrong to contemplate war with respect to Denmark under any circumstances whatever. That was the only conclusion which could be drawn from his speech. But the noble Earl who has brought forward this Motion (the Earl of Malmesbury) has taken a different view, and has stated his opinion so clearly that there can be no misunderstanding about it;

that at a certain period—when the German troops were about to enter Schleswig—he would have preferred a decision in favour of war, which he told us would have been attended with little or no risk, would have prevented all the miseries that have happened, because it would in reality have rendered war actually impossible, without any sort of danger to this country. If that be the case, I cannot be astonished that the noble Earl would have preferred war under such a contingency. But I must find some fault with the noble Earl who spoke last (the Earl of Carnarvon), and who tendered a definition of our foreign policy as one which would exclude war in every case. Now, I really wonder at that assertion; because I have several times had to explain the grounds upon which I think a war inevitable, and the grounds upon which it is a matter of debate and consideration. I have said more than once that if the honour of the country is involved, you can have no hesitation, no weighing of the inconveniences and disadvantages of war; but you must at once make the choice which is alone consistent with honour. I have said, likewise, that if there were some great and paramount interest of the country involved, that there again all minor consequences would be lost sight of, and we must accept war. But, at the same time, I have said that if the question is of minor interest, if some advantage can be gained for another nation by going to war, but if, at the same time, there is some risk, some chance of failure in your object, no great certainty, and the prospect of adding considerably to the weight of your debt, you have a right to set the advantages against the disadvantages, and if you think it unwise or inexpedient you have a perfect right to refuse to enter into a war.

My Lords, with regard to the Question which is immediately before the House, the noble Earl who has brought it forward is very happy in not having had himself to encounter the difficulties and to consider the perils which have attended this war in Denmark. The Treaty of 1852 was, I believe, a wise treaty in its general objects, and well calculated to promote the peace of Europe; but a treaty more artificial, more exposed to contingencies, and less under the control of the States which were removed from the field of action, never was made. It depended, in the first place, upon the accomplishment by the Danes of all their promises to the German Powers; it depended, in the next place, on the moderation of the German Powers as regarded Denmark, and the Germans asking for no more than they were entitled to, and showing some forbearance towards Denmark. Unfortunately, these conditions, which did not depend on England, France, or Russia, were never accomplished. The Danish Government—I know not whether from necessity or impolicy—governed its German subjects in such a manner as to produce continual irritation, and to excite feelings similar to those existing in Belgium before the Revolution. On the other hand, the Germans, instead of asking no more than they had a right to, asked conditions which were altogether incompatible with the existence of Denmark as an independent State. If, therefore, this artificial treaty was not carried into effect by those Powers principally concerned, it became a matter of immense difficulty when the moment of danger occurred, to preserve Denmark from the consequences of that treaty. The noble Earl who brought forward this Motion, and those who followed him—but more especially the noble Earl who is now absent (the Earl of Derby)—has spoken of our continual promises to Denmark, and threats to Germany; that we threatened Germany first, if there was a Federal Execution; next, if Schleswig was taken possession of; and next, if Jutland was invaded. These statements are plausibly made. We on this side of the House have asked all along for a proof of these statements, and not one proof has been offered. On the contrary, my noble Friends who have spoken before me from this bench have shown that none of these threats have been uttered, and that the charges are entirely without foundation. Just to show the nature of these charges, it was said that we threatened Germany if she proceeded to Federal Execution; but what was the real state of the case? We said that if Germany had reason of complaint against the Government of Denmark in Holstein, that the people of Holstein as to their laws and taxes did not enjoy their full privileges — Federal Execution was quite right; but if that Federal Execution were prolonged, and if under its name an attempt was made to carry on the Government at Copenhagen by this system, that a small minority of the population of the Danish Monarchy should have the same representation as the majority, that, we said, would be a complete departure from the nature of a Federal Execution, and must cause serious remonstrance. But what has occurred? A different demand altogether has been made; Schleswig and Holstein have been asked for a Prince of Augustenburg; and that which for many years was the greatest danger to the Danish Government, being overcome by a German minority in Copenhagen, has entirely passed away. Therefore, this remonstrance was not a mere idle threat. The danger has ceased to exist, and in that respect, therefore, the British Government would have nothing further to demand. I am not finding fault with the noble Earl opposite for any language which he used in despatches, but I may observe that when he found the German Powers were likely to carry things to an extremity, he wrote a circular to say that such a course was calculated to produce grave complication.

The Earl of MALMESBURY: I rise to order. I have no objection to any despatches that I ever wrote being laid upon the table, but I appeal to your Lordships whether it is right that despatches which have not been laid upon the table should be used in debate. I think the rule is a fair and just one. It is not from any personal feeling that I raise the objection; but I think we had better adhere to the rule, and not establish a precedent for its violation.

Earl RUSSELL: I always understood the rule to be, that should a Secretary of State in either House of Parliament use a despatch he was obliged to produce it. I have no objection to produce the despatch to which I refer; I refer to it not to find fault with the noble Earl, because I think he did right in telling those Powers that they ought to fulfil their engagements, and that by carrying things to an extremity they would produce grave complications.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I rise to order. The rule of the House is that no Member of the Government should allude to a despatch which has not been laid upon the table; and that rule is founded on the ground that noble Lords who may wish to answer comments made upon despatches should have the documents before them. It is very well for the noble Earl to say he will produce the despatch, but he cannot do so for several days, when the whole matter will be forgotten. The course taken by the noble Earl is unfair, because he must have intended to refer to this despatch, and therefore he should have laid it upon the table.

The Marquess of CLANRICARDE: I rise to order. If the noble Marquess speaks of an Order of the House, he ought to cite the Order to which he refers.

Earl RUSSELL: I do not know how far noble Lords opposite would carry this principle. Do they mean to hold that we cannot refer to a matter of historical importance unless the despatch, if the matter referred to was the subject of a despatch, happens to have been laid upon the table of the House? I conceive that such a rule would very much embarrass our debates. I may say that the policy of the present Government may be seen in despatches now on the table of the House. That policy was to warn Germany that Her Majesty's Government could not help regarding in a serious light the beginning of a war in Schleswig, believing that it would be likely to lead to serious complications; and we thought it right at the same time to advise Denmark to fulfil her obligations in order to avoid such a calamity. I do not think I am saying anything disparaging to the noble Earl opposite when I state that, as the Foreign Minister of another Government, he followed a similar course. I think it has been made quite clear that, with regard to promises, there have been no promises made to Denmark, that we would give her material assistance; because when, on the 9th of March, I wrote to Sir Augustus Paget that no promise of material assistance had been given, and that if we had given such a promise we should have had a right to call upon Denmark to follow our advice as to conciliating Germany, it is quite clear that if Denmark felt—however erroneously—that she had reason to think we had given her a promise of material support, the Danish Minister would hardly have failed to say, "You tell us in March you never gave us a promise of material support; but look at those promises in December—look at those promises in January. How can you assert that you did not give us a promise?" I think it is quite clear that no word of that kind fell from the Minister of Foreign Affairs for Denmark; he fully admitted no such promise had been made. We know also, from the papers, that when my noble Friend (Lord Wodehouse) went to Copenhagen he was reproached by M. Hall because he would not give a promise of this kind. When my noble Friend asked the Danish Minister to repeal the Constitution, the latter said, "Will you assure me that if the Constitution is repealed the German troops will not enter Schleswig?" But my noble Friend refused to give any such promise or to hold out any such hope. And on a subsequent period, when writing to Sir Augustus Paget, I said—

> "With regard to the request that friendly Powers should come to the assistance of Denmark, Her Majesty's Government can only say that every step they may think it right to take in the further progress of this unhappy contest can only be taken after full consideration and communication with France and Russia. These Powers are as much interested in the maintenance of the integrity of the Danish Monarchy as Great Britain; and Her Majesty's Government may fairly have recourse to their advice and concert in any measures to be taken for the preservation of that integrity."

The Danish Government must, therefore, have fully understood that we thought we were not bound to give material assistance to Denmark. They must have understood that we thought the matter one of European concern, and that the European Powers should be consulted on the subject. I must beg your Lordships to look to the very different judgment which is passed on the conduct of Great Britain and France respectively with respect to certain proceedings which have taken place within these two last years. Last year Her Majesty's Government were joined with France and Austria in making remonstrances to Russia with respect to Poland. The Austrian Government not only promised "the six points" which were first adopted, but also proposed a seventh point, to which France and England gave their adhesion. However, when the question came to this—whether Great Britain would be ready to consult with France as to the means to be taken if the answer of Russia should be unfavourable, Her Majesty's Government, in concert with Austria, saw very clearly that this would lead to a European war; and they weighed well what were the objects to be obtained and what were the means which must be taken in order to obtain them; they could only be obtained by entering into a mighty contest waged to dismember Russia. Having learned the opinions of Austria, we find that she was equally opposed to this course with ourselves. The result was, that England and Austria declined undertaking such a war for such objects. The Emperor of the French then said, reasonably enough, "I was ready with these two great Powers to enter on a contest with Russia on behalf of Poland; but, as these two Powers wont join with me in rendering material assistance to Poland, I cannot think it is the duty or the interest of France to undertake the contest alone, and, therefore, dear as that object is to France—lively as is the sympathy of France for the Poles—I shall refrain altogether from appealing to arms in support of that people." This year another great question arises. France and England are both signataries to the Treaty of 1852. It is binding on both to recognize the integrity of the Kingdom of Denmark. Prussia and Austria having made up their minds to invade and take possession of certain provinces of that monarchy; we appeal to France and Russia, and say, "Here is a case which interests us as regards the balance of power in Europe, and which we have now declared to be a matter of great importance. Do you consider it is a case in which you can join us in giving material assistance to Denmark, to save her from being overwhelmed." Both France and Russia declined acting in co-operation with the British Government in the case of Denmark, as we had declined an invitation of the previous year—the invitation of France to interfere in the case of Poland. The British Government then says, "We are ready to enter into co-operation, but if we are to be left alone, if France and Russia will not act with us, we declare that there is no obligation on us to act alone; we neither will give a promise of material assistance, nor will we afford material assistance itself to Denmark. We will allow the war in Denmark to proceed." That is exactly acting in the case of Denmark as France acted in the case of Poland. But everybody is ready to say, and more especially the Opposition part of the community, "What grand conduct on the part of the Emperor of the French! How wise of him to refrain from making war in Poland when he could not obtain the assistance of his Allies! But in the case of the Government of Great Britain it is a base desertion by her of the country she hoped to befriend." That, my Lords, is exactly what has happened with regard to Denmark. The war went on, and Jutland was entered. It certainly was contrary to what Austria and Prussia had declared, for they said they would only take Schleswig as a material guarantee. But we never promised Denmark that we would prevent the entrance of the German troops into Jutland, nor had we threatened Germany in any way to make a *casus belli* of that event. We remained, therefore, in the same position as we had occupied before the Austrian and Prussian troops entered Jutland. At the same time, I think it is impossible not to make some observations with regard to the conduct which Austria and Prussia have pursued. It appears to me, I own, that it would have been fairer—that it would have led to less difficulty—if those two great Powers had taken the bold line which was taken by the German Confederation. If they did not mean to observe the treaty which they had signed, if they did not intend to maintain the integrity of Denmark, it would have been far better if they had said at once, "The sufferings of the German inhabitants of the Duchies have been such, the sympathies of the German people with them are such, the conduct of the Danish Government has been so unfaithful with regard to the treaty, that we declare ourselves entirely free from its engagements, and shall enter the Duchies upon that footing." Such was the feeling of the German Confederation. But Austria and Prussia said, "We enter into Holstein solely for the purpose of a Federal Execution;" and afterwards, when they entered Schleswig, they said, "We enter Schleswig solely for the purpose of occupation as a material guarantee, and we shall not depart from that line unless Denmark should herself continue to refuse justice and fulfil her obligations." Well, they have not adhered to this declaration. Neither of these Powers has kept its engagement; because when the Conference met, and when the question was, on what terms would these Powers make peace? the first proposition that they put forward was that Schleswig and Holstein should have political independence, without naming the Sovereign who was to rule over the Duchies. And when they were questioned on the subject they said, "The Diet at Frankfort must decide who shall be the Sovereign," it being quite notorious that the German Diet would never place the King of Denmark in possession of those Duchies. Thus they did, in fact, though in the manner I have stated, completely violate the Treaty of 1852. I say, therefore, it would have been far better if they had made that open declaration, and if, instead of pretending to enter Holstein for the purpose of Federal Execution, and Schleswig for the purpose of occupation as a material guarantee, they had declared that they meant to violate the treaty and that a German Prince must rule over the Duchies. It would in that case have been similar to the manner in which Victor Emmanuel took possession of the kingdom of the Two Scicilies. He plainly declared that as the people were discontented with their former Sovereign he meant to take possession of those States, in order to comply with their wishes. I think this would have been a much better mode of proceeding than that which Prussia and Austria adopted. When the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Malmesbury), who was my predecessor in the office of Secretary of State, had to discuss these matters, he pointed out, as he has pointed out to-night, the evils which must follow the adoption of any such principles by Powers like Prussia and Austria. But when the noble Earl says that this principle of nationalities must be altogether disregarded, I cannot agree with him. It is quite true that there is no Power in Europe that can say that it will govern entirely on the principle of nationalities, because there is no Power in Europe in which there are not many nationalities comprised within the same country; and I think it would be going back in the science of government and of civilization if you were to say that a Sovereign could not govern with perfect justice, granting equal rights to his subjects of every nationality. So far I entirely agree with the noble Earl; but at the same time it is impossible not to admit that, whether with regard to Italy, Germany, or other States of which we may hear more hereafter, this principle of nationalities has taken deep root in Europe, and being countenanced and promoted by so great a Sovereign as the Emperor of the French, it is difficult to discard the principle from consideration by the Government of this country. Now, with regard to this case, it is a most powerful consideration that the German subjects of the King of Denmark had at their backs upwards of 40,000,000 Germans, all excited to the utmost pitch on the subject of establishing the separate nationality of their fellow-countrymen. The noble Earl seems to think that it was entirely an object of ambition, in order to get possession of the harbour of Kiel, that the Germans made these efforts, and have expressed such sympathy with the inhabitants of Holstein and Schleswig. But I cannot say that I think it was merely as an object of ambition that they did this. I do believe that there was an honest feeling among the German people—whatever may have been the grounds for it—that the German subjects of the King of Denmark had not the rights which they ought to have, and did not enjoy a protection which they ought to enjoy; and it was with a view of rescuing them from a state which they thought one of degradation and inequality that the German people first took up a question which has become so popular in Germany. This feeling had a material influence in the decision of the question; because after the German armies had entered Holstein and Schleswig—after they had, so to speak, cultivated and promoted these ideas of separation from Denmark and of independence under the Prince of Augustenburg, or any one else—it was impossible to consider the question as being in the same position as it had occupied before. It was impossible to restore those two Duchies to the Crown of Denmark in their integrity; it was impossible to restore those parts of the Duchies, at least, which were inhabited solely by Germans, because those people had become imbued meanwhile, not only with a stronger conviction of their rights, but with a more decided wish for separation from Denmark and for their existence as an independent State. I say, then, that this is a view of the question which has to be considered by Her Majesty's Government. The Emperor of the French has noticed it, partly because he favours the principle of nationality, and partly also because he has a very accurate knowledge of the state of Europe and the different countries of Europe. I say that if after what had occurred we had attempted to drive the German troops out of Holstein, and then had assembled the Diet of Holstein, there would have been an instant declaration in favour of independence by the Diet; and if we had been so unwise as to attempt to go to war we should have had to govern by military force, and subdue the German inhabitants of Holstein by force, in order to reduce them again under the dominion of the King of Denmark. That was a position which it did not become any English Government to take. But, I say, besides that, the question which the noble Earl has put—whether there was not a time when we might have said to the German Sovereigns that they must not enter into Holstein—although it is a question to which I conceive that two answers may be given, yet implied so much hazard, implied the danger of so great a war, was so encompassed by difficulties on every side, it was so likely to lead in the prevailing excitement and enthusiasm of Germany to a war, as my noble Friend has said, against the whole German people united, and the risks of that war, if we had gone into it without the assistance of France and Russia, were so great, that I think any English Government would hardly have been justified in coming before an English Parliament and an English people, and declaring that they had committed this country to all these dangers in the hope and on the chance that the threat might be successful, and that Germany might yield to it. If we had had to deal with the Cabinets of Berlin and Vienna alone, I believe we should have found no difficulty in arriving at a peaceful solution of the question. I think that any one who is intimately acquainted with this subject, and even those who have gathered their information about it from a perusal of the papers, must have perceived that it was not much the wish of Prussia, and not at all the wish of Austria, to depart from the Treaty of 1852. On the contrary, it was with the greatest reluctance that the Cabinet of Vienna, after some ineffectual attempts to adhere to the treaty, made some proposition which should have satisfied anybody; but it was, I am convinced, with a very sincere reluctance that they gave the signal for a departure from a treaty to which they, in common with other Powers, had attached their signatures. Austria is not so adventurous in her spirit as to desire to meet danger without a necessity; and it is evident that it would hereafter be open to any one who proposed to depart from a treaty to say, "You departed from the Treaty of 1852, and how can you reproach us for doing the same thing?" Besides, when the German armies entered Schleswig, and when they took so much pride in the rejoicings of German nationalities, the Austrian Government was too cautious not to perceive that there were other nationalities whose pride might also be roused, and whose imitation of the example set by the inhabitants of Schleswig might be encouraged by the departure from the Treaty of 1852. It was, therefore, not because the Cabinets of Vienna and Berlin desired to satisfy any ambitious project that they determined to depart from the treaty, but because they yielded to strong popular impulse; being determined, in the first place, not to allow the minor principalities to supplant them as leaders of the German Confederation, and, in the next place, because they dreaded the popular impulse and liberal tendency of the Democratic party in Germany. It was on these accounts they departed from the Treaty of

1852. But, in addition to these reasons, I am convinced that the conduct of Russia has exercised considerable influence upon this question. I could not help remarking to the Ambassador how different was the conduct of the present Emperor from that of the Emperor Nicholas in the year 1848. I believe the reason of the change of the policy of the Russian Government to be attributable to a certain sympathy which I believe to exist on the part of Russia towards Austria and Prussia. They all dread the advance of popular democracy in Germany, and therefore they were willing to sacrifice Denmark to carry the popular party in Germany with them.

Now, my Lords, having spoken at some length upon this question, I must say that, although it may be an easy topic for a personal attack, I believe any Government in our place would have experienced as great a difficulty as we did, considering the excited state of Germany, and the determination of Austria and Prussia rather to assume the direction of the storm than to resist its force. One of the most dogmatic writers ever known, Rousseau, has said very truly, "The science of Government is a science of combinations, applications, and exceptions, according to time, place, and circumstance." There is no invariable rule which you can follow upon all occasions. You cannot neglect time and circumstance, the popular feeling, or the disposition of different Courts; the means by which you can obtain your object may at one time be easy, and at another time difficult. There is a passage in M. Thiers' *History of the Consulate and Empire*, an example of this fact — which I think is pregnant with instruction for all of us. At the celebrated meeting between Napoleon and Alexander at Erfurt, these two monarchs entered into an agreement with respect to Spain; they determined that the Danubian Principalities should be transferred to the Emperor of Russia, and they decided also upon various other arrangements with respect to the different nations of Europe. By their conduct these two potentates would seem to have had the power of making any disposition of Europe which might have pleased them. What, however, became of those arrangements. Like other projects of the moment they were destined never to be realized. If those two mighty monarchs were unable to carry out the arrangement upon which they agreed, is it at all wonderful that so artificial a Treaty as that of 1852, by which a people had its then future Government decided upon without being consulted, should be found impossible to maintain? The noble Earl has charged us with having no guiding principle in connection with our foreign policy. There is one principle which is as capable of general application as it is useful to mankind, and that is the non-interference in the internal affairs of other nations. Therefore it was that when, soon after I first accepted the seals of the Foreign Office, the question of Italy came before us: Her Majesty's Government decided to leave the people of Italy free to dispose of their own destinies — they said that they were the best judges of the Government they would have. That declaration, following the declarations of the Emperor of the French, completely decided the question, and no attempt has since been made to disturb the unity and independence of Italy, which Her Majesty's Government rejoiced to see established. In reference to the great civil struggle now going on in America, there have been from time to time great exhibitions of sympathy on one side or the other, and I cannot but perceive that there exists on the other side of the House the strongest sympathy with the Southern States—the strongest desire to allow the Confederate States to have the greatest advantage in the present contest. This feeling was even so obvious that when men attempted, contrary to Her Majesty's proclamation of neutrality, and contrary to their duty, to consent to the fitting out of expeditions on behalf of Confederates from Liverpool and other ports, those attempts were evidently viewed by the other side of the House with a considerable amount of sympathy. But Her Majesty's Government proceeded on the principle of right—upon the principle of duty towards both belligerents. They took care that such expeditions should not sail — they took care that such vessels should be seized—and if they had not been seized I feel fully convinced that we should now be engaged in war with the Northern States. I have stated the course we have pursued upon general principles; I have stated the course which we have pursued in regard to Germany and Denmark; and if I am obliged to plead to the indictment that has been brought against us, all I can say is that we are guilty of endeavouring to promote peace, that we are guilty of endeavouring to maintain justice, and that we are guilty of promoting freedom in Europe and throughout the world.

EARL GREY: My Lords, if after the protracted discussions which have taken place, and at this late hour, I venture to trespass upon your Lordships, it is because there are one or two points to which I think your Lordships' attention should be more particularly directed. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Clanricarde) objects to the terms of the Resolutions, and denies that the just influence of the country has been lowered, because, he says, the influence of a country depends upon its power, and that we at this moment possess a finer fleet and a finer army than we ever possessed at any former time. I would submit to my noble Friend that the influence and power of a country do not depend merely upon physical power. Even with respect to an army, Napoleon said the moral power was more important than the physical. It is still more important among nations; and our just influence and power depend not only upon fleets and armies, but upon the respect and goodwill borne towards us by other nations. I ask your Lordships, Does this country at this moment enjoy the respect and goodwill of the other nations of the world to the same extent as formerly? I ask you whether, as a matter of fact, that is the case or not? My noble Friend the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster indeed denied that this country had fallen in the estimation of other nations, and found great fault with a noble Lord on this side who contended that it has, because he referred to the foreign newspapers in proof of his statement. I have yet to learn that the newspapers of the day are not to be regarded as indications of the popular feeling. But the fact of our having lost character in the eyes of the civilized world does not rest only upon the authority of newspapers. I am sure none of your Lordships are so ignorant of what is now going on in Europe as not to know that the character of this country does stand so well with other nations as it used to do, and as it ought. My noble Friend (Lord Clarendon) himself admitted that there had been a coolness between the French Government and that of England, and he traced to that coolness some of the misfortunes which have occurred. We know that Russia is ill-disposed towards us—we know that Germany is exceedingly irritated against us—and Denmark, which has such bitter reason to rue our professed friendship, entertains towards us almost as much animosity as against the Germans themselves. That we are not regarded with goodwill and respect either by the Governments or by the people of other nations is too notorious to be disputed, and is proved by the very despatches which have been laid on your table. I am convinced that such a state of things cannot have been brought about without some fault on the part of our own Government. No nation falls into such general odium and disrepute without being itself to blame; and I do not think we have to go far to find the causes which have brought us to this unhappy position. My noble Friend (Lord Clarendon) has acknowledged that what happened with respect to Poland produced a coolness between our Government and that of France, and to this coolness the unhappy issue of the negotiations in which we have since been engaged is mainly to be attributed. But our failure with respect to Poland was the inevitable result of the policy we pursued. That policy seems, therefore, to have been the first great error of the Government. It was defended on a former evening by my noble Friend the Foreign Secretary, upon the ground that the Government had only followed with respect to Polish affairs the course chalked for them by that which had been pursued in somewhat similar circumstances in 1831. I ventured at the moment, speaking from memory, to deny the accuracy of that statement. Upon referring to the authentic documents which describe the policy of 1831-2, I find I might have made my denial still stronger, and that the policy of the British Government with respect to the Polish war of 1831, instead of affording a precedent for my noble Friend's policy in 1863, was in every respect the reverse of it. I would remind your Lordships that in 1831, while the Polish war was still raging, an application was made to our Government by that of France to join in a proposal to Russia for an immediate suspension of arms, with a view to negotiations for the purpose of re-establishing peace between the contending parties by some lasting arrangement. Remember that in 1831 the war in Poland was a different affair from what it now is. Then the insurgents held the capital for a considerable time, and they had a regular army and a regular Government with whom we could treat. None of these things existed in 1863; and, as Lord Ellenborough justly observed, if we had proposed a suspension of arms there was no one to treat with. Yet how was the proposal made by France in 1831 received by the English Government? The answer to the note presented by Prince Talleyrand was written by Lord Palmerston, then Foreign Secretary, and if it had been written last year against what we then did, it could not have stated the objections to our policy more clearly. In this note Lord Palmerston pointed out to Prince Talleyrand that a simple offer of mediation would certainly be refused by Russia, and that it could not be expedient to make a proposal which there was no ground to hope would be accepted, and which, if refused, would leave to the two Governments the embarrassing alternative of either acquiescing in a rejection of their proposal or of taking measures to enforce it by means of a more direct and effectual interference. As the British Government were not prepared to adopt the latter course he declined to agree to the French proposal. Your Lordships will perceive that in 1831 the British Government refused to adopt the very course that has now been taken, and for the reasons which were urged against it when this subject was brought before the House last year. A Government ought not to take a step of such importance without considering beforehand what it may lead to. In this case the alternative of acquiescence was chosen, and it was decided not to go to war. Thus the very evil foreseen in 1831 has presented itself now. In 1831-2 no formal remonstrance was addressed to the Russian Sovereign on behalf of his Polish subjects; and Lord Palmerston instructed Lord Durham, our Ambassador at St. Petersburg, to touch upon the subject of Poland with great delicacy, because it was not consistent with the power and dignity of the British Empire to insist too strongly upon points, which, if refused, it might be inexpedient, if not impossible, to support by force of arms. Lord Durham, in reply, said, that in pursuance of these instructions he had abstained from presenting any note upon the subject of Poland to the Russian Minister, saying, that he knew such a note would only lead to a formal repetition of the justice of our reasoning, and that he feared the publicity of our interference would oblige the Emperor of Russia either to take steps of additional severity or to postpone any conciliatory measures he might contemplate towards the Poles, in order to prove to his Russian subjects that he was not controlled in what they consider the administration of their internal affairs by a Foreign Power. I cannot help thinking that that was a wiser course than sending irritating remonstrances to Russia, and, above all, wiser than publishing those remonstrances for general information. What has been the effect? In the first place it encouraged the Poles to continue the war—next it irritated Russia—and lastly it proved to Germany that we could use strong language without any intention of following it up by forcible measures. That was the lesson taught to Germany; and the consequence was that in the autumn of last year we entered on those negotiations under extreme disadvantages. After all that has been said, I certainly shall not trouble your Lordships with further references to the long and complicated Correspondence. It is enough to say that according to the statement of Her Majesty's Government themselves, it has ended in a triumph of might over right. We resisted that oppression by what, at least, must be called very strong language. Some will have it that we did too much, others that we did too little. In my own judgment we did too little, and we asked too much. It is the great fault of this Correspondence that Her Majesty's Government went on too long insisting on the maintenance of the Treaty of 1852, and the arrangements which may be considered as forming part of that treaty. The noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) has told us that the treaty has long ceased to be a practical question; and the noble Earl says that it was an artificial treaty. According to both their statements—which are quite true—the Government ought to have foreseen that the treaty could not be maintained. They went on, however, maintaining it in words, while at the same time they did nothing to support it. If the treaty were so defective (as I think it was) the Government would have been wiser if they had earlier accepted the necessities of the case, and had endeavoured to form some arrangement more acceptable to Germany. After twelve years' vain attempts to get the parties to agree upon the meaning of this treaty, and the manner in which it could be best carried into execution, it ought to have been seen that it was impracticable in its character. Moreover, it had the inherent vice of being framed in total forgetfulness of the principle that all Governments, whether great or small, exist only for the benefit of the governed; and it affected to dispose of the Duchies and to regulate their future, not with a view to the welfare of their inhabitants, but according to the supposed interests of Europe, and to the claims to the Duchies (as if they had been private property) possessed by certain Princes, according to the antiquated principles of feudal law. Little foresight was needed to see that such a treaty could not be permanently maintained, and if Her Majesty's Government had earlier suggested that it should be revised, so as to effect an arrangement fair and just to all parties, they would have placed themselves on irresistible ground, and they would have been able to say that the arbitration of the sword must be postponed until all attempts to settle the question by peaceable means had failed. It is said of those who impugn the conduct of Her Majesty's Government that they are supporters of a warlike policy. I altogether deny the justice of that reproach. One of my objections to the policy of Her Majesty's Government is, that in their over anxiety for peace they have acted in a manner which has in fact exposed the nation to greater danger of ultimate war. The noble Earl the Secretary of State himself admitted distinctly that the securities for peace are diminished; and can any one look at the existing state of Europe without seeing that such is the fact? By the license given to this one unprincipled act of aggression they have destroyed men's faith in treaties and in the existing public law of Europe; they have set loose ambitious desires, and already the air is full of rumours of schemes for spoliation and unprincipled aggrandizement. To suppose that this state of things can continue without involving us in danger of war is absurd. We have been told that we ought never to go to war unless our own interests are immediately affected. I, for one, entirely contest that principle. I am persuaded that if we lay it down as a rule to act upon simply selfish considerations, and never to interfere unless our own interests are affected, whatever schemes of spoliation and aggression are entertained by other nations, giving free scope to that unprincipled ambition by which the councils of nations are too frequently guided, wrong and violence will prevail without check; and if we ourselves should become their object, in the day of our necessity we must expect the rule we have applied to others to be applied to us, and we shall meet with no sympathy or support in any quarter, because we have deliberately withheld our aid from the weak when threatened with oppression. I do not mean to say that we should undertake the general redress of all cases of injustice. Far from it. The circumstances of each case must be taken into account, and it must be considered whether we can interfere with advantage. But the power which we possess and the station which we occupy impose on us the sacred duty of maintaining, as far as we are able, the principles of justice in the international relations of Europe. Looking at the condition of Schleswig before the invasion, it was in the enjoyment of undisturbed peace. There was no serious attempt at resistance to the authority of the Danish Government. But it was perfectly clear that once we allowed the German troops to enter Schleswig, under cover of their presence a system of agitation would be got up which must make it practically impossible to bring about a satisfactory settlement. That is the noble Earl's reason for not interfering now, and I admit its force. It was shown from the first that that difficulty would occur, and therefore I say that that was a reason for our interfering earlier and preventing a state of things arising, in which we are powerless to undo the evil that has been done. But we are told that it was impossible for us even at an earlier period to interfere with effect, that we could not make war against united Germany for the defence of Schleswig. There would have been no question of war. It would have been a question whether Germany should make war upon us. ["Oh, oh!" *and* "Hear, hear!"] It is not an immaterial difference, and you feel that it is not an immaterial difference at this moment. If you now wanted to assist Denmark you must make an offensive war, and drive the Germans out; and that would be a very difficult operation. But while the Danish army was unbroken, while the strong fortifications were in existence, while Sweden was ready to stand by you, I say that it was not an operation of such great difficulty that we should maintain a defensive position which Germany would be slow to attack. My noble Friend the Chancellor of the Duchy asked how it was possible that we could act at sea, or how we could send a fleet into the Baltic, which was frozen up. I have inquired of very high authority, and I am informed that at that season of the year, when peace is preserved, there is a regular trade in cattle from the west coast of Schleswig to England, which is carried on by large steamers with the utmost facility; and that we had at that time means quite sufficient to have sent between 20,000 and 30,000 men to assist the Danes and Swedes in maintaining a very narrow frontier, of which both the flanks would have been perfectly secure. It would then have been a question whether the Germans would attack us ; and I think that the statements of my noble Friends themselves go far to prove that they would not. Because, what has my noble Friend the Secretary of State just told you ? He has told you that Austria went very reluctantly into this whole scheme of policy, and that although yielding to Prussia she saw very well the dangers which she was encountering, and the difficult questions which she was starting. I believe that that is perfectly true. I believe that Austria, under the vain delusion that by acting in this manner she would hereafter secure for herself support in defending Venetia, has reluctantly followed Prussia into this scheme. But if she was reluctant to enter into it when she knew that there was no danger from us, is it likely that she would have gone into it if she had known that she would have to attack us ? My noble Friend has said that Austria was afraid of disturbing Hungary and Venetia ; that she was afraid of the state of her finances. All that is perfectly true ; but all those arguments go far to prove that there was not the slightest danger of her venturing upon offensive operations if we had firmly maintained a defensive position. I am not prepared to say that there would not have been some small risk in pursuing such a policy ; but in the affairs of nations it is always a question of comparative risk ; and I firmly believe, looking at the present state of affairs, that the risk which you have actually incurred is far greater than that which you would have run by following a more decided and more manly policy. But if that was not your intention—if you had made up your minds not to go to war, then I say that it is perfectly clear that you ought not to have used the language which you did. My noble Friend has referred at great length to the text of the various despatches to show that we made no promises to Denmark. I quite agree with my noble Friend that we did not in so many words make any promise that we would interfere : but I ask any fair and impartial man—I ask those of your Lordships who were present when my noble Friend the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Clanricarde) spoke this evening, whether there can be a doubt, taking the whole course of the Correspondence, that the conduct of our Government was such as to create expectations in the mind of that of Denmark that assistance would be rendered to them. The same is the case with regard to our threats to Germany. My noble Friend said that there were no threats, only warnings. I think that the distinction is a nice one—when warnings are accompanied by language such as that which was used by Her Majesty's Government, it is hardly possible to distinguish them from threats. These reasons satisfy me that, in point of fact, the Resolution which has been moved is completely in accordance with the truth. It is true that the influence of the country has been diminished, and that that has been the result of the Foreign policy of the Government. The noble Marquess said that even if that was true it ought not to be asserted by such a Resolution as this. It appears to me that if the country has been lowered in the eyes of the world by the policy of the Government, the best course that can be adopted to relieve us, as far as possible, from the stain upon our national reputation, is to show that in this matter the Government, who were intrusted with the guidance of the national affairs, have not truly represented the feelings and the will of the nation, and it is only by the two Houses of Parliament that that can be shown. On that ground I think that the Resolution is one which we ought to adopt. It might, perhaps, in some respects have been better worded ; but I think it expresses a correct judgment as to the policy of Her Majesty's Government, and that—a matter to which I attach importance—without expressing any confidence in their political opponents. With regard to the Amendment proposed by my noble Friend (the Marquess of Clanricarde), I cannot help observing that it seems to me utterly inconsistent with the speech which was made in support of it. It only regrets that Denmark was led to expect aid from the English Government ; but a good part of the speech of my noble Friend went to show that at one time aid might properly have been afforded. If it had been afforded, no harm would have arisen from the raising of those expectations, and, therefore, the Amendment of my noble Friend is by implication a decided approval of that very timid policy which part of his speech denounced. It is a censure of Her Majesty's Government quite as distinct as that conveyed by the

Resolution. I do not know whether he intends to press that Amendment, because as a Vote of Censure it can hardly be adopted by Her Majesty's Government, and as a censure upon wrong grounds it is not likely to be accepted this side of the House. Therefore, I trust that my noble Friend will not press it, but will allow us to divide, "Contents" or "Not-Contents," upon the Motion originally submitted to the House.

Earl GRANVILLE: My Lords, when I make a promise that I will be brief I do not like to break it; and I certainly have no great temptation to do so on the present occasion, because, if I think it hardly necessary to answer at great length the speech of my noble Friend the noble Earl who has with such admirable impartiality objected to everything and everybody in the House; on the other hand, I am so well satisfied with the course of this debate that, although speeches proverbially have not very great influence upon the votes of Peers, particularly of those Peers who are absent from the House, I believe that the statements, facts, and arguments which have been adduced on this side of the House will have the greatest possible effect in showing to the country how futile are the accusations which have been brought against Her Majesty's Government. I shall, therefore, only say a few words with regard to the reasons why I ask your Lordships not to agree to the second Resolution of the noble Earl opposite, or to the Amendment proposed by my noble Friend the noble Marquess. With regard to the Amendment, if the facts were as described, I see no Parliamentary objection to its form; but I do think that what we have heard to-night shows that the facts are not as my noble Friend has stated them. I need hardly trouble your Lordships by again alluding to the speech which was made by Lord Palmerston last year, when he said he concurred entirely with Mr. FitzGerald and all reasonable men in Europe in desiring that the independence and integrity of Denmark might be maintained. When Lord Palmerston made that statement he knew that the great Powers of Europe were co-signataries of a treaty declaring it to be of the utmost importance that the integrity and independence of Denmark should be preserved, and could hardly fail to suppose, at the time he made that speech, that they would join with England in resisting any attempt to destroy that independence. It is, I

may add, absurd to contend that the remonstrances addressed by the Government to Germany amounted to a threat that this country would go to war for Denmark; and it is hardly creditable that the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Malmesbury) should make the assertion which he has done, to the effect that Denmark had been deluded, in the face of the fact stated by my noble Friend the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, that the Danish Minister admitted that such was not the case. For these reasons I hope your Lordships will not agree to the Amendment; while, with regard to the substantive Resolution before us, I would say that if the noble Earl who has just spoken (Earl Grey) had not so entirely found fault with it, I should have supposed he had a hand in framing it, from my knowledge of his tactics. I recollect the noble Earl having on one occasion pointed out the advantage of having no meaning in the terms of a Vote of Censure, inasmuch as all the soft Members of the House might in consequence be induced to vote for it.; and I can have no doubt that this Resolution, in that respect at all events, completely meets his views, inasmuch as there seems to me to be no policy or principle involved in it. It is, however, intended as a Vote of Censure, and in that light we accept it. The noble Earl who introduced it to our notice blames us for having, as he says, blown hot and cold—but what, I would ask, has been the policy of the Opposition? The noble Duke behind me (the Duke of Argyll) read a remarkable extract from a speech made by Lord Derby last year, in which he went further even than the declaration of my noble Friend at the head of the Government, and said that the independence and the integrity of Denmark were of vital importance to this country. We have heard that speeches have been made in another place by the leaders of a party of a very peaceable character, who have described war as insanity; and we have had allegations made to-night against the pacific policy of the Government. I listened with the greatest attention to the speech of the noble Earl who opened this discussion, and the only suggestions which I heard him make were, that we should have demanded from Germany a definition of the word nationality—a definition which I have no doubt a German Professor would be glad to give him at any length, but which would not, I think, contribute much to the integrity of Denmark — that we had not used language strong enough towards Germany at a particular juncture, and that we should have entered on military operations at a moment when owing to the nature of the weather they must have been singularly useless. Now, if that be not blaming the Government for being too peaceable and not sufficiently warlike I do not know the meaning of plain English. With respect to another point with which fault has been found with the Government—namely, the refusal to enter a Congress on European matters—I venture to say that there is hardly a Member of this House who does not believe that refusal was right. It is said, however, that it was couched in terms discourteous to the Emperor of the French; but I have never yet heard a sentence quoted to establish the justice of that charge. As regards the Conference, there has been a sort of general sneering on the other side with respect to it; but I do not know whether noble Lords opposite really object to our having gone into it or not; but it is, at all events, very remarkable that, with their acute minds, they have not been able to detect a single flaw in the very difficult discussions which took place while it lasted. Certainly they have not objected to our efforts to obtain a suspension of hostilities. As to the allegation that we have lost our just influence in Europe, I, for one, do not believe in the truth of that statement. I feel, on the contrary, that we have maintained an influence. There was the most perfect harmony and concord among the neutral Powers throughout the sitting of the Conference; we parted on the most amicable terms—nay, more, the agreement between us was greater in reference to our policy in this matter than before. This is, I think, better proof that we continue to maintain our just influence in Europe than can be found in reading a few extracts from newspapers, which may represent the daily feeling of the people of the places in which they are published, but which can hardly form a ground on which to base your Lordships' decision in this important subject. It is natural that certain parties in Italy and Germany should wish to see us involved in war with the hope that they may gain some advantages regardless of the difficulties in which we might be involved. And as regards France, though I have not the slightest complaint to make against the Emperor, nevertheless the French people will, I think, be more than human if, with their feelings towards this country, they did not see with satisfaction England embarking alone in a war—a circumstance which might give them a great political pre-eminence and a commercial advantage. But these facts did not at all go to prove that we have lost our just influence in the councils of Europe. I do trust that this House will not give an opinion which I believe myself to be a false one. We cannot possibly have any official information as to the exact state of public opinion with regard to us on the Continent of Europe; and even if, contrary to my belief, the opinion which we are asked to express were perfectly true—neither in a national nor a public-spirited sense is it desirable that this House should publicly complain of the degradation of the country in the terms proposed by the noble Earl.

On Question, That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Motion? their Lordships divided—

Contents (Present)	119	
(Proxies)	58	
		177
Non-Contents (Present)	123	
(Proxies)	45	
		168
Majority		9

Resolved in the *Affirmative.*

Then the said original Motion *agreed to.*

CONTENTS.

(Present.)

Beaufort, D.
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Manchester, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.
Rutland, D.

Abercorn, M.
Bath, M.
Exeter, M.
Hastings, M.
Salisbury, M.

Abergavenny, E.
Amherst, E.
Aylesford, E.
Bandon, E.
Bantry, E.
Belmore, E.
Brooke and Warwick, E.
Cardigan, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Cathcart, E.
Cawdor, E.
Coventry, E.
De La Warr, E.
Devon, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose*).
Grey, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harewood, E.
Home, E.
Lucan, E.
Macclesfield, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mansfield, E.
Manvers, E.
Mayo, E.
Mount Edgcumbe, E.
Nelson, E.
Orkney, E.
Pomfret, E.
Portarlington, E.
Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Rosse, E.
Rosslyn, E.
Sandwich, E.
Selkirk, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Stanhope, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Verulam, E.
Westmoreland, E.
Wilton, E.
Winchilsea and Nottingham, E.

Canterbury, V.
Clancarty, V. (*E. Clancarty*).
De Vesci, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hawarden, V. [*Teller.*]
Hill, V.
Hood, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore*).
Melville, V.
Sidmouth, V.

Oxford, Bp.

Abinger, L.
Arundell of Wardour, L.
Bagot, L.
Bateman, L.
Berwick, L.
Bolton, L.
Boston, L.
Chelmsford, L.
Churston, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim*).
Clifton, L. (*E. Darnley*).
Clinton, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Colchester, L.
Colville of Culross, L. [*Teller.*]
Conyers, L.
Crofton, L.
Denman, L.
De Ros, L.
De Saumarez, L.
Digby, L.
Dinevor, L.
Dunsandle and Clanconal, L.
Dunsany, L.
Egerton, L.
Farnham, L.
Feversham, L.
Grantley, L.
Grinstead, L. (*E. Enniskillen*).
Heytesbury, L.
Inchiquin, L.
Kingsdown, L.
Leconfield, L.
Lovel and Holland, L. (*E. Egmont*).
Northwick, L.
Polwarth, L.
Raglan, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Rayleigh, L.
Redesdale, L.
Sheffield, L. (*E. Sheffield*).
Sherborne, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford*).
Skelmersdale, L.
Sondes, L.
Southampton, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway*).
St. John of Bletso, L.
Templemore, L.
Tenterden, L.
Thurlow, L.
Tredegar, L.
Walsingham, L.
Wynford, L.

(Proxies.)

Cleveland, D.
Northumberland, D.

Tweeddale, M.
Winchester, M.

Beverley, E.
Bradford, E.
Buckinghamshire, E.
Cadogan, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Derby, E.
Desart, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry*).
Erne, E.
Hillsborough, E. (*M. Downshire*).
Howe, E.
Huntingdon, E.
Morton, E.
Mount Cashell, E.
Onslow, E.
Stamford and Warrington, E.
Tankerville, E.
Vane, E.

Bangor, V.
Doneraile, V.
Lifford, V.
St. Vincent, V.
Strathallan, V.

Bangor, Bp.

Berners, L.
Blantyre, L.
Blayney, L.
Braybooke, L.
Castlemaine, L.
Clanbrassill, L. (*E. Roden*).
Clarini, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Delamere, L.
Dormer, L.
Dunfermline, L.
Forester, L.
Hawke, L.
Kilmaine, L.
Lilford, L.
Middleton, L.
Moore, L. (*M. Drogheda*).
Petre, L.
Plunkett, L. (*Bp. Tuam, &c.*)
Rodney, L.
Rollo, L.
Ross, L. (*E. Glasgow*).
Saltersford, L. (*E. Courtown*).
Saltoun, L.
Stourton, L.
Strathspey, L. (*E. Seafield*).
Tyrone, L. (*M. Waterford*).
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss*).
Wharncliffe, L.
Wigan, L. (*E. Crawford and Balcarres*).

NOT-CONTENTS.

(Present.)

Westbury, L. (*L. Chancellor*).

Armagh, Archbp.

Devonshire, D.
Grafton D.
Saint Albans, D.
Somerset, D.
Sutherland, D.
Wellington, D.

Ailesbury. M.
Anglesey, M.
Bristol, M.
Camden, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Normanby, M.
Townshend, M.
Westminster, M.

Abingdon, E.
Airlie, E.
Albemarle, E.
Caithness, E.
Camperdown, E.
Chichester, E.

Clarendon, E.
Cowper, E.
De Grey, E.
Ducie, E.
Durham, E.
Effingham, E.
Essex, E,
Fitzwilliam, E.
Fortescue, E.
Granville, E.
Harrowby, E.
Lichfield, E.
Lovelace, E.
Minto, E.
Morley, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Russell, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Sommers, E.
Spencer, E.
Strafford, E.
Suffolk and Berkshire, E.
Yarborough, E.
Zetland, E.

Eversley, V.
Falmouth, V.
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster*).
Stratford de Redcliffe, V.
Sydney, V.
Torrington, V.

Carlisle, Bp.
Chester, Bp.
Cork, Bp.
Down, &c., Bp.
Ely, Bp.
Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.
Hereford, Bp.
Lincoln, Bp.
London, Bp.
Ripon, Bp.

Abercromby, L.
Annaly, L.
Aveland L.
Belper, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery*).
Calthorpe, L.
Camoys, L.
Carew, L.
Chesham, L.
Churchill, L.
Clandeboye, L. (*L. Dufferin and Claneboye*).
Clanwilliam, L. (*E. Clanwilliam*).
Congleton, L.
Cranworth, L.
Dartrey, L. (*L. Cremorne*).
De Mauley, L.
De Tabley, L.
Ebury, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Gardner, L.
Harris, L.
Hatherton, L.
Houghton, L.
Hunsdon, L. (*V. Falkland*).
Keane, L.
Leigh, L.
Lismore, L. (*V. Lismore*).
Llanover, L.
Lyttelton, L.
Lyveden, L.
Methuen, L.
Minster, L. (*M. Conyngham*).
Monson, L.
Mont Eagle, L. (*M. Sligo*).
Monteagle of Brandon, L.
Mostyn, L.
Overstone, L.
Panmure, L. (*E. Dalhousie*).
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough*). [*Teller.*]
Rivers, L.
Sandys, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Seaton, L.

Sefton, L. (*E. Sefton*).
Seymour, L. (*E. St. Maur*).
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde*).
Stafford, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stratheden, L.
Suffield, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*
Talbot de Malahide, L.
Taunton, L.
Truro, L.
Vaux of Harrowden, L.
Vivian, L.
Wensleydale, L.
Wentworth, L. (*V. Ockham*).
Wodehouse, L.
Wrottesley, L.

(PROXIES.)

York, Archbp.
Newcastle, D.
Portland, D.
Northampton, M.
Brownlow, E.
Carlisle, E.
Cowley, E.
Gainsborough E.
Ilchester, E.
Innes, E. (*D. Roxburghe*).
Lindsay, E.
Radnor, E.
Scarbrough, E.
Bath and Wells, Bp.
Durham, Bp.
Manchester, Bp.
Rochester, Bp.
Salisbury, Bp.
St. Asaph, Bp.
Worcester, Bp.
Broughton, L.
Byron, L.
Charlemont, L. (*E. Charlemont*).
Chaworth, L.(*E. Meath*).
Clifford of Chudleigh, L.
De Freyne, L.
Dorchester, L.
Erskine, L.
Fingall L. (*E. Fingall*).
Fitzhardinge, L.
Gifford, L.
Howard de Walden, L.
Kenlis, L. (*M. Headfort*).
Kenmare, L. (*E. Kenmare*).
Kintore, L.(*E. Kintore*).
Londesborough, L.
Lovat, L.
Lurgan, L,
Manners, L.
Mendip, L. (*V. Clifden*).
Poltimore, L.
Stuart de Decies, L,
Sudeley, L.
Vernon, L.
Wenlock, L.

PROTEST

Against the EARL OF MALMESBURY'S *Resolutions relating to Denmark.*

Die Veneris, 8 Julii, 1864.

Dissentient,

Because the Second Resolution implies, although in vague and ambiguous language, that the Duty of upholding the Integrity and Independence of Denmark was incumbent on the Government of Great Britain more than on the other Powers who were Signataries to the Treaty of London of May, 1852 :

Because this implied assertion has no foundation in fact, and no justification in policy :

Because the said Second Resolution farther implies, in a like ambiguous manner, that the Integrity and Independence of Denmark, if they could not be upheld by Negotiation, ought to have been upheld by the Arms of Great Britain alone :

Because any Resolution to this effect ought to be expressed distinctly, and in specific Terms :

Because the said Second Resolution affirms that the just Influence of Great Britain has been lowered in the Councils of Europe, without stating any fact, or giving any reason to justify this assertion :

Because such an assertion, made in such Terms, by this House, is in itself injurious to the Public interests, and is in the highest degree unwise and inexpedient.

SUNDRIDGE
RUSSELL
SHAFTESBURY
ST. GERMANS
LEINSTER
DEVONSHIRE for the 1st, 2nd, 5th and 6th reasons
WICKLOW
ANNALY
FOLEY
MOSTYN
FORTESCUE
LLANOVER
EVERSLEY
GRANVILLE
METHUEN
HARROWBY
OVERSTONE.

House adjourned at a quarter past Two o'clock, A.M., to Monday next, half past Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, July 8, 1864.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report*—On Schools of Art* (No. 466).

SUPPLY — *considered in Committee* — Committee —R.P.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolutions in Committee*—Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment [Deficiency of Dues], *reported**.

Second Reading—Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans)* [Bill 191].

Considered as amended—Public Schools* [Bill 168] (*Lords*).

BRITISH MUSEUM.—QUESTION.

MR. HARVEY LEWIS said, he would beg to ask the right hon. Member for the University of Cambridge, Whether an order has been issued (to take effect from the 1st of September next) prohibiting the attendants at the British Museum from leaving the Museum during the ordinary dinner hour, or at any time between the hours of nine o'clock in the morning and six o'clock in the evening ; and, if so, why has such order been issued ; and whether any and what provision has been made to enable the attendants to procure their dinner on the premises at a moderate charge ?

MR. WALPOLE said, in reply, that the order to which the hon. Gentleman referred had been issued. In 1838 the rule was that the attendants should continue in the Museum from ten to seven in summer, and ten to four in winter, and during that time they had only half an hour to go out for luncheon or dinner. The Trustees consented to alter that arrangement by giving them an hour for their dinner. The regulations had since been altered. The time of attendance had been reduced, and was made from ten to six in summer, ten to five in spring, and ten to four in winter. The absence, however, of the assistants at the dinner hour had occasioned great loss of time and great inconvenience to thōse who frequented the Museum, and accordingly the Trustees, with the consent of the Treasury, had issued the rule referred to, but at the same time had made provision for enabling the attendants to take a comfortable meal. He knew that the assistants had sent in an address thanking the Trustees for the arrangements that had been made, and he hoped everybody would be benefited by them.

THE NEW ZEALAND WAR.—QUESTION.

Sir FREDERIC SMITH said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether he has any objection to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the number of Officers and Soldiers of the Regular Forces, as well as of the Militia and Volunteers, who have been killed or wounded, up to the last Returns, in the New Zealand War?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON replied that there would be no objection on his part to give a statement of the officers and men of the Regular Forces killed or wounded up to the last Returns in the New Zealand war, and he had no doubt that the Colonial Office would be willing to give a similar statement with respect to the Militia and Volunteers.

CHINA—MAJOR GORDON'S RETIREMENT.—QUESTION.

Mr. LIDDELL said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any official information has been received of Major Gordon's retirement from the command of the Anglo-Chinese disciplined force, in compliance with the terms of the Order in Council of March last, or whether any "secret orders," or reservations, or discretionary powers, were conveyed to Major Gordon or any other English officer in China along with such Order in Council; and, if so, whether there be any objection to state the nature of such secret orders or reservations, and under what circumstances such discretionary powers were to be exercised?

Mr. LAYARD replied that the Order in Council was dated the 1st of March, and had not left this country until the 10th of March. There had not yet been time to hear from Sir Frederick Bruce on the subject. There were no secret orders. Instructions were given to Sir Frederick Bruce that Major Gordon should retire from the Chinese service; but, if he could withdraw him from that service, and yet retain him under his own orders for the defence of the thirty miles radius, he was directed to do so.

DENMARK AND GERMANY—SWEDES AND DANES.—QUESTION.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he rose to ask, Whether the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs can now inform the House whether the statement, which has appeared in *The Times*, that 400 Swedes have been taken by the Germans and received no quarter is true; and also whether the Swedes are taking part in the war with the Danes?

Mr. LAYARD replied, that he was happy to inform the House that he believed there was no foundation for the report that the Swedes had been killed in cold blood. The Foreign Office had telegraphed both to Copenhagen and Berlin on the subject, and it appeared that several Swedes, both men and officers, had been killed, but they were in the Danish service and wore the Danish uniform. Several Swedes had also been taken, and Prince Frederick Charles had ordered them to be tried by court martial, but he hoped that that order would be rescinded by subsequent orders from Berlin.

VOTE OF CENSURE— THE DEBATE OF MONDAY EVENING— LANGUAGE IN DEBATE.

EXPLANATIONS.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, I beg to ask the indulgence of the House for a moment, while I make a personal explanation. Yesterday the hon. Member for Leominster (Mr. Gathorne Hardy) adverted to a word used by me which at the moment could not be exactly specified, but which, he proceeded to say, went beyond the due licence of debate. I was not precisely aware at the time what the word actually used by me was; but I have since endeavoured to refresh my memory by reference to the usual reports of our debates. I find that I stated with reference to a particular letter relating to the Federal Execution that it had been "falsely" quoted by the right hon. Gentleman. My memory does not serve me as to the fact whether this word was used by me or not: as it is, however, ascribed to me, I am bound to suppose it was. I certainly consider that such words have a tendency to do that which is extremely objectionable—namely, to enlarge the due freedom of speech which we already abundantly possess. I think the expression was a very improper one, and I sincerely regret that I have used it.

GENERAL PEEL: I wish to give the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary the opportunity of correcting a great inaccuracy into which he fell in his quotation from my speech, and which he gave on the authority of his own notes. I do not object to the first part of it—namely, "If such a thing occurred in common life the greatest coward in the world would rush forward to protect the weak against the strong, without even asking the cause of the quarrel." But the hon. Member then omitted four distinct sentences, and then quoted as follows:—"I see no reason why the Foreign Minister should not be guided in the affairs of his office by exactly the same principles." But what I did say was this, "I was anxious to maintain the honour and peace of the country," and I added, "I see no reason why the Foreign Minister of this country should not be guided in the affairs of his office by exactly the same principles as those which would guide his conduct in private life."

MR. LAYARD: It is quite true that I did omit four sentences, but I certainly did not wish to misrepresent the right hon. and gallant Gentleman. The fact, however, is that these four sentences compared the breed of men with the breed of horses, and the right hon. and gallant Gentleman said he did not see any difference between the two. ["Oh, oh!"] I did not leave out these sentences from any desire to misquote the hon. and gallant Gentleman, but I admit that they were left out. The House will now, perhaps, allow me to say a few words by way of personal explanation as to the date of the delivery of certain papers about which there was some difference of opinion yesterday. I have informed myself from the printers, the officers of the House, and the Foreign Office, and I find that I was strictly accurate. The papers containing the despatch asking the French Government whether they were inclined to co-operate with us—and it is upon that despatch the whole question turns—it is to be found in Correspondence No. 4—were laid upon the table on the 1st of March, and were distributed on the 3rd of that month; and, therefore, my only inaccuracy was that I said it was on the 2nd. The other papers, which came down to the 25th of March, were laid upon the table before the House separated for the Easter recess. I laid them "in dummy" on the table, because I wished that Members should have them as soon as possible. They formed No. 5, and they were in the hands of Members on the 5th of April.

DENMARK AND GERMANY—VOTE OF CENSURE.

RESOLUTION—(MR. DISRAELI).

ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [FOURTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [4th July],

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to thank Her Majesty for directing the Correspondence on Denmark and Germany, and the Protocols of the Conference recently held in London, to be laid before Parliament:

"To assure Her Majesty, that we have heard with deep concern, that the sittings of that Conference have been brought to a close without accomplishing the important purposes for which it was convened:

"To express to Her Majesty our great regret, that, while the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government has failed to maintain their avowed policy of upholding the integrity and independence of Denmark, it has lowered the just influence of this Country in the counsels of Europe, and thereby diminished the securities for peace."—(*Mr. Disraeli,*)

And which Amendment was—

To leave out the second paragraph of the proposed Question, in order to insert the words "To submit to Her Majesty the opinion of this House, that the independence of Denmark and the possessions of that Kingdom, on the terms proposed by the Representatives of the Neutral Powers in the recent Conference, ought to be guaranteed,"—(*Mr. Newdegate,*)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

MR. BERNAL OSBORNE: Sir, the House will recollect that, at the commencement of the Session, when a question was put to the noble Lord the First Minister, as to when the voluminous papers on Denmark and Germany would be laid upon the table, in complying with the request for their production, the noble Lord, with a prophetic instinct, and I think foreseeing the course which this discussion has assumed, said he would produce them without delay, and he wished the House joy of them. I think I may venture to say that the House has had joy of their production, and that the case, as laid before the House last night by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General, was indeed a very heavy case, and not made lighter by his method of managing it. The House has, indeed, been fairly drenched with despatches and saturated with extracts distilled from the blue-books—so much so that it has nearly lost sight of the question at issue. What are the two Questions before us? The Question before the House is, first, the Address to Her Majesty moved by the right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire; and next, the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), to which I shall first very shortly advert. That Amendment, with some difficulty, found a seconder, and when it did it was evident that the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley) seconded it under a total misapprehension; for it was plain from his speech that that hon. Member was under some misty idea that the Amendment moved by his hon. *confrère* and colleague the Member for North Warwickshire—

MR. NEWDEGATE: My Amendment was seconded by the hon. Member for Bristol (Mr. F. H. F. Berkeley).

MR. BERNAL OSBORNE: I was under a mistake then, and I apologize to the hon. Member, for he evidently does not like the connection with the hon. Member for Peterborough. Be that as it may, the hon. Member for Bristol made no speech in support of the Amendment, and the hon. Member for Peterborough did make a speech in its defence, and was evidently under the idea that its object was not to preserve Denmark, but to protect this country from some aggression on the part of Cardinal Wiseman. Whoever the seconder, the Amendment will soon expire in its cradle, and will, probably, be followed to the grave by the two hon. Gentlemen, and perhaps by the third. Let it rest in peace.

Before commencing this adjourned debate, I must remind the House of the denunciations made by the War party at an early period of the Session, and of the loud appeal to arms which was heard from a large part of the House. Now what has become of that great section—the War party? Why, it would appear to me as if the millennium had arrived in this House. The noble Lord the Member for Huntingdon (Lord R. Montagu) is in accord with the hon. Member for Rochdale—"righteousness and peace have kissed each other!" Who can help looking with mingled feelings of admiration and surprise on the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck) contemplating with brotherly love the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs? All seem to be of one accord. Everybody appears to be pleased with the present aspect of affairs, though it is all doubtful. Every one is for peace, except the hon. Member for North Warwickshire, whose "voice is still for war." But he is deserted by the most effective and most important member of his party. What has become of the noble Lord the Member for Stamford? He appears to me to have discovered on this occasion that "his party may be counted on one's fingers." I think, therefore, the House is now about to listen to the dictates of common sense and to preserve that peace which the country has determined to maintain. Now, Sir, were I inclined to indulge in a tone of triumph on this aspect of affairs—were I inclined to lay a heavy finger on the mystification and blunders which have occurred from 1852 to 1864, I think the opportunity presents itself; but I am not anxious to snatch a personal triumph when the humiliation of the country is in some degree implicated. No man in or out of the House is able to deny that the failure of the Ministry to some extent involves the honour of the country; and however we may rejoice that they have returned to the paths—if they really have—of peace, all must acknowledge, however grateful we may be for the result, that, as was said of the Peace of Amiens, no one can be proud of the means by which it has been attained. We have had a great many solutions attempted of this Danish-German question; and one remarkable solution was given by an hon. Friend of mine on the other side of the House—I mean the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield. The hon. and learned Gentleman seems to have supposed that he had entirely settled this question by telling this House that 40,000,000 of Germans had gone mad. Like the excited Irishman at Donnybrook Fair, he flourished his shillelagh both against friend and foe. But I must say that, when his speech is read in Germany and Schleswig-Holstein, it is not likely to give to Prussia a lucid interval, or to impress the people there with the notion that the eccentric and hon. Member is imbued with much learning on this subject, for he appears to be totally ignorant of the merits of the question, and to have taken no pains whatever to inform himself with regard to it. The hon. and learned Member went somewhat out of his way to attack the noble Earl, the Foreign Secretary. Now, whatever I may think of the noble Earl's conduct in these affairs, I do not think that it is a worthy thing to say of the noble Earl, if he had not been brought up as a statesman he would have been a schoolmaster. The hon. Gentleman might have recollected, when sneering at the profession of a schoolmaster, that there have been schoolmasters who might rank with statesmen—that the name of Arnold, for instance, might stand upon an equality with that of a Roebuck. The hon. Member might further have remembered that this country has received some lessons on civil and religious liberty from the noble Earl which it is not likely to forget. Neither can I admit that the noble Earl is alone to blame for the diplomatic blunders and failures that have occurred. It is very true that the fine Roman hand of the noble Lord may be detected in these despatches, which were to confound Europe at the same time that they put this House to sleep. In reading these despatches, one cannot help seeing that, though the "hands are the hands of Esau, the voice is the voice of Jacob." If any one is to be blamed for the complication and failure of these transactions it is the noble Lord the First Minister of the Crown, who has for half a century directed the foreign policy of the country. In treating this question of Denmark and the Duchies, I think that not only the country, but the House, has been too much inclined to listen to sentiment rather than to reason. Sympathy without inquiry is a dangerous virtue for a nation to indulge in. It seems to have been taken for granted that everything the Germans did was wrong, and everything the Danes did was right; while it has been forgotten that for twelve years Denmark has systematically evaded her treaty obligations. Because she is a weak Power it seems to be conceded in this House that Denmark was to be allowed to presume on that position to violate her engagements. From the outset Denmark appears to have adopted one of the maxims of La Rochefoucauld: she "has promised according to her hopes and performed according to her fears!" The House will recollect that before Easter, so impressed was I with these transactions, and so far from shirking my duty—according to the assumption of the right hon. Member for Stroud—I on two several occasions put Questions and gave notice of Motions on this subject. And how were they met? On April 9, I predicted that the Conference must necessarily be a failure. I did so not pretending to any prophetic inspiration, but from the rule of common sense, which is able to guide us all in such matters. The noble Lord at the head of the Government, shaking his finger at me in a manner so peculiarly his own, said—

> "The hon. Gentleman pledges his political sagacity that the Conference will lead to no good result; I can only say, I trust this day next year he will not be able to remind us of what he is now predicting."

It is four weeks since I made that prediction, and what has happened? [An hon. MEMBER: Two months.] I give the hon. Gentleman the benefit of that: say it is two months. At any rate, it is not a year—and what has become of the Conference? Again, I urged that the Conference should not have for its basis the Treaty of 1852; but the noble Lord said he determinately adhered to the Treaty of 1852. On that occasion I was met by the "previous Question" being moved. I lament that was done, because I think the House would have been put in a fairer position—we should have known better how parties stood—if we had gone into the discussion at that time. If the remarkable speech of the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn had been delivered then, nobody on whatever side of the House could have hesitated who should be his leader on this question. The right hon. Member for Stroud has fortified me by his opinion that a great mistake was committed; but I regret that he has been animated only by that *esprit d'escalier* which is so peculiarly his own, and that at the time he deserted me altogether, affording neither assistance nor advice. My right hon. Friend now, at the eleventh hour, not only attacks the opposite party for their conduct, but attacks the whole system and theory of Parliamentary Government. I dissent altogether from his proposition. It is not the business of the Opposition to furnish a policy for the

Ministry; and the right hon. Gentleman has laid down an entirely new doctrine in that respect. [Mr. HORSMAN: I said so!] The right hon. Gentleman has really said so many things and explained so many, that I may be excused if I have mistaken him. Neither have the Government any right to blame the right hon. Gentleman opposite for having moved his Resolution in its present form. What do the Government want? They object to be destroyed; but, whatever the weapons, or however forged, I fear it would be impossible to please them. The form of words which has been adopted is, at least, conclusive for its purpose. We were told that when the Conference assembled it would set everything to rights, confirm the Government in their place, and maintain peace in the North of Europe — two very important things — the first probably the more important. Well, the Conference met, and has separated. Of course every hon. Gentleman has read the Protocols, which really seem to me to resemble rather the inspirations of the noble Lord's newspaper, *The Owl*, than the records of such potent, grave, and reverend seignors. Then there is also a summary of the Conference, which is so loosely and inaccurately drawn up, that if I had not known to the contrary I should have suspected it to be the production of the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs. What has happened within the last day or two with regard to that paper? Why the German Plenipotentiaries have written two letters protesting against that summary of the Conference, and giving their own ideas of it. From first to last this Conference has been a most unfortunate and fatal failure. The language of the Protocols is really very extraordinary. I do not speak of the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary as having written it. Take the first day, for instance. The members of the Conference all assembled, after a little delay, on the 25th of April. Protocol No. 1 tells us that the first thing they do is to elect the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary President. The noble Lord then begins with a solemn speech to them, which must remind hon. Members with dramatic tastes of the celebrated scene in the *Critic*, where the actors are sworn to inviolable secresy. He says:—"With the exception of the communications which each representative will make to his own Government, the most inviolable secresy will be preserved." We have seen how that rule was observed, and, of course, it is not for me to suggest by whom it was broken. In regard to the drawing up of the very first Protocol, I, on behalf of the neutral Powers—although I am not commissioned to do so—must protest against the language used. Here is a sample—"After the exchange of ideas in which all the Plenipotentiaries took part"—but we are not told what time the operation occupied—"those of the neutral Powers guided by an unanimous feeling of humanity," &c. The inference in regard to the other Plenipotentiaries is obvious. That is not, I say, a proper way of putting the matter. We ought to speak of these Powers in respectful language, and the tone of mingled blarney and bluster is most objectionable. At this first meeting the Plenipotentiaries agreed to refer the proposal for a suspension of hostilities to their respective Courts. That was on the 25th of April; and they did not reassemble till the 4th of May, when there was again a reference to their respective Courts. On the 9th of May the suspension was finally agreed upon. The only thing which one can learn from these Protocols is the definition of the distinction between a "suspension of hostilities" and an "armistice," which is given by M. Quaade at page 32. On the 12th of May the Treaty of 1852 for the first time came before the Conference, and was declined as a basis by the Austrian and Prussian representatives. On that occasion there was a very disorderly debate, nearly as much so as ours last night, though there were no "calumnious" reflections. They adjourned to the 17th of May, and again to the 28th of May, when an extraordinary proposal was made by Lord Russell. I think that some hon. Members in this House, and particularly the hon. Member for North Warwickshire, ought to be exposed for the part they have taken in these transactions, and I intend to expose them. Let us first see what took place on the 12th of May. On the 28th of May Lord Russell comes down with a proposition. The House will naturally suppose after all that had been said, that it was to stand by the Treaty of 1852 and to preserve the integrity of Denmark. ["Hear, hear!"] The hon. Member who cheers, and who has evidently not read his book, supposes so; but let me tell the hon. Gentleman what the noble Lord did propose—and it must also be borne in mind that this was a British Minister who had been loud for the Treaty of 1852 and still louder for the integrity and independence of Denmark. The noble Lord comes down to the Conference and he says—

> "In order to prevent a future contest, and to satisfy Germany, it would be necessary, in our opinion"—[that is, in the opinion of the neutral Powers]—"entirely to separate Holstein, Lauenburg, and the southern part of Schleswig from the Danish Monarchy."—p. 39.

That is the proposition of the English Minister, and he adds that,

> "In order to justify so vast a sacrifice on the part of Denmark, and to maintain the independence of the Danish Monarchy, it is desirable in our opinion that the line of the frontier should not be drawn more to the north than the mouth of the Schlei and the Dannewerke."—p. 39.

The noble Lord made that proposition, and the House has not had its attention drawn as yet, I think, to the great escape it and the country have had from the next proposition of the noble Lord. What was the next proposition? The noble Lord proposed—

> "If the King of Denmark consents to the sacrifices of territory which are required of him in the name of peace, it would be just that the independence of his kingdom should be guaranteed by the great European Powers."—p. 40.

So that, if Denmark had consented, we should have been placed in the position of guaranteeing its independence amid a hostile population, and if war had broken out that guarantee must have been redeemed. The hon. Member for North Warwickshire has stolen his Amendment *verbatim* from Lord Russell. The proposal contained in the Amendment is the very proposal made by Lord Russell in the Conference, and the hon. Member comes down now, supported by his hon. Friend the Member for Bristol, and his other hon. Friend who is not his Friend, the Member for Peterborough, and he makes no allusion whatever to what the noble Lord the Secretary for Foreign Affairs did when he proposed this guarantee from which we have been saved by the obstinacy — thank God! — of Denmark. And now, what has been the result of the twelve meetings of the Conference, for the meetings were twelve in number? There was only one thing on which they were unanimous; but when they did agree their "unanimity was wonderful." They agreed to a vote of thanks to Lord Russell, and they said they left England with the most pleasant recollections. And that, Sir, was the only thing this Conference—assembled from all parts of Europe—was unanimous in agreeing to. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bucks says there was no result from the Conference; but there has been a most important result, and I will point it out to the House. The Conference was assembled to preserve the integrity of Denmark; it separated, having decreed its dismemberment! The Conference was assembled to maintain the Treaty of 1852 intact; it declared its abrogation! The noble Lord the President of the Conference and the Secretary for Foreign Affairs was the person who moved for the dismemberment of Denmark, and he was the President who assented to the destruction of the treaty. No doubt he did so with great coyness and with some reluctance. Indeed, I am reminded, by his conduct, very much of Donna Julia, of whom it is said, as the House will recollect—

> "A little still she strove and much repented,
> And swearing 'I will ne'er consent'—consented."

We have heard various accounts of this Treaty of 1852, and I am bound to add that those we have received from the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs are more than usually inaccurate. All of them have been excessively unsatisfactory and scanty in the materials they afford. The noble Lord the Prime Minister can no longer say that he is tongue-tied, and before I sit down I wish to put to him certain questions, which have been put to him before, but which he has taken ten years to answer. Now, Sir, the right hon. Gentleman the Lord Advocate, who generally speaks so well in this House, but who on a late occasion, whether from illness or owing to the weight of the case, was not particularly successful in his defence of the Government, was at last reduced to such straits that he held up his hands and asked, "Who made the Treaty of 1852?" I will endeavour to give a reply to the right hon. and learned Gentleman, and also to explain some of the circumstances attending the making of it. Indeed, that is absolutely necessary, because it will not do to come down to the present day, but we must go a little back for these transactions, and I shall have something to say by and by to the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, in reference to the version which he has given of them. We are asked, Who made the Treaty? Its origin, though at first mysterious, I believe is pretty well known now. It was compiled at St. Petersburg, printed at Warsaw, bound in Russia leather, and sent to the noble Lord the present First Minister of the Crown, who was then Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Indeed if you turn to our Parliamentary history I am inclined to believe that we shall seldom find a time when the noble Lord was not Secretary for something. What were the principles of the treaty? Why, the treaty bore in its origin, and on its face, the aspect whence it was derived—namely, the Russian aspect. It undertook to set aside the hereditary claims of Princes and the rights of Nations. It undertook to hand over a large population, like so many serfs, to a dynasty which was hateful to them. It infringed all the rules which are supposed to make treaties valid. Here is the definition which Vattel gives of a treaty, "A treaty made for an unjust cause is absolutely void. No one can engage himself to do things which are contrary to natural law." Sir, this treaty was altogether contrary to natural law. It undertook to manufacture an order of succession which was neither valid nor hereditary. It undertook to deliver the people to the rule of a monarch who had no legal right to reign over them. If I wanted a condemnation of it, I should go to a Member of the Government, and a very influential Member too, who says—

> "In these times it is necessary that a treaty should not only have the signatures of envoys and the ratifications of Sovereigns, but that in its working it should be made to accord with the sentiments and wishes of the people to be governed under it."

The Member who made use of these words was the noble Earl the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, speaking in another place in June last. It is a pity that the noble Earl had not considered the subject in that light when he undertook to adhere so positively and so fallaciously to the Treaty of 1852. How were the negotiations for the Treaty of 1852 carried on? The treaty itself was supposed to be the crowning glory of the noble Lord, the First Minister of the Crown, although an attempt is now made to shuffle off the responsibility. The noble Lord says, "It is very true that I made the treaty, but it was signed by a noble Lord in another place." But all the important negotiations from first to last were carried out by the noble Lord, and it is hardly fair to the Earl of Malmesbury, who we now hear has written such volumes of excellent despatches, to say that he is in any way responsible for the treaty. He signed the treaty, as any hon. Member would have signed it, in perfect confidence in the wisdom of the noble Lord, the then Foreign Secretary, who at that time was more trusted in foreign affairs than he is at this moment. The Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs told us last night that the House must take into consideration the policy of 1848, and he would have the House to believe that he gave a correct version of that policy. Now, what was the policy of 1848? The hon. Member says that the policy of 1848 was the natural parent of the results of 1864. But was that so? Although it is not in our blue-books, I am in possession of a despatch from a foreign blue-book, which was written by the noble Lord the Prime Minister when Secretary for Foreign Affairs, on the 23rd of June, 1848, in reference to the Schleswig-Holstein dispute. This is the proposition which the noble Lord made for the settlement of the Schleswig-Holstein question. It differs so much from the present policy that I beg the attention of the House while I read the passage. The noble Lord said

> "The future condition of the Duchy of Schleswig shall be settled upon one or the other of the two following plans, according to the choice of the King-Duke."

The House will remark that the people were not mentioned at all. The note goes on to say—

> "First, the Duchy of Schleswig might be divided into two parts with reference to the German or Danish nationality of its inhabitants, the southern and German part being to be called the Southern Duchy, the northern or Danish part being to be called the Northern Duchy. The King would then become a member of the Germanic Confederation in his capacity of Duke of Southern Schleswig, as well as in his capacity of Duke of Holstein, and Southern Schleswig would, like Holstein, form part of the territory of the German Confederation, and the sovereignty of southern Schleswig would follow the same line of succession as the sovereignty of Holstein. On the other hand, Northern Schleswig would be attached by its laws of succession to the Crown of Denmark, and the sovereignty of that Duchy would be inseparably united with the Danish Crown. Secondly, if this arrangement should not be thought expedient, the Duchy of Schleswig might remain entire and undivided, such as it now is; it might continue to be administered as it has been by an Administration established for Schleswig and Holstein jointly; and there should also be provincial States in which the representatives of the two Duchies would be assembled together in their proper respective proportions. In this case the King of Denmark would remain as he now is, a member of the Germanic Confederation in his capacity of Duke of Holstein, but he would not become member of the Confederation in his capacity of Duke of Schleswig. No change would in this case be made in the law of succession in Schleswig."

So the noble Lord was fully aware in 1848 of this matter of the order of the succession, and of how nicely that question ought to be touched. The question of the succession was never mooted by the noble Lord till the 4th of July, 1850; and some very extraordinary events occurred then. The idea of changing the succession proceeded from the noble Lord. In a despatch to Sir Henry Wynn on the 9th of February, 1850, the noble Lord first proposed the idea of altering the succession to the Danish Crown, and it was his suggestion that the son of the Duke of Oldenburg should succeed to that Crown, and he desired Sir Henry Wynn to sound the Ministry at Copenhagen as to how far that would be agreeable to them. Sir Henry Wynn wrote back what was rather a lecture to the noble Lord, for he said that it was between His Majesty and his subjects that the question of the succession must ultimately be arranged. Nothing whatever had been said at that time about the feelings of the people. Well, in 1851, some interest was excited in this country, and a Question was put to the noble Lord, which I trust he will answer to-night, whether there had been any negotiation with respect to the succession to the Crown of Denmark, or the succession to the Duchies? What was the answer of the noble Lord. It was this—

> "A good deal has passed in regard to these points; but Her Majesty's Government had studiously and systematically held themselves aloof from taking any share in these negotiations. Her Majesty's Government had confined themselves strictly to the mediation which they undertook, which was a mediation for the purpose of restoring peace between Denmark and the Germanic Confederation."—[3 *Hansard*, cxv. 221.]

I want to know how the noble Lord accounts for that answer, he having written the despatch to which I have referred in 1850, suggesting an alteration in the succession, and then told the House that the Government had not interfered in any manner. That is an important point, and, as the noble Lord is now no longer tongue-tied, I think he is bound to explain it to the House and the country. We have heard something of the Protocol of London. That Protocol was signed on July 4, 1850. I am not now speaking of the Protocol of Warsaw. The Protocol of London of 1850 was represented by the Under Secretary in the history he gave us that night as having been subscribed by Austria and Prussia as mandatories of the Germanic Confederation. I do not want to be afterwards contradicted. Did the hon. Gentleman not say that? The hon. Gentleman nods his head. Well, I say he has totally misinformed the House. Neither Austria nor Prussia did sign that Protocol as mandatories. Austria signed it after some time. Prussia never signed it at all. [Mr. LAYARD expressed dissent.] I maintain what I say. I really do not know how to meet the hon. Gentleman. Will he leave office if he is wrong? I am speaking of the Protocol of July 4, 1850, quoted by the hon. Gentleman, and I pin him to that. I deny that either Austria or Prussia signed the Protocol as mandatories of the Germanic Confederation; and I say that Prussia never signed it at all. The matter is so important that I must read the protest of Prussia on that occasion. Here is the protest which the Chevalier von Bunsen, who then represented Prussia at the Court of England, made to the noble Lord as our Foreign Secretary on July 3, 1850, the day before the Protocol was signed—

> "I deeply regret to be obliged to declare to you, without a moment's delay, that I am not at liberty to join in the Protocol. On the contrary, my instructions prescribe to me positively not to join in any Protocol of this sort, previously agreed upon by the three non-Germanic Powers of Europe, in consequence of negotiations carried on, and commented upon even publicly between those Powers without either Prussia or Austria or any German Government and authority having been consulted or even as much as asked their opinion. Can it be overlooked that this Protocol has been kept studiously, and in spite of reiterated requests as far as Prussia is concerned, a secret to the German Powers? . . . Germany is excluded from the negotiations which have led to the agreement both here and at Paris, and France is introduced in her place; France who has no legitimate right or claim, or pretext even, to interfere in a question relating to the Baltic and the internal affairs of Germany. Is the world to see, for the first time, a triple coalition against Germany, headed by England? A system of interfering in the affairs of Germany by her great eastern and western neighbour, under the sanction, yea, with the initiative of Great Britain? Are the two German Powers to be slighted by England, whose traditional Allies they have been, and with whom she has fought for the independence of Europe? . . . Let me then indulge the hope that you will not press any longer a Protocol, nor seem to impose, at the head of an European coalition, upon Germany an arrangement which must by her always be considered as *res acta inter alios*, as one which disposes of her rights, as if she was to be 'Polonized,' to use an expression coined by you."—*Correspondence*, 1850-53, p. 13.

That is the protest of Prussia against this Protocol; and yet the hon. Gentleman comes down to the House and tells you that that Power signed that document. Let us glance at some facts connected with the year 1850, because they will materially enlighten us on the reasons for signing the

Treaty of 1852. Important events took place in 1850. In January, a blockade, commanded by Admiral Parker, was undertaken by this country against Greece in the affair of Don Pacifico. In the May following there was a protest from all the great Powers, and the French Ambassador was recalled on that account. There was an important division in this House on June 17, 1850, in which the Government was beaten. There was also a division in this House, when the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield acted more the part of a retriever than a watchdog. It was rumoured and never contradicted, that on that occasion the Russian Minister demanded his letters of recall. That brings me down to June; and there was a great fear of a general European war. The noble Lord was in a great difficulty. What was he to do? He signed the Protocol of July 4, 1850, which, from first to last, was a Russian concoction, and the Russian Minister was satisfied and remained. Now, I come to the Protocol of Warsaw, which bears the date of June, 1851. What was that Protocol? A foreshadowing of the Treaty of 1852. It engaged between Russia and Denmark—not that the Duke of Oldenburg should be nominated, for the Duke of Oldenburg was put on one side because he from the first maintained the rights of Schleswig and Holstein, and would not do for the purpose—but it engaged that the Duke of Glucksburg, the present King Christian IX., who was nominated by Russia, should succeed to the Danish Crown. But Russia by that document for the first time reserved her own claims to the Gottorp portion of the Duchies. Well, that was followed by the Treaty of London of the 8th of May, 1852. It has always been a matter of curiosity to me how they contrived to get the signature of the Prussian Minister to that treaty. The Prussian Minister hung back; but at that time Prussia had a great desire to maintain her claim to Neufchatel, and a week after the Treaty of London was signed, Prussia contrived to have her rights to Neufchatel acknowledged by treaty by the Powers. What happened? The treaty respecting Neufchatel was of no use. In 1856, an unsuccessful revolution of the Royalists broke out there—it was rapidly put down; and since then we have heard nothing of the Treaty of Neufchatel. Yet that treaty acknowledgment of her claims was, I believe, the reason which induced Prussia to sign the London Treaty of 1852. I have no doubt the Under Secretary when he next speaks will confirm me on this point. But what is the position of the King we have made by that treaty? Christian IX. undoubtedly is King of Denmark Proper, because he is so in virtue of the Vote of the Assembly of the Estates of Denmark. But he is no more entitled to be Duke of Schleswig-Holstein than the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary is. The Treaty of 1852 can give him no valid right. The Estates of that country never were consulted. Christian IX. may well say—

> "Upon my head they plac'd a fruitless crown,
> And put a barren sceptre in my gripe,
> Thence to be wrenched by an unlineal hand—
> No son of mine succeeding."

That was the effect of the Treaty of 1852. The noble Lord has, indeed, lately assured us, that when the Danish capital is bombarded and the King taken captive, he will call Parliament together for the purpose of re-considering the situation. What was the first act of Christian IX.? His first act was to decree the incorporation of Schleswig with Denmark, contrary to all his solemn stipulations and agreements. The hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary turns round and gravely gives the House a lecture on the danger of nationalities as lying at the root of this question. But who so loud two or three years ago as the hon. Gentleman on that very question? Who so loud in the case of the Italians rebelling from Austrian domination in Lombardy? Where is the difference? Are not the same principles to hold good on the banks of the Eider as on the plains of Lombardy. Nationalities lie at the root of this question. I have yet to learn that the House has not the same sympathies with the people struggling in the North as in the South of Europe. It comes to this—after making an excuse, he says the King of Denmark could not help signing the Constitution. But what did he say for the Duke of Augustenburg? He said he accepted compensation as a set-off for his claims on the Duchies. Why, if he had not accepted compensation he would have got nothing. But this compensation was not given for his title—it was a most inadequate return for his estate. The thing was done at the beck of Frederick VII., and if he had not taken that he would have got no money at all, he would have been a beggar. The hon. Under Secretary went on to say that no protest was entered. Why, Sir, there was a protest in March, 1853, against the whole transaction by the brother of the Duke of Augustenburg, and the language of that protest is so just that I will read the concluding paragraph. He protested against the whole treaty. He reserved his rights, and said if he was ever inclined to give them up it should not be for the forwarding of Russian intrigue and Russian claims. He protested at that time; but what happened lately at the Conference? Do not tell me you can get rid of his claims. So sacred and so just are those claims that even now Prussia and Austria have recognized them, and the whole people of Germany are, I believe, unanimous in favour of them. But what happened, I ask, in the Conference? In page 59 of the Protocols of the Conference there is an account of a most amusing scene. At the sitting of June 2, Baron Brunnow, the representative of Russia, made the following communication:—

> "The Ambassador of Russia announces that the Emperor, wishing to facilitate, as far as depends on him, the arrangements to be concluded between Denmark and Germany, in view of the re-establishment of peace, has ceded to the Grand Duke of Oldenburg the eventual right which Section 3 of the Protocol of Warsaw of June 5, 1851, reserved to His Majesty as head of the elder branch of Holstein Gottorp."

Upon which the other representatives all got up and complimented him on the excellent spirit he had shown, and the amicable intentions of Russia; and it was, I believe, upon this occasion that they shook hands all round. But what are the real facts of the case? Russia, as far back as 1773, had given up all right and title and claim on the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein to the Counts of Oldenburg, in exchange for Delmanhorst and Oldenburg: in 1864 she made a merit of renouncing a title which she did not possess. It was not till the Protocol of Warsaw that Russia slipped in her claims. What was the object of Russia? To exclude the Augustenburg line; and for this reason—that female succession not being legal in the Duchies, by the exclusion of the House of Augustenburg the succession was brought nearer to Russia. Russia, in fact, had thus succeeded in putting aside seventeen claimants between herself and the Duchies. There are now but two claimants to the Duchies before Russia; and what would then become of the Baltic? It would become a Russian lake. That is a short, though somewhat tedious history of these transactions.

But we are told that Germany has gone mad. I undertake to say, that never at any period of her history has Germany with her 40,000,000 been so united and of one mind as on this question; and if any people are to be reputed to have gone mad it is the people of England and the House of Commons, if they can be persuaded to go into a war on the question of Schleswig-Holstein, in order to thrust on an unwilling people an unwelcome dynasty. What interest have the taxpayers of this country in the question, whether a Prince of the House of Augustenburg or Oldenburg sits on the throne of the Duchies? The taxpayers of England will say of both these Kings and Princes, "A plague on both your Houses." The Lord Advocate took credit to the Government for preserving the peace of Europe. How far is that correct? It is impossible to deny that the Government were in a league to go to war—to involve this country in a great European war—to put an unwelcome Sovereign on the throne of Schleswig-Holstein; there is no doubt of the fact. Who prevented it? That much maligned and ambitious potentate the Emperor of the French. Had it not been for the Emperor of the French, and had the designs of Her Majesty's Government been followed up, we should at present have been engaged in an awful war with Germany. But the Emperor of the French hesitated. And now I come to the question which demands an answer from the noble Lord at the head of the Government. We have heard of certain words spoken by the noble Earl (Earl Russell) in another place as to the designs of the Emperor of the French. I did not hear them, but I am not satisfied with the explanation given of them by the Under Secretary. The words are very remarkable, and the House will not, I am sure, object to hear them. The noble Lord in another place said, on June 28, 1864—I find this in *The Times* newspaper, which, we all know, whatever Ministers may be, is never in the wrong—

> "The French Government have repeated to us only within the last twenty-four hours, that the Emperor does not consider it essential to the interests of France to support the line of the Schlei; he declares he does not think France would go to war for such an object. I think if that war were successful, France would expect some compensation on account of her participation, which could not be granted without causing general jealousy and disturbing the balance of power."

Now, I want to know what communications have taken place between Her Majesty's Government and the French Government as to the compensation which France has asked? That is a very material question—we have only been able to get glimpses and snatches of this question; but, whatever may be said by the hon. Gentleman opposite, the progenitor in office of the Under Secretary—(I admit they are very unlike)—I must think that there have been some important secret negotiations going on when the noble Lord so pointedly alludes to the compensation which France was likely to demand. Is not this a warning to us how careful we should be not to meddle in these European matters? Whatever the compensation would be, we are told it would upset the figment called the balance of Power, and possibly saddle us with a considerable addition to our National Debt.

Sir, I will not go into the question how far the Danish people and Ministry have been misled by the noble Lord and Her Majesty's Government; but the House will agree that the Danes were misled by the articles in the Ministerial press, and especially in a paper which was known at one time to be inspired by the noble Lord, because I have seen the editor frequently leaving his house. I beg to say it is not *The Times*. ["Name!"] No; I will tell the hon. Member in private. But did not that paper systematically and continuously sound the war trumpet? Were not the regiments named, was not the commander-in-chief pointed at, and can we be very much surprised if the Danes were misled?—because, Sir, I believe they place much greater credence on the English press than on the English Cabinet. But be that as it may, I think I could prove that they relied on foreign aid. Would any Minister in his senses have neglected to adopt some of the new inventions, and have left the defences of Denmark in such a disgraceful state, that in some respects they are only to be equalled by our own country, where we have at this moment a paucity of steel shot and no good guns for the navy? Let this country take warning from that state of Denmark. Denmark would have been in a very different position if she had been done justice to by her Minister. M. Hall boasted, menaced, and threatened after the true Palmerstonian style; but he took no pains to arm his brave and intelligent countrymen. I must remind the noble Lord that his Ministerial career has been singularly hostile to Denmark. Sir, the Danes must look upon him with feelings of dislike and suspicion. The noble Lord made his maiden speech in this House on the 3rd of February, 1808, in defence of the seizure of the Danish fleet. I have the speech behind me. He took office in the following year, and he has continued in office until 1864. He presided at the disruption of Denmark in 1808, and in 1864 he presides over her dismemberment. There must be "something rotten in the state of Denmark." What will be the fate of Denmark? Hon. Members will probably see that now the Danes have lost that most unpleasant thing, the sympathy and assistance of England, they will make peace direct with Prussia; and I shall not be surprised if we have to-night a declaration from the noble Lord that the Danes will probably join the German Confederation as a means of escape, and from the chances of avoiding a Scandinavian kingdom.

I think that my hon. Friend the Member for Rochdale (Mr. Cobden) in his speech laid down the true policy of England. It was not, as was misrepresented by the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, that my hon. Friend wished to maintain peace at any price, nor has he ever done so. In fact, I have to find fault with my hon. Friend. I think he was a little too warlike when he pointed to Venice in the manner he did. I thought that my hon. Friend, in his more mature views, was manifesting a more warlike spirit, and qualifying for the Cabinet of the noble Lord the First Minister. The time has gone by for presenting this attitude to Europe. The time has gone by for enacting in this way the bluster of Bobadil without the chivalry of Quixote. What has been the fruit of all our intervention in European affairs? Let Poland and Denmark give the reply. What has been its effect? We are isolated in Europe; we are meddling in Asia; we are distrusted by both sides in America; and in Africa even the King of Ashantee resists with effect our ill-planned and ill-conducted enterprises. And this is the history of our spirited foreign policy. I was surprised, in the face of such a state of things, to hear the eulogium pronounced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the success of our foreign policy. The right hon. Gentleman is a great master of character, and has depicted for the first time the noble Lord as the great Minister of peace. But here is a different account by another hand, and I claim the attention of the House, because it is not only amusing but excessively instructive. This is speaking of the policy of the noble Lord—

> "Indeed it seems as if there lay upon the noble Lord (Viscount Palmerston) an absolute necessity for quarrelling; if he can he will quarrel with an absolute monarchy: if he cannot find an absolute monarchy for that purpose, he will quarrel with one which is limited; if he cannot find that, sooner than not quarrel at all he will quarrel with a republic."

I will shorten the quotation; there is a great deal more, but this is very nice—

> "What ought a Foreign Secretary to be? Is he to be like some gallant knight, challenging all comers, having no other duty than to lay as many as possible of his adversaries sprawling in the dust? If such is the idea of a good Foreign Secretary, I for one would vote the noble Lord this appointment for life."

Who does the House imagine drew this able picture? The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer. But the right hon. Gentleman has made up his quarrel with the First Minister, and they certainly now resemble the late noted Siamese Twins. Some question has occurred in the debate as to how far the honour and influence of this country has been lowered. It could not be denied that this country did not occupy quite the position it ought to hold among nations. The want of success alone, independent of the way in which we have managed to bungle and botch, must of itself reduce the just influence of this country. In my mind it would be very easy to redress that, and to replace this country in a proper position. Members ask, "What is your policy? What would you do?" I will tell you. The noble Lord and the Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench are men of great capacity, but a little past their time, and they bungle; but if they wish to put the country in a proper position with Foreign Powers, and restore the "just influence" of England, it might be easily done by their imitating that custom which is obligatory on unsuccessful officials in Japan. If, Sir, they would enact, in a modified form, that "happy despatch" which we have learnt from the Asiatics, I am sure this country would at once regain its proper position. It would be a subject of regret among themselves and their families for a short time, but it would have the effect of setting matters right. That, Sir, is my policy; but I am afraid they will not take that advice. There sits the noble Lord—*sedet, æternumque sedebit*—I was about to add, but it would not be true—*infelix!* But there is another question. What is the position of what is jokingly called the Liberal party? That is the *nom de guerre*—there is no such thing. But that is between ourselves. We all know that here. There are people out of the House who imagine when we go to the hustings with all our fine professions that we mean it, and that we shall stand by our colours in this House. Well, as an election is near, what is the position of the Liberal party? The old Liberal cries are rather the worse for wear. They used to be something like "Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform." Now, as to one of these questions, Peace, it is delightful to see how we are all agreed; even the noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Lord R. Cecil) is for peace. We are all for peace; and occasionally we all nibble at retrenchment! ["No, no!"] Oh, yes; but only occasionally. But on both sides of the House no one wants Reform. Well, Sir, that is the end of "Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform." But what is the position of the Liberal party? The hon. Member for Sheffield, who has no preferences, but only dislikes one more than another — and, curiously enough, he dislikes the people among whom he sits more than anybody else—has instituted a comparison between the two benches. I have always been of opinion that there are as good fish in the sea as ever were caught, and if we lost the present Ministry, I do not know why we should regard it with inconsolable regret, for it might be possible to replace them. Now, let us see how this Ministry is constituted. Well, I will take first the noble Lord the First Minister—and I wish to speak of him with every respect, because I believe that a more active or a more able man has seldom existed in this country. I may say that

> "Panting Time toils after him in vain,"

He is certainly *facile princeps*, the liveliest, if not the youngest on the Treasury Bench. The noble Lord deserves great credit for his admirable management through so long a time of the affairs of this House. He has acted with all sorts of men, and agreed with all sorts of opinions. He has contrived a most extraordinary feat. He has contrived to conciliate both the Low Church party and the High Tories. The *Record* acknowledges his inspiration, and the hon. Gentleman the Member for North Warwickshire bows to his influence. These are great feats. But what is his policy? Sir, his domestic policy is paternal but stationary; his foreign policy up to this day has been pugnacious but progressive. But now, Sir, he is about to achieve the most wonderful feat of his life—he is about to go to the country as the apostle and minister of peace, and will be supported by my hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham. Now, that is the most extraordinary feat of all. I have not been unfair to the noble Lord; but let us go into his Cabinet. His Cabinet is a museum of curiosities. There, Sir, are to be found some birds of rare and noble plumage, both alive and stuffed. But, unfortunately, there is a difficulty in keeping up the breed—for these Whig birds have been very barren, and they were obliged lately to take a cross with the famous Peelite strain. I do them the justice to say, however, that there is a very great and able Minister among them in the shape of a Chancellor of the Exchequer, and it is to his measures alone that they owe the little popularity and the little support which they get from this Liberal party. Certainly it cannot be said, either by their enemies or friends, that they have been prolific of measures since they have taken office. Even my right hon. Friend (Mr. M. Gibson), who is not connected with them by family, and somehow got into the Cabinet—but, like the fly in amber, "one wonders how the Devil he got there"—has not been fertile. I must say that his hon. Friends the Members for Rochdale and Birmingham are, I think, disappointed in "this young man from the country." When he married into the family we expected some Liberal measures; but the right hon. Gentleman has become indolent, if not quarrelsome, under the guidance of the noble Lord. Well, Sir, what is to be done? We know by the traditions of the great Whig party that they will cling to the vessel, if not like shipwrecked sailors, like those testaceous marine animals which somehow adhere to the bottom, thereby clogging the engines and impeding all progress. Sir, should a vote of this House displace that Administration, what are the Liberal party to do? Well, Sir, if I might advise the Liberal party, I should say that they may feel perfectly happy as to the issue of this great duel which is being fought. They are somewhat in the situation of Iago in the play, and may say like him, "Whether Cassio kills Roderigo or Roderigo kills Cassio, or each kills the other," they must gain. No, Sir, even should this Parliament decide on terminating its own and their existence, they will find some consolation in the knowledge that the funeral oration will be pronounced by the hon. Member for North Warwickshire, and that some friendly hand will inscribe on their mausoleum—"Rest, and be thankful!"

Mr. WHITESIDE: After the remarkable speech of the hon. and gallant Gentleman it may not, perhaps, be inappropriate to recall the attention of the House to the precise question before it. The words of the Resolution express regret "that the sittings of the Conference have been brought to a close without accomplishing the important purposes for which it was convened;" and "that, while the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government has failed to maintain their avowed policy of upholding the integrity and independence of Denmark, it has lowered the just influence of this country in the counsels of Europe, and thereby diminished the securities for peace." Now, the main question is, whether as matter of fact that Resolution is true, and it lies within a very narrow compass—within a period of about eleven months. The hon. and gallant Gentleman who has last spoken entered upon a minute dissection of the Treaty of 1852, and inquired into matters antecedent to that treaty. He truly stated that that treaty was the work of the noble Viscount. The noble Viscount himself had informed the House that he had conducted a correspondence with the Powers of Europe touching the settlement of Denmark, which reached 6,000 folios, and that this treaty had been the result. When Lord Malmesbury came into office he was called upon to sign it; but he declined until he ascertained that the faith of England was pledged; and the interval of eight or nine months which he spent in office before he signed was employed in the endeavour, in conjunction with Count Bismark, the Prussian Minister, who acted on behalf of the Duke of Augustenburg, to see that the claims of the Duke upon Denmark were satisfactorily adjusted. He did not sign the treaty until it was ascertained that the Duke had renounced his claims, such as they were, to the Duchies. That is the true history of Lord Malmesbury's connection with the treaty. It is true that once afterwards he was appealed to by the Germans in respect of the Duchy of Schleswig, and I believe he answered that the Diet had rights with reference to Holstein, but as for Schleswig that Duchy was to be considered as disposed of by the signataries to the treaty, and thus by their united act rendered the subject of an European adjustment to be modified by the parties who had signed the treaty. At the time of the death of the late King of Denmark it was incumbent on the English Ministry to decide upon a policy, and to pursue it with consistency and moderation. The noble Viscount was then in office; he was the author of the treaty, and in his hands were the issues of peace or war. But Her Majesty's Government, instead of pursuing a policy of wisdom and moderation, had recourse to menaces and threats, unaccompanied by corresponding action. From this inconsistent, capricious, and therefore mischievous policy, has sprung the present condition of affairs. Let us see whether this position cannot be proved. The Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs read a vast number of documents to the House, but there is one paper which I did not hear him read, and which proves the whole case on which the House must give its decision, because the vote is not a vote of confidence or no confidence, but every hon. Gentleman is called on to vote whether the Address moved by the right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire is true or not. The Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs said that no intention to make war had existed in the Foreign Office, and I now ask attention to what is my contribution to the quotations already furnished to the House. I presume it may have originated in consequence of the Prussian Minister having possibly informed the Russian Minister at a casual meeting that he had been conversing with the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and that the noble Earl had in effect threatened Prussia with war. I could suppose that, under these circumstances, the Russian Minister having reminded his colleague of the successful way in which Prince Gortschakoff had disposed of Earl Russell, suggested that the Prussian Minister should call on the noble Earl and ask for an explanation. In the month of January I find Earl Russell giving a description of what passed between him and the Prussian Minister, which proves to my entire satisfaction that in a number of conversations between the Prussian and perhaps other Foreign Ministers and Earl Russell, threats and menaces, not vague but positive, must have been used by the latter noble Lord. On the 14th January, 1864, Earl Russell writes to Lord Bloomfield that he had had a conversation with Count Bernstorff on the subject of the proposition to occupy Schleswig, and adds—

> "That the Count desired to have an explanation of some observations made by me on a former occasion, which he said he had not fully understood.
>
> "I had spoken on a former occasion in the sense that Denmark would resist such an occupation, and might be aided by Great Britain. He wished to have an explanation of what I had then said.
>
> "It is to be observed that in speaking to Count Bernstorff on the occasion alluded to, I had expressly declared that I could not say what the decision of the Government might be, as the Cabinet had not yet deliberated, and consequently not submitted any opinion to the Queen; but that judging from the general current of feeling in Parliament and in the nation, I thought an invasion of Schleswig by Germany might lead to assistance to Denmark on the part of this country.
>
> "I now said that, apart from the occurrences of the last two months, I could well understand that Great Britain might fully rely upon two Powers so honourable and so much alive to the interests of Europe as Austria and Prussia. But we had lately seen how little their authority was regarded by the smaller German Powers, and by the popular enthusiasm of the masses."—No. 4, 534.

This was spoken on the 14th of January, before the application was made to France to make war, and it shows what was passing in the mind of Earl Russell. In writing this despatch to Lord Bloomfield, it is to be observed that Earl Russell admits that, in speaking to Count Bernstorff, he stated that, judging from the general current of feeling in Parliament and in the nation, he thought that the invasion of Schleswig might lead to assistance being given to Denmark by this country. Now, I maintain that anything more decisive and emphatic is not to be found in all this mass of papers, and that despatch shows how vain was the endeavour of the Foreign Under Secretary to prove that the department, of which he is a member, did not do the very thing which it is plain to demonstration that they did. It must be observed, too, that if Government maintain in office any Colleague who holds opinions which they disapprove, they must either disavow and expel him, or else they all become responsible for what he does. Earl Russell then, according to the same despatch, proceeded to explain to Count Bernstorff,

> "That should the Duke of Augustenburg enter into the possession of the Duchies, the occupation would at once be turned into permanent possession, and Denmark would be dismembered; and that, seeing these dangers, and the reckless manner in which many of the German Princes and all the German popular meetings were ready to set the faith of treaties at defiance, Her Majesty's Government could not wonder that the King of Denmark was ready to defend Schleswig, and to consider its hostile occcupation as a fatal blow to the integrity of his dominions."—No. 4, 535.

But, Earl Russell added,

> "That he could not doubt that he would be assisted by Powers friendly to Denmark in that defence."—No. 4, 535.

Now, what Powers, I ask, were alluded to? The noble Earl had before said that Denmark would be aided by England. Had he any authority to speak for France or Russia? Where does that authority appear? I say he had none; and for whom, then, did he speak but for England? And in the compass of the short document I have referred to, the noble Earl twice, I believe, assures the Prussian Minister that England meant to assist Denmark with material aid. If there is any doubt from Earl Russell's words, there is none from the answer of the Prussian Minister, who, according to the despatch, "shortly but pointedly adverted to the dangers that might be incurred by Europe if Germany and England were to become enemies." Anything more plain to an unsophisticated man, not trained in diplomacy, or in the ways of the Foreign Office, I cannot conceive. That document proves two things. It proves that menaces were held out towards the German Powers, and it proves that there existed an intention to go to war. If that document were read and known in Denmark, could any man there doubt but that the faith of England was pledged to that country, and that the Danes might safely continue the war, and maintain that noble defence which they had undertaken against overwhelming odds? But we were asked last night whether the Government are not at liberty to give advice to Foreign Powers; and I answer that it does not follow that you have a right to give advice to Foreign Powers unless you mean to assist them, if they submit to your advice and follow your dictation. In the whole political history of Europe there is not such a thing to be found as that short document of four lines—signed "Russell"—calling on Denmark to summon a Parliament to repeal the Constitution.

> "Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that, if the Danish Government should receive a summons from the Diet, or from Austria and Prussia, calling upon them to repeal the Constitution of November last, the King should declare that he will convoke the Rigsraad without delay, in order to submit to that Body a proposal for the revocation of such parts of the Constitution as apply to Schleswig."

I say the Government had no right to make such a demand as that upon another State, and then desert her in the moment of difficulty. In former days a great Foreign Minister would have burnt his fingers sooner than sign such a document unless he was prepared to act with corresponding firmness. The Attorney General asks whether we are not to remonstrate. Sir James Macintosh, speaking on behalf of Italy, once asked that question of Mr. Canning, when urging him to remonstrate with the great Powers against interference in the affairs of that country. Mr. Canning's reply, in effect, was this—"You, as a private Member, may say what you please. You have a right to speak your mind as regards Italy, Poland, or any other country. But when you call on me, as the Minister of England, to remonstrate with other Powers, I have to consider what must be done if our remonstrances were flung back in our faces. England is too great a country," said Mr. Canning, "to endure such an insult." Therefore, it does not follow, as the hon. and learned Gentleman seems to think, that the affairs of the world are to be managed like a Chancery suit, advice being given at every step, till, after dragging its slow length along, the wordy controversy ends in war. When the Duke of Wellington went to the Congress of Verona, Lord Castlereagh bade him beware how he offered advice in regard to the affairs of Italy, because we never sanctioned the invasion of Naples, which overthrew the Parliament of that State; and because, said Lord Castlereagh, we must not give advice when we are not prepared to act. I have no authority to speak on behalf of the party of which I am an humble Member; but if I were asked what ought to be the guiding principle of the foreign policy of England, I would answer, in the words which Mr. Canning uttered on a memorable occasion. Mr. Canning said—

> "The situation which England holds forbids an exclusive selfishness; her prosperity must contribute to the prosperity of other nations, and her stability to the safety of the world. But, intimately connected as we are with the system of Europe, it does not therefore follow that we are called upon to mix ourselves on every occasion with a selfish and meddling activity in the concerns of the nations which surround us. It is upon a just balance of conflicting duties and of rival but sometimes incompatible advantages, that a Government must judge when to put forth its strength, and when to husband it for occasions to come. Our ultimate object must be the peace of the world; that object may sometimes be best attained by prompt exertions; sometimes by abstinence from interposition in contests which we cannot prevent. It is upon these principles that it did not appear to the Government of this coun-

try to be necessary that Great Britain should mingle in the recent contest between France and Spain."

That is, I say, a very statesmanlike doctrine as to the foreign policy which should be pursued, and it is exactly contrary to the course taken by the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary. If there were nothing else, the immense pile of papers relating to Denmark, which have been laid on the table, is conclusive evidence against the noble Lord. No man could write such an enormous amount of matter without committing himself a hundred times over. The assertion that it was not intended by the Government to go to war is contradicted —as I could easily prove if I were not unwilling to weary the House, by the whole scope and spirit of the despatches, and the war policy was abandoned only when it was found that a peace policy would be safer for Her Majesty's Ministers. In the course of the Debate there have been three remarkable speeches— the able and suggestive speech of the hon. Member for Rochdale, the brilliant but eccentric speech of the right hon. Member for Stroud, and the speech in which the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield assailed the theory of Parliamentary government and the Constitution of the country. The speech of the hon. Member for Rochdale filled me, in one aspect of the question, to which I will hereafter advert, with alarm. The hon. Gentleman asked, as a matter of abstract principle, whether it was not wise in a Minister to take every possible precaution not to enter into a Continental war; and I must say I never heard a sentiment in which I more cordially concurred. Then the hon. Gentleman proceeded to express his belief that the conduct of our foreign diplomacy was deplorable and inexcusable; that it had utterly broken down; and whereas we propose to censure the Government in regard to Denmark only, in his opinion England has been subjected to humiliation in every quarter of the globe. Now, that is a most startling assertion when we consider the position and character of the hon. Member for Rochdale. It has been justly said that a politic Minister would wish to stand well with France, not by forfeiting in the slightest degree the independence of his country, but by conducting our communications with France with courtesy, dignity, and tact. The hon. Member for Rochdale negotiated the commercial treaty, and is known to every political man in Paris and to the whole mercantile interest of France. His opinion, therefore, carries with it great weight in that country; and I ask, can it be wise or safe to preserve in office the Ministry whose conduct he has described in such severe terms of reprobation, and to leave the interests of the nation in such unworthy and imbecile hands? The hon. Gentleman imputes to the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary only incapacity, but he charges the noble Lord at the head of the Government with insincerity, because he states broadly that noble Lord intends, when he has demoralized his party, to transfer power to those who are believed to be opposed to the political convictions which he now professes. What will be thought of the Government when that description of their character is read in France, or in other parts of the Continent? Will people abroad not be disposed to say—We know this Gentleman, the Member for Rochdate, well; we have confidence in his capacity and sincerity; and if what he tells us be true, how can such a Government properly be allowed to remain in power only to plunge England into even a lower depth of humiliation, if that be possible, than any she has reached already? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stroud broached some theories of a very novel and impracticable character. He commenced with a well delivered Philippic against the foreign policy of the Government. Now, I wish to speak of Lord Russell with all possible respect. When he was a Member of this House I think he displayed great learning in his speeches upon historical and constitutional questions, and I often obtained from him instruction which I failed to get in other quarters. Therefore I have no wish to apply to Earl Russell the language applied to him by his friends, and especially by the right hon. Member for Stroud, who exhausted the language of vituperation in describing the contempt he felt for the policy of the noble Lord, although he nevertheless intends to support the Government by his vote. I regret that the right hon. Gentleman is not in his place, because I was anxious to give him an opportunity, before his political reputation as a statesman is seriously damaged, of withdrawing two-thirds of his speech, and giving his vote in accordance with the remaining third. What did the right hon. Gentleman say? He told the House that, in September, 1862, the noble Lord wrote a despatch relating to the affairs of Denmark, and that when the unfortunate Danish Minister to whom it was read heard it he became agitated, and said, "I little thought a British Minister would ever seek to destroy Denmark." The cause of that remark was, that in this document, strange to say, the noble Lord recommended the severance of Schleswig from Denmark. The right hon. Gentleman, having laid great stress upon that part of the conduct of the Foreign Office, said, "That was, Sir, a fatal policy." A fatal policy! Why, such an avowal is a fatal avowal for the right hon. Gentleman; for if the policy is fatal, and the Ministry is in power who have pursued that fatal policy, how does he, the uncompromising patriot—the only one who is awake while the nation is slumbering—continue to support a Government in office whose fatal policy he so deeply laments? The right hon. Gentleman proceeds to say, with singular inconsistency, that the Government is not to blame, but that the blame, in reality, attaches to the Opposition. Those intrusted with the management of affairs are not to blame for the fatal policy, but those who have no power and no responsibility must bear the blame. I hardly know what might happen to the right hon. Gentleman if he were face to face with his indignant constituents at Stroud. Suppose some one amongst his constituents said to him, "Did you say that the policy of Earl Russell was a fatal policy?" "I did." "Did you say that it was blind, rash, and ignorant?" "I did." "Did you censure the conduct of the Minister for Foreign Affairs throughout?" "I did." "And yet you gave your vote to keep him in power." Surely no such theory was ever before propounded by a public man for supporting a Government. How could the Opposition be held responsible for the failures of Earl Russell? The noble Lord the Prime Minister has told us over and over again that the Opposition have no right to interfere with negotiations until they are completed, and all the right hon. Gentleman has been trying to do has been to screen the bad vote he is about to give by an abusive speech. The Resolution of my right hon. Friend (Mr. Disraeli) has been brought forward at the right time in accordance with the principles of the Constitution, and it is not to be met by an excuse that the Opposition are to be blamed for what the Government has done, of which the Opposition knew nothing. The right hon. Gentleman, using a legal phrase, says that we were accomplices before the fact; but in order to be so it should be shown that we knew there was a criminal and a crime, and that we possessed a guilty knowledge, and aided the criminal in his crime. What did I know of these despatches until they were laid on our table? No more than if I had never been born. Yet I should be an accomplice after the fact, and so would every hon. Gentleman on these benches, if, when the right time came, and when the materials were before the House to enable it to form a judgment, we who object to the course taken by the Government did not promptly and effectually bring the question to an issue in the only proper and constitutional manner in which the question can be considered and discussed. The right hon. Gentleman entertains a most extraordinary view of responsibility. He said, truly, that responsibility was the first duty of a statesman; but this is a monarchy, and the negotiations upon foreign affairs are conducted in the name and on behalf of the Crown. Treaties are made by the Crown, and those who act for the Crown are Ministers selected by and responsible to the Crown. That is the first stage of our constitutional responsibility, and the next stage is that the same Ministers are also responsible to the House of Commons. That stage we have now arrived at, and our responsibility now begins. That we assented to the previous question on the Motion of the hon. Member for Liskeard is no argument, because the time was inopportune; but now the time for action has arrived, and we are not only responsible to our consciences for the vote we give, but there is still another stage of our responsibility, and that is to the constituencies who have sent us here. They may rightly call us to account for the vote we give to-night, just as we call the Ministers to account for the conduct they have pursued while acting as the responsible advisers of the Crown. The right hon. Gentleman has mistaken the whole theory of our responsibility. He has confounded the Opposition with the Government, and has also confounded the rights of the Crown with the privileges of Parliament. The right hon. Gentleman went the length of saying, that north, south, east, or west, there was no quarter in the civilized or uncivilized world in which the influence and prestige of England have not been lowered and her character humiliated; and I submit to him that the moment he proves those facts to his own satisfaction, he is as much bound as a juryman on his oath to give the verdict which a belief in such facts warrants. A man of the conspicuous ability of the right hon. Gentleman has no right to propound theories in this House which tend to damage or destroy the Constitution of the country.

As to the doctrine laid down by the hon. Member for Rochdale to the effect, that the Foreign Minister should lay every despatch upon the table and ask our concurrence in it, that is simply impossible. We have pursued the only constitutional course that was open to us, and those who admit the truth of the charges we make against the Government are bound to vote with us. I come now to the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck), and I confess that, if possible, it surprised me even more than any other speech which I have heard in this debate. The hon. Gentleman applied language to the noble Lord at the head of the Foreign Office which I shall not repeat, because it is not respectful to the high position of that distinguished Peer. He may have been placed at the head of the Foreign Office at a time of life when he was not acquainted with the delicate duties which he had to perform, and he has no doubt exhibited a want of sagacity in the performance of those duties; but it is scarcely right or courteous to say that he is only fit to be a schoolmaster. But my hon. and learned Friend, like the right hon. Member for Stroud, was looking for an excuse for his vote, and he laid down a doctrine which I certainly thought the Revolution had settled. He said he knew that the policy of the noble Earl was entirely disapproved by the noble Viscount at the head of the Government; and although the noble Viscount expressed his dissent, my hon. and learned Friend had the modesty to say, "I know how it is much better than you do. You are of one way of thinking, and the noble Earl is of another. If you had been at the head of the Foreign Office these things would never have occurred. It is because the noble Earl is at the head of the Foreign Office that everything has gone wrong. Therefore I will vote for you and I will abuse him.". That is called a statesmanlike policy; but is it possible for any reasonable man to subscribe to such a doctrine? The scope of the argument of my hon. and learned Friend is, that the noble Viscount has deliberately kept at the head of the Foreign Office a noble Lord whose policy he disapproves and whose conduct he condemns. The hon. and learned Member for Sheffield's excuse for the noble Viscount for having kept the Foreign Minister in his office against the convictions of his understanding and with a knowledge that he was damaging the best interests of his country is, that the noble Viscount differs from his own Foreign Secretary, and we are to assume now, on the day of trial, against the principles of the Constitution, that one colleague is to be sacrificed in order that another colleague may be flattered. Lord Macaulay, in his brilliant sketch book called the *History of England,* has a celebrated passage in which he says one of the great blessings derived from the Revolution is to be found in this, that whereas before the Revolution each Member of the Government was only responsible for his own department, now the settled and fundamental doctrine of the law and Constitution is, that each Member of the Government is responsible for the conduct of every other Member. That theory and practice, however, the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield endeavours to shatter to fragments by attempting to screen the noble Viscount in a manner that must wound his pride as a statesman, and hurt his feelings as a man. Yet these are the intolerable paradoxes which the hon. and learned Gentleman, with all his peculiar air of superior wisdom, propounds to this House. I can quite understand the argument suggested by the hon. Member for Rochdale, and virtually repeated by many others, as to the effect which may be produced by individual character on the fortunes of a people. It has been so from the beginning of the world. It was the character and genius of individual men which built up and sustained the colossal fabric of ancient Roman power. It was the proud consciousness of heroism which made the old Roman, when asked what would have happened if Alexander the Great had marched against Rome, instead of against the East, reply, that if he had come to Rome he would have found there many Alexanders. The question has been agitated among the biographers of Castlereagh, Wellington, and Alexander Emperor of all the Russias, as to which of those three men it was who exercised most influence in overthrowing the despotic power of the first Napoleon, and in giving, I have no doubt, a wholesome lesson to the Third. Some maintain that it was the Emperor Alexander, others that it was Wellington; but M. Thiers gives the preference to the English statesman, the great and fearless Castlereagh. And when I heard the hon. Member for Liskeard, with his peculiar talent for ridicule, describing the late Conference, I could not help contrasting our present Foreign Secretary with that other wise and intrepid English statesman, who, while always exhibiting the respect due to the Sovereigns of Europe, compelled Kings and Emperors to do the thing that was just, and raised the honour and influence of his country to that pinnacle of glory from which his feeble and vacillating successors are dragging it down. What has been the course of conduct of Earl Russell throughout these transactions? I have heard it aptly described by one who has watched it closely as "a protracted Parliamentary manœuvre." Good faith ought to be the foundation of England's foreign policy. The Government might have said either that they would go to war, or that they would not, to maintain the integrity and independence of Denmark. Either statement of policy would have been distinct and intelligible; but they compelled her to yield everything that was demanded of her until her brave and unfortunate people said, "We have nothing more to give but our lives, and those we will sell as dearly as we can in defence of the land of our birth." The spectacle now offered by unhappy Denmark, as brought about—I charge it strongly—by the want of decision and firmness on the part of Government, is one of the most deplorable ever presented to the eye of a humane man. I agree that the smaller free and independent States are among the most beautiful parts of the European system. I regret the downfall of Denmark, and I say her name and example will live in the admiration of mankind when the memory of her unscrupulous aggressors is execrated or forgotten. The conduct of Her Majesty's Ministers in this lamentable business has not been defended by one independent Member of this House, unless, indeed, the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield can be said to have defended it by avowing that it would be impossible for him to find in the English language words sufficiently strong — I was going to say sufficiently ferocious—to denounce the head of the Foreign Office. The hon. Member for Rochdale seemed to think this an ill-timed Motion, and he told us that the noble Viscount was doing our work, and would, when he had sufficiently demoralized his own party, hand over the Government to his political opponents. Sir, we do not desire to possess a tarnished and dishonoured inheritance. We are called Conservatives, and why? Because we are jealous of the honour of our country, conservative of its glory, as we are of the noble institutions which have made it free and kept it happy. We believe that the Foreign Minister has erred, and greatly erred; we believe that he has lowered the influence of England among the nations of the earth; and we appeal to every right-minded Member of this House, if he thinks that to be the truth, to assert it on this occasion by his vote, and to agree to a Resolution which I am satisfied will be confirmed by the approving voice of an indignant country.

Mr. MONSELL said, that before alluding to the speech of the right hon. and learned Gentleman who had just sat down, he desired to refer to the speech of the hon. Member for Kildare. In many of the statements of that speech he entirely concurred. He believed that the interests which both he and that hon. Gentleman represented had not been wisely cared for in many instances by the noble Lord; but the best and fairest course to pursue on that occasion was to deal with the question before the House on its own merits. This was the course the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley) had adopted, and he had frankly stated that he did so deliberately because, if extraneous faults were to weigh against the Government, extraneous merits would also have in justice to weigh in their favour. With reference then to that subject the right hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Whiteside) appeared to him to have forgotten what had been the conduct of the Opposition, and how that conduct had influenced the negotiations while they were proceeding. To both sides of the House he thought some blame justly attached for the manner in which they had allowed themselves to be swayed backwards and forwards by public opinion on a delicate and difficult matter about which it was impossible that public opinion could be well informed. Let them remember the speeches which had been delivered in that House during the last few weeks on the subject of Denmark. Take those delivered by the noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Lord Robert Cecil) for example. The only time that he had ever seen the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Osborne) cowed or silenced was, when that noble Lord held up to public indignation those whose sympathies were German, and sought to show the world that in that House almost all were in favour of Denmark, and that there was nothing like a German party there. Had that language no influence on the affairs of Denmark? Had the yet stronger language used by Lord Derby in another place no influence? The effect of their speeches was such as to create a false impression on the minds of the Danes. It appeared to him that in some degree the Government were subject to the same reproach. Those who had listened to the speech of the hon. Member for Liskeard must be aware that, under the Treaty of 1852, Denmark had entered into most solemn obligations with Germany with regard to the affairs of Schleswig and Holstein. Lord Russell, on the 20th of September, 1862, wrote a despatch which declared the minimum that Germany had a right to claim from Denmark. Was there any Gentleman in that House who would controvert that fact, which went to the very marrow of the question? Was there any demand in that despatch which Denmark was not bound—most solemnly bound—by treaty obligations to yield to Germany? Yet the right hon. Gentleman came down to that House and talked of the interference of the Government. What could the Government do for Denmark till she had respected her treaty engagements? The Government ought to have said to Denmark, "These are the best terms we can make for you, and we ask you to fulfil your treaty engagements. If you wont do that we can do nothing more for you. Germany, Austria, and Prussia have accepted our terms; the whole matter will be satisfactorily arranged—will you accept those terms or not?" And if Denmark refused to accept those terms, they should have told her boldly that she could expect no aid from England. Earl Russell did attempt to wash his hands of the whole matter at that time, and what prevented him from persevering in that course? Hon. Gentlemen opposite now talked of peace; but who sounded the trumpet in the House of Lords on that occasion? Who denounced that compromise which, had it been accepted, would have placed Denmark in a position of security free from the invasion of hostile armies, and without a disputed succession? A most distinguished statesman in another place, who had been a Member of Lord Derby's Government, brought forward the subject, and the Earl of Derby stated in the strongest manner that

> "It is our duty as it is our policy to protect her against aggression. And although God forbid that the last extremity should be forced upon us! yet, I say, that if a question arose as to whether the Danish monarchy should be dissolved, or should lose its integrity and be frittered away —(still more that it should be placed by collateral means through indirect influences in the position of a dependency of the German Confederation)—I say there is no alternative which would not be preferable, on the part of England, than that a policy should be adopted which would lead to consequences so disastrous."—[3 *Hansard*, clxx. 1761.]

That was the interpretation put by the noble Earl on the recommendations made by Lord Russell in his despatch of September 20, 1862. When Lord Ellenborough was dwelling on the expediency of not consenting to the arrangements proposed by Lord Russell, he was driven by the force of the treaty engagements of Denmark to maintain that treaties extorted by force did not bind; in other words, he invented a new code of international morality to disengage Denmark from doing what she had promised to do; but it should be recollected that the conditions Denmark obtained were made at considerable sacrifice on the part of Germany, because, before 1852, Schleswig and Holstein were so intimately united together that there was a Customs' line between Denmark and the Duchies, and Danes could not pass into Schleswig-Holstein without a passport. He thought, therefore, that for the present unfortunate position of affairs the Opposition were very much to blame. He could not deny that at the present moment this country had not the influence in Europe which fairly belonged to her, and he entirely agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stroud (Mr. Horsman) in attributing that altered condition to our conduct on the Polish Question. He was on the Continent at the time, and he must say the feeling which that conduct had excited was very strong indeed. And who was to blame in that matter? Austria had been blamed; but in a letter to the Duke de Gramont, M. Drouyn de Lhuys said expressly it was not the fault of the Austrian Government that the proposition of France had not been adopted. That proposition was an identic note; and if Austria, together with France and England, had signed an identic note, the whole aspect of affairs would have been changed. Austria would have taken her part with the Western Powers in the cause of liberty and progress; but, in consequence of the outcry made by the Opposition to such a course, she had been thrown back into the arms of Prussia and Russia, and to that was to be traced all the misery that had happened to Denmark, and the still greater misery that was menaced. Hon. Gentlemen opposite were quite as much responsible for that state of things as the Government. What would be the consequence of transferring the conduct of negotiations in this state of affairs to hon. Gentlemen opposite? They absolutely refused to give any idea of the policy they would pursue; and we had to gather it from loose speeches and vague declarations made by noble Lords and hon. Members, and from articles in newspapers. Their organs in the public press were constantly preaching war. He thought, therefore, that nothing could be more dangerous than to hand over the power of carrying on these negotiations where such tremendous interests were at stake to a party who declined to declare their policy. It might be said, "they should not prescribe till they were called in." But that was not in conformity with the course pursued by Sir Robert Peel on the Vote of Confidence, January 31, 1840. Sir Robert Peel then said—

> "I know too well the little value that can be placed on that support which arises from misconception of one's real opinions. . . I have so little desire to procure a hollow confidence, either on false pretences or by delusive silence, that I rejoice in the opportunity of frankly declaring my opinions."—[3 *Hansard*, li. 1016.]

He did frankly declare his opinions, and it was not on any abstract ground, but on a comparison between his principles and those of the Government he wished to supersede, that the vote was taken. The House had not been told on what principles the policy of hon. Gentlemen opposite would be conducted, and for that reason alone he felt justified in opposing the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire. He would now say a few words on the foreign policy of this country. He was afraid the intimate alliance of Austria might be lost to this country; but he trusted the noble Lord at the head of the Government would endeavour to renew the warm and cordial relations which formerly existed with France. He knew the noble Viscount set value on the French alliance, but he feared that he was too much guided by the ideas that prevailed a few years ago, and that he was always too eager to gain a diplomatic triumph over France. The noble Lord succeeded in isolating France in 1839, and so gave rise to a bad feeling that nearly broke out into open war; and something of the same kind took place last November and December on the Polish Question. He attributed the present position of Schleswig-Holstein to the latter event. If the noble Lord intimated to France his wish that cordial relations should be re-established between the two countries, and satisfied them that there was no desire on our part to trip them up, the peace of Europe would be preserved, the affairs of the Duchies would be satisfactorily arranged, and the clouds which now overspread the horizon would disappear. But so long as there was disunion and suspicion between these great Powers, the peace of Europe would always be in danger.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken, that the two most important points to remember in this debate were the relations of Schleswig and Holstein with Denmark and Germany, and the interpretation of the famous despatch of September 24, 1862. He would deal with the first point at once. The right hon. Gentleman said that Schleswig was united to Holstein. This might be true in 1848-9, when the country was upset by revolution and commotion; but for hundreds of years Schleswig had been a part of Denmark, and the Eider had been the boundary, Holstein belonging to the German Confederation, and Schleswig to Denmark. He had already called the attention of the House to an important treaty ratified by the French King in 1720, by which France, in concert with England, guaranteed the Duchy of Schleswig to Denmark. With regard to the despatch of Earl Russell, dated September 24, 1862, and called the Gotha despatch, it was the keynote of all the embarrassments which now surrounded the question. His case was, that the noble Earl (Earl Russell) had lowered the just influence of England, not only by holding out menaces that were not fulfilled, but also by laying down general principles of conduct upon which foreign nations, believing in the Foreign Secretary, thought the English Government would act. Lord Russell on one occasion asserted that when a weaker people were fighting for their homes it was the business of a greater Power to assist them. That general principle was quoted everywhere on the Continent as the guiding policy of the noble Earl, and this was one of the main causes of the embarrassments that had ensued. Acting in that spirit, Lord Russell dictated to Denmark the principles on which that kingdom should be governed, and went into the smallest details in a manner which could not but give offence to an independent nation. Lord Russell returned from his attendance on Her Majesty about the 17th of September, and the despatch was dated on the 24th of September, but it was not communicated until October 11. What became of the despatch during that interval? The noble Earl, writing to Sir Augustus Paget, said —

> "Sir,—I had yesterday a long conversation with M. Bille. He called in consequence of the report of a despatch which I was about to send to the great Courts. M. Bille proceeded to say that this report had caused great alarm in the Danish Government; that they had hitherto reason to believe Her Majesty's Government favourable to the rights of Denmark. The Danish Government, upon the advice of the British Government, and other allies of Denmark, had complied with the requisitions of Germany in regard to Holstein and Lauenberg. Their only stronghold at present was the constitution which bound together Denmark and Schleswig; this gone, the Danish monarchy would fall to pieces."—*Correspondence*, (1862) 311.

Now, before it was communicated, the Danish Minister told Lord Russell what effect the mere rumour of such despatch would have upon the Continent. But, in spite of all that, in spite of the difficulty in which he knew he was placing his country, in spite of the warning he had got, the despatch was communicated. On October 14, Mr. Paget writes to Earl Russell —

> "M. Hall was visibly agitated while I was reading the despatch, and when I gave him a copy of it he said that he had never expected to receive such a document at the hands of Her Majesty's Government. Coming at such a moment, he considered it the most disastrous blow that could be inflicted on the cause of Denmark, and as leading most surely, if acted upon, to absolutism, or to the dismemberment of the Danish monarchy. . . . . He thought, moreover, he had some right to complain that, whereas this despatch had been communicated more than a fortnight to Berlin and Vienna, it was only now communicated to the Danish Government. He had always looked to England as the surest support of Denmark. No one had upheld more strongly than your Lordship that Germany had no rights over those parts of the monarchy not appertaining to the German Confederation, and it was certainly, therefore, not from your Lordship that he expected a project to emanate which suggested the abolition of the common constitution."—*Correspondence*, (1862) 315.

Here was the origin of all the embarrassment that had followed. Lord Russell took upon himself to give advice to the Danish Government—he was warned of the bad effect it would have—and in spite of that he gave it, and communicated it to the Courts of Berlin and Vienna. He must say that if the Resolution had been a great deal stronger it would only have been treating the Government with due severity. He would not trouble the House by repeating that tissue of ineffectual menaces which were afterwards made to the great Powers; but we were now placed in a very painful position in consequence. The hon. Member for Bridgewater (Mr. Kinglake) had interposed between the House and the Government by an Amendment, by means of which the Government expected to slip through. But they would not say "Aye" or "No" fairly to the Resolution before the House. This was no party question. [*A laugh.*] The hon. Gentleman might laugh, but on that (the Opposition) side they did not make it a party question in the least. The Government, however, made it a party question, otherwise they would not have ten Members voting with the noble Lord. If a Gentleman went into the lobby he would meet with hon. Members who would say they were very glad Kinglake had brought forward his Amendment in order to get Lord Russell out of the scrape, because they did not like to throw the noble Viscount overboard, seeing that he had served his party well. But he was surprised that such an Amendment should have proceeded from the hon. Member. His hon. Friend was the author of a most remarkable book, *The History of the Crimean War*. He had read that book not once but several times, and he had extracted from it an eloquent passage, which he should like to read. It was this :—

> "Any Prince who may be inclined to wrong another State casts his eyes abroad to see the condition of the great Powers. If he observes that they are all in a sound state, and headed by firm and able rulers, who are equal, if need be, to the duty of taking up arms, he knows that the contemplated outrage would produce a war, and unless he be a madman or a desperado he will be inclined to hold back. On the other hand, if he sees that any great nation which ought to be foremost to resist him is in a state of exceptional weakness, or under the governance of unworthy or incapable rulers, then, perhaps, he allows himself to entertain a hope that she may not have the spirit or wisdom to perform her duty; that is the hope—and it may be said in these days it is the only hope—which would drive a sane Prince to become the disturber of Europe. To frustrate this hope—in other words, to keep alive the dread of a just and an avenging war, should be the care of every statesman who would faithfully labour to preserve the peace of Europe. In general, when the world believes England is firm, there is peace; it is the hope of finding her weak and irresolute that tends to breed war. If a Power fails in this duty to itself and Europe, it suddenly becomes lowered in the opinion of mankind; and, happily,

there is no historic lesson more true, than that a moral degradation of this sort is"—what?—"speedily followed by disasters."

This was beautifully expressed, and it was such words as these that he should have expected to hear on this occasion from his hon. Friend, but they were quite inconsistent with the Amendment now placed before the House by their author. It was a sad position in which this country was placed. The interests of a great country found themselves opposed to the great, noble, and generous performance of duty. He did not hesitate to say so, because the interests of this country were always for peace, and always must be. At any rate, war was so terrible a scourge that every nation would pause before making an appeal to what was called the *ultima ratio regum.* But grant that war was a terrible thing, yet we could not but feel our present humiliation. He had seen to-day the contest between the Schools of Eton and Harrow, and when he beheld those gallant boys he could not but feel ashamed to recall the expressions of contempt which he had heard on the Continent against the policy of the noble Lord. But it was said that, at any rate, the country was still at peace. This was the extraordinary part of the business, for the Government made proposals to some of the great Powers to go to war, and it was made their special excuse for not going to war because France and Russia would not aid them. The noble Lord the Prime Minister could not end his speech the other night without suggesting an occasion which would impel this country to war. The noble Lord was very fond of interfering, but he must say that when the noble Lord was Foreign Secretary this country was respected owing to the energetic character of the noble Lord, with whom it was a word and a blow. But what has become of the *civis Romanus* now? The noble Viscount's policy was very unlike the noble Earl's. What was now the feeling in Denmark about England, where England used to be loved? In a book written by Mr. Herbert, the brother of Lord Carnarvon, a most touching record was given of the effect of the mismanagement of English foreign policy on the feelings of the Danish people. That gentleman wrote—

"To be born a Dane is to be born an honest, courteous gentleman. The Danes are sorely hurt at our desertion of their fortunes; they feel it the more severely because between them and England there has existed a silent brotherhood. English is the language that is taught in their schools and colleges; their customs, their feelings, their thoughts are all English. Whatever the Danes feel on the subject of England, they say but little to an Englishman; it always touches me to see how much their courtesy seals their lips. Sometimes, however, the thought escapes them—'I cannot go to England this year; all is too much changed.' They read with great delight the debate on Denmark in the House of Lords. 'It was the old Norse blood,' they said, 'that ran so hotly on that night.'"

He should like the noble Lord at the head of the Government to explain the fresh menace he uttered the other evening when he said, that if the Allied troops were to occupy the Danish Islands, to bombard Copenhagen, or to take the King prisoner, the Government would take the matter into consideration. What was the force of those words? He hoped the vote of the House to-night would show, not that the country was going to war, but that the House did not approve a policy which had degraded and humiliated England.

LORD ELCHO: No doubt the noble Lord will give a satisfactory answer to the question just put to him, though it may perhaps not prove to be satisfactory to the hon. Member. As a disinterested spectator of a party struggle, I am anxious very shortly to explain my views on the question submitted to the consideration of the House. The hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Osborne), in an amusing speech resembling a pyrotechnic display, which dazzles the eyes and pleases the senses of the spectators, but which when examined for argument offers nothing but a few bits of burnt paper and charred stick, said that the House had been drenched and saturated with despatches and quotations from the blue-books. As far as I am concerned, I can promise not to cite any single passage from any one of these 1,500 pages which the right hon. Gentleman the late Chancellor of the Exchequer told us he had studied with so much care, but which the present Chancellor of the Exchequer showed that he had studied to little profit. I readily admit that this country stands in a disagreeable position. Failure in a just cause, and even in a bad cause, is always disagreeable; but, because the negotiations have failed, I cannot see any justice in carrying a Vote of Censure against the Government; and if I had any doubt on this point in my mind, it would have been removed by the course of the present discussion. It was my good fortune to listen to the great gladiatorial contest between the right hon. Gentleman the Member for

Buckinghamshire and the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and it appears to me that the Chancellor of the Exchequer tore into shreds the web, or rather the net, which the right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire, the *retiarius* of his party, had manufactured with so much care and labour. The speech of the right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire was intended to be a general bill of indictment against the foreign policy of the Government; but it was somewhat strange that in a bill of indictment against the whole foreign policy of the Government no mention was made of Italy, none of Syria. It must have been for one of two reasons that Italy was not mentioned — either because the policy of the Government in regard to Italy was considered sound and unassailable, or because there were circumstances connected with the present debate which rendered it desirable that Italy should not be mentioned on the other side of the House. In Syria the Government obtained a great and undeniable diplomatic success. The greatest credit is, in my opinion, due to Lord Dufferin, who conducted the negotiations on the spot, and succeeded in inducing the French Government, who may be said to have held the keys of St. Peter in one hand and of the Holy Sepulchre in the other, to withdraw their army of occupation from Syria. The present question, however, resolves itself practically into one concerning the conduct of the Government in regard to Denmark. It is not a question of policy. We are all, I think, agreed in favour of a policy of peace. It is simply a question of conduct. What, then, are the faults found with the conduct of the Government in this Danish Question? The main objections urged here and elsewhere against the Government may be summed up as follows:—First, that they did not adopt a decided line in the first instance; second, that they menaced and did not follow up their menaces by action; and third, that they held out to Denmark promises which they were not able to fulfil. Now, I must say that if the Government had at the outset taken what is called a strong course, it would, in my opinion have been of very doubtful policy. It is easy to be prophètic after the event; but how do we know what might have been the consequences of action? Prussia is obstinate and excited on this matter, as much from a fear of revolution at home as from a desire to assist the Germans in Schleswig-Holstein. Prussia is, moreover, a great military nation; and if in midwinter, when the ice was still in the Baltic, we had sent a fleet thither and a contingent of 30,000 or 40,000 men to support Denmark, it is questionable whether we should have been successful in preventing the flooding of the Danish mainland by the hosts of Germany. Without any discredit to us, that policy might, perhaps, have resulted in misfortune and disaster. I do not believe that our honour has suffered in consequence of the failure of our negotiations, or that our influence in Europe is really lessened. I believe that a nation like England, strong in her armaments and known integrity of purpose, will always continue to possess her just influence in the councils of Europe. It is true that we are closely allied to Denmark—it is true that the Rose of Denmark has been transplanted to the English soil, and is now the pride of England—it is true that we felt indignant that Denmark should be used as an outlet for the revolutionary passions of Germany, and that the Danes should be made experimental targets for needle guns; but we are not called upon, either by honour or by interest, to go to war for Denmark, any more than any of the other Powers that signed the Treaty of 1852. I do not feel that we have been humiliated by the course which has been pursued by Her Majesty's Government in this matter. In dealing with the alleged menaces the element of time is generally left out of consideration; but it is necessarily very important. I am not in favour of threats without action. I greatly prefer hard hitting to hard talking, and I am not an admirer of everything that has been said or written by the Government on this subject. At the same time I cannot shut my eyes to the circumstances under which indications of future conduct were given. When the Government used strong language they had reason to believe that the other signataries of the treaty would cordially join with them, and when they discovered their mistake they changed their tone. I do not, therefore, see in the despatches any ground for censuring the Government in regard to the language which they employed. The Chancellor of the Exchequer referred to the analogous case of Spain in 1823, when England, although anxious to prevent the invasion, only looked on. The Opposition then, as the Opposition does now, approved the policy of peace; but that did not prevent them from attacking the Government. They said, "We are against war;

but we think you should have used stronger language at the first, and then there would have been less risk of war, for that would have deterred France from going into Spain." That is another feature of analogy between that case and the present which the right hon. Gentleman overlooked. I have not the slightest doubt that, at the present time, if the Government had followed the example of Mr. Canning and abstained from strong language, we should have heard the Opposition making that a ground of complaint, and insisting that a decided tone would have afforded greater security for peace. The third point is as to the Government having deceived Denmark. At the opening of the Session there was great doubt and apprehension on this subject, for it was feared that the honour of England might have been pledged in an unfortunate manner. I, for one, entertained this fear; but, after hearing the speech of the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary in another place, I went home comforted. The noble Lord distinctly said that we had not promised material aid to Denmark; and, in confirmation of that, he told the House of Lords that the Danish Minister had declared to him that the Danes expected no material help, but only sympathy from England. Therefore, on none of these three heads of the indictment do I think the Government open to condemnation. I own that we have failed, and failure must be mortifying. It is painful, too, to stand idly by and see a gallant little State bullied by a large nation like Germany. It is sad to see wrong thus rampant and triumphant, and to find Faust-recht — the barbarous policy of Goetz of the Iron Hand — again in the ascendant in the middle of the 19th century: but we are not to blame for this. I attribute our failure to the fact that England was really the only Power ready to go to the assistance of Denmark. We had no *arrière pensée*—no compensations to seek, no boundaries to extend or frontiers to rectify. We were willing to do our part to protect a small Power from the oppressions of a large one, and to prevent might from becoming paramount in Europe, if the other signataries of the treaty had gone along with us. The Protocols prove that it was from mere accident, consequent on the meeting of the Conference having been held in London, that Earl Russell was the mouthpiece of the neutral Powers. They all endorsed his proposals in the Conference. I cannot, then, admit that my country is humiliated by the failure of the negotiations, or that our influence in the counsels of Europe is forfeited. On this occasion we were not bound to go to war by ourselves single-handed; but that does not mean that England will never again engage singly in war. We showed our readiness to fight, if it were necessary, in defence of our honour in the *Trent* case; and one can easily conceive that questions might arise in regard to the independence of neighbouring States, in regard to our highway to India, and in regard to other matters, which might lead us to rise in arms in support of our honour or our interests. Our indignation at the treatment which a country so nearly allied to us in various ways as Denmark has received is just and natural; but we alone are not called upon to stand up for the maintenance of the balance of power in Europe Nor is the balance of power the figment which some hon. Members imagine. It is the expression of a desire on the part of the nations to live together in peace and amity; but its main principle is, "Take care of No. 1." It would not be right for England to peril her power and authority by Quixotically serving as the sole policeman of Europe. From the way in which hon. Gentlemen opposite seem to luxuriate in a sense of humiliation, it must be, one would fancy, a pleasant and delicious sensation. They appear absolutely to revel in this feeling of humiliation. My hon. Friend opposite cannot even go to the cricket match between Eton and Harrow, which *The Times* calls a great constitutional game, without experiencing humiliation. What association there can be in the hon. Gentleman's mind between Cricket, the Danish Question, and this Motion, I am at a loss to understand, unless it be that the hon. Gentleman and his friends think they have been fielding long enough, and that it is now their turn to have an innings. I confess that I for one do not feel humiliated, and in looking to this question, and in looking back to the past, I cannot help thinking that hon. Gentlemen who censure the Government for having dishonoured and humiliated the country would do well if they recollected the golden rule, not only to do but to feel towards others as you would they should feel unto you. In 1859, when Lord Malmesbury held the seals of the Foreign Office, I recollect how the policy of the Government was censured. I thought the censure unjust at the time, and I brought forward a Resolution stating that the honour of the country had not suffered in their hands. But there was also the case of the *Charles et Georges,* which occurred soon after, a matter in which the Foreign Minister of England figured. In both Houses of Parliament—by Lord Wodehouse in one and by the hon Member for Bridgewater (Mr. Kinglake) in the other—was the conduct of the Government denounced, and the hon. Member for Bridgewater went so far as to say that England had not been so humiliated and degraded since the days of Charles II. Although I do not feel humiliated now, I did then; and I cannot help recollecting that hon. Gentlemen opposite, who are so lavish of censure now, were the first to deny that the country had been dishonoured and humiliated then. These recollections of the past should, therefore, make hon. Gentlemen opposite careful how they bring like accusations against their successors. But be that as it may, I cannot think it a patriotic course to endeavour to step into office upon the humiliation of the country, and I will be no party to censure a Government which has earnestly, honestly, and perseveringly, although unsuccessfully, laboured in defence of treaty rights and for the maintenance of peace and order in Europe.

MR. SCOURFIELD said, that when he first heard that it was impossible for Parliament to separate without expressing some opinion upon the Danish Question, he felt it difficult to deny the propriety of such a course; but, at the same time, he felt a secret misgiving as to the nature of the advantage that was to be derived from it. That misgiving was founded upon the remark of a very eminent statesman who once held a distinguished position in this country—that he never felt thoroughly alarmed when he parted with his colleagues, except when they had all come to a determination that something must be done. The same difficulty applied to a determination that something must be said when they had no definite idea as to the nature of what that something must be. Every person who had spoken appeared to be anxious to relieve himself of the responsibility of saying anything in favour of war. Indeed, one hon. Member went so far as to declare that it would be absolute insanity to go to war with Germany for the sake of the Duchies. It was hardly necessary for any man of average common sense to say that he was averse to war, but, at the same time, it would be very imprudent to make any general declaration against war such as had been made in that House. They could not control events, and a mere declaration in favour of peace had not the effect of producing peace. No Englishman desired to see this country embroiled in a war with Germany, but it was impossible to say what might not be forced upon us. It was hardly possible to avoid the embarrassment which the question now before the House had occasioned. For his own part he denied the necessity of doing something when the something to be done was worse than nothing. It was an axiom of policy with some people, that something must be done; but if that something was radically bad, it was better to remain perfectly quiet than to pass a Resolution which must deceive. He disliked abstract Resolutions, because, under a vague form of words, very false issues might be raised; and for that reason, since he had been a Member of the House, he had almost invariably voted against abstract Resolutions. With regard to the present Resolution he could only contemplate it in two aspects—interior and exterior. In its interior aspect it meant nothing but the transfer of power from one side of the House to the other; and as to its exterior aspect, the country and the people of Europe generally would scarcely imagine that the House of Commons had met and had had a serious discussion upon the question of Denmark, without stating what was intended to be done. He admitted that we were not bound to say what we would do; but it would be very mischievous if Resolutions of this kind were brought before the House simply for the purpose of making a little political capital out of them. It appeared to him that the House was exercising a sort of criminal jurisdiction, and was now engaged in trying the Government: yet, although he had had some experience as a magistrate, he had the greatest difficulty in arriving at a satisfactory conclusion as to the merits of the charges brought against the Government. One night an accusation was made that the noble Lord at the head of the Foreign Office had declined an offer of mediation; and the next they were told that it was no such thing. The noble Lord at the head of the Government was accused of having stated that, in the event of a war, Denmark would not act alone; and it was said on the other side, that if the context of the noble Lord's speech was examined it would be found that there were two other Powers engaged in backing Denmark to whom the remark applied. It was not want of honour but want of skill that was imputed to the Government, and that was a very difficult matter for the House to decide, although it was extremely easy for any one to say that they might have done better. The House had been in some degree an accomplice in the course pursued by the Government, for it had over and over again compelled the Government to deliver lectures to the Governments of other Nations; it was almost on the point of declaring itself for war on the Polish Question; and therefore it was but fair that some share of the blame should be distributed to the House. He could have wished that the Resolution had been brought before them in a different shape. Even if it were true that "the just influence of the country had been lowered," he did not see how the matter was to be made much better by the House declaring that fact. That reminded him of the celebrated character in one of Shakespeare's plays who wished to be "written down an ass." He did not wish it to be written down by the House that this country's influence had been lowered, and he thought the influence of this House was likely to be lowered if they turn out the Government without expressing an opinion on their policy. Moreover, the Motion was indefinite. The hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), who was always straightforward, had moved an Amendment which some might think dangerous, but which, at least, meant something; yet if that House went to a division he would probably find that those who agreed with him in that were very few. He saw no practical object that was to be gained by transferring power from one party in that House to the other; and he thought that if they were to come to a solemn Resolution on the question before them, they ought to declare something with regard to the future as well as to the past. In the absence of such a declaration, he could not be a party to a Resolution, although it came from his own side of the House, which simply referred to what was past without affording any practical indication of the course which ought to be pursued.

THE O'DONOGHUE said, the Motion of the right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire censured the Government for having failed in their avowed policy of maintaining the integrity and independence of Denmark. The Amendment of the hon. Member for North Warwickshire must be taken as a condemnation of the Government for not having avowed their determination to maintain that integrity and independence by armed intervention; and the Amendment by the hon. Member for Bridgewater might be said to mean that, apart from all other considerations, the House ought to be grateful to the Government for maintaining peace, and ought to manifest its feeling by silently and tranquilly adapting itself to circumstances. He believed the original Motion would be supported by a large number on its intrinsic merits, that the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley) would be the solitary follower of the hon. Member for North Warwickshire, and that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Bridgewater would be accepted by the Government as meaning that, no matter what else happened, the integrity of the Treasury bench ought to be maintained. The tendency of the discussion had been to raise a much larger question than any that had actually been brought forward; and the practical result of their decision would be affected by the confidence which the general policy of the Government might have inspired. Even the Chancellor of the Exchequer had admitted that their foreign policy had failed. But those who intended to support them might nevertheless ask, "Can you forget what they have done for Ireland? Can you forget how they have settled the question of tenant-right—how they have both deplored and sought to arrest the depopulation of that country—how they have dealt with the question of the Established Church—how they have secured for Ireland a fair share of the public expenditure—how they have given a charter to the Catholic University—or how, at a moment of unparalleled distress, they have widely opened the public purse, and through the mouth of the Chief Secretary appealed to the inexhaustible treasury of English generosity?" If hon. Gentlemen who meant to support the Government were able to point to such things as these, he could understand the Vote they were about to give. But his own opportunities of observation had not enabled him to discover that the Government had done anything for Ireland which they ought to have done, and he believed that for him to support them would be a violation of the duty he owed to his constituents and his country. It was not fair on the part of the hon. Member for East Norfolk (Mr. Howes) to refer to rumours disparaging to the character of Members of that House, the accuracy of which he doubted. The hon. Member for Kildare (Mr. Cogan) had replied to the insinuations of the hon. Gentleman in eloquent and indignant terms. So far as he was personally concerned, he confessed, instead of being irritated, he was rather amused by these insinuations. There always had been and always would be some persons in that House who would persist in believing that on all critical occasions there were Jesuits in disguise in the galleries and about the lobbies, endeavouring to operate on the minds of Roman Catholic Members. The House of Commons would be incomplete without some persons to represent this peculiar class of delusions. Only yesterday he was given to understand by an hon. Friend of his, a member of the Church of England, that two eminent ecclesiastics had arrived in this country in order to assist at the overthrow of the noble Viscount's Administration. He could assure the House there was no kind of truth in the rumours to which the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Norfolk had referred ; and the Vote he was about to give had nothing whatever to do with the fact of his being a Roman Catholic, but was altogether the result of the almost universal distrust which was felt of the policy of Her Majesty's Government. Apart from the general question of confidence in the Government, this Resolution contained two propositions which were perfectly true. First, that Government had failed in upholding the integrity and independence of Denmark ; and, second, that the just influence of England had been lowered in the councils of Europe. Must not every candid mind acknowledge that all this was true ? Had they not inspired the Danes to resist even at overwhelming odds. That fact had certainly lowered the influence of England in the councils of Europe by creating a suspicion in the minds of Continental Governments, that England's character for truth and honour could not be relied upon. Moreover, Continental Governments would believe that England abstained from acting because she was afraid ; and they would believe so for this reason—the Government said that England would have to contend against the whole German people, because France and Russia for some reasons seemed determined not to act. It was said that France and Russia were parties to the Conference, and that they had failed as well as England. But they distinctly stated that they were not partisans, and they never threatened in word or deed. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had accepted the issue of confidence or no confidence. Speaking, then, of Ireland, of which he knew something, he ventured to say there was not a constituency in that country which had confidence in the Government. There was not an Irish Member who owed his seat to the fact of his being a supporter of the noble Viscount. He believed the time was very near when the noble Viscount and his Friends would experience the consequences of the distrust and dissatisfaction their policy had created in Ireland; and he, for one, would rejoice in the advent to power of those of whom it could be said that they never promised without meaning to perform, or created expectations destined never to be realized.

MR. BUXTON said, the hon. Gentlemen opposite had some difficulty in concealing their aspirations for war—except the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), who had boldly given them the same counsel which a far less respectable Gentleman had given in another place. Almost in the very words of Beelzebub he exclaimed

> "My sentence is for open war ; of wiles
> More unexpert I boast not ; them let those
> Contrive who need, or when they need—not now."

The right hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite also (General Peel) had, against his will, advocated a war policy—at any rate, the lion, in his speech, lay down so near the lamb that no one could tell which was lion and which was lamb. Then the hon. Member for West Norfolk (Mr. Bentinck) thought the head and front of the offending of the Government was that they had reduced the Naval Estimates. A paper had been placed in his (Mr. Buxton's) hands by the noble Lord the Secretary of the Admiralty which would console the hon. Gentleman. Never was the fleet more efficient. There were now 10 iron-clads in commission ; 4 more would be ready directly ; 9 besides were building ; and 4 more were nearly finished—making in all 27 iron-clads, besides floating batteries. He had listened with the closest attention on the first evening of this debate to the speech of the right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire, and the conclusion he had come to was that, while it was intended as a solemn indictment of the British Government, the facts were too strong for the right hon. Gentleman, and he turned it into an indictment of the Governments of Russia and

France. The right hon. Gentleman laid it down as an indisputable axiom, that if France, Russia, and England combined, war would be impossible. At the same time he employed all his comic powers in travestying the strenuous efforts of the British Government, notwithstanding what he called humiliating rebuffs, to induce the Emperors of Russia and France to enter into that very combination with us by which, according to the right hon. Gentleman himself, war would have been impossible. Surely it followed that the British Government had been unjustly blamed, and that all the guilt—if guilt there were—rested upon Russia and France, who coldly rejected that proposal by which Denmark must have been saved. Now, the right hon. Gentleman, and nearly all those who followed him on that side of the House, had laboriously scrutinized the 1,500 pages of blue-book on this subject, in order to scrape together every word that could possibly seem to bear out the idea that we gave unfounded encouragement to Denmark. The right hon. Gentleman came forward with a Vote of Censure against Government for its shameful treachery to Denmark. He had moved Heaven and earth; he had searched through and through every sentence in those great blue-books for the materials of his censure. For himself he (Mr. Buxton) frankly admitted that, in the conduct of this affair, lasting for many months, involving a huge amount of correspondence and of negotiation, and passing through such a singular variety of phases, things had been said and written, which, with the light of the event upon them, might be looked upon with some regret; but, at the same time, he thought that every one must have noticed the fatal, the ruinous omission in the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman and his supporters who had attacked the Government. How was it that when he came forward to avenge that cruel wrong to Denmark he had not a sentence, he had not a line, he had not a word to quote showing that Denmark herself deemed that she had been treated with treachery? Surely, if England had lured her on by false pretences, and had brought those woes upon her by pretending to hold out her right hand to aid her, and then leaving her in the lurch, surely then Denmark herself would fill the world with the accents of her indignation! There would be some despatch—there would be some appeal—from Denmark to the public opinion of the world

—some reclamations against such base misconduct. It was an overwhelming fact, that neither the right hon. Gentleman, nor any of those who had followed him, had pointed to a single word to that effect uttered by Denmark. No doubt Denmark had expressed profound grief and disappointment at finding that we did not come armed to her aid; but that was altogether another thing from expressing indignation at having been deceived. It seemed to him that the position of hon. Gentlemen opposite in that respect partook of the ridiculous. They seemed to be saying to Denmark, in the words of the Friend of Humanity—

"Drops of compassion tremble on my eyelids,
Ready to fall as soon as you have told your
Pitiful story."

Whereas the virtual answer that Denmark gave to them was simply—

"Story; God bless you, I have none to tell, Sir."

Whereupon *exit* the right hon. Gentleman in a transport of universal philanthropy and indignation. Now, the mind of that House had been sufficiently saturated with extracts from despatches and questions as to the exact amount of responsibility in which they involved the Government. The phrases used by the noble Lord (Viscount Palmerston) and by Lord Russell in many of his despatches did—it must in all frankness be allowed—amount to menaces of war against Germany; whereas the palpable fact was that we refrained from war. He did not wonder that Europe should have put those two things together, and jumped to the conclusion that England blustered and threatened without meaning to perform. But he spoke the real conviction of his mind when he said that that conclusion, however plausible, was false. England threatened Germany; that could not be denied. But the essential thing to observe was that all those threats were uttered during the first phase of the affair, when there was every reason to expect that France and Russia would join with this country in resisting the dismemberment of Denmark. Those threats during that period were perfectly sincere, and would have been carried out. After it had become clear that Russia and France would not join, then from that moment England ceased to menace Germany with armed resistance, and betook herself to negotiation alone. Those who wished to form a true judgment on the conduct of the Government could not do so unless they fixed their eyes on that vital point of time and circumstances under which those menaces were uttered; and he could not refrain from saying how glad he was that the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley) with that candour and love of truth which distinguished him, had admitted the bearing of those considerations on that famous sentence which had been so often cast in the teeth of the noble Lord at the head of the Government. But whether those threats were defensible or not, he could not think that the question they had to decide was a mere question of the force and meaning of phrases. It would be a most pitiful thing for Parliament to abdicate its functions as supreme judge of the policy of this country, and turn itself into a petty critic of the details of the manner in which that policy had been carried out. The Resolution proposed by the right hon. Gentleman was constructed with subtle skill; but depend upon it, the strong common sense of the people of this country would demand that if Parliament condemned or maintained the Government, they should not do so upon the ground of a few phrases, the real tenour of which might have been misconceived and the circumstances of the utterance of which might have been forgotten. The people of this country—nay the people of Europe—were looking to that House for a discussion and a decision upon the broad policy which the Government had pursued. That policy had, it seemed to him, been marked by three main features. It was marked at the outset by an energetic endeavour on the part of England to induce Russia and France to combine with us in guaranteeing the integrity of Denmark, if need were, by force of arms. The second great feature, in the policy of the Government was their determination, after France and Russia had rejected those proposals, not to fight for Denmark alone. The third main feature of their policy was, that after the Government had come to that conclusion, although they had decided against war, they did not stand coldly aloof, but came forward earnestly and strenuously as mediators between the combatants. He would state as succinctly as he could what to his mind were the grounds for a true judgment upon each of these main features of the policy of the Government. With regard to the endeavour made last year by the Government to persuade Russia and France to combine with us to secure justice to Denmark, he would content himself with saying that he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bucks that such a combination would have rendered war impossible, and therefore as a lover of peace and humanity he held that the Government had been right. He passed on to that far more complex question, which had perplexed every thoughtful mind during the last few months, the question whether the honour and duty of England required us to go to war for Denmark, although standing alone in her defence. Now, he believed that there were few even of those who clearly held that it would not have been well to fight for Denmark but had come to that conclusion with reluctance, hesitation, and pain. No man could be so cold-hearted as not to have watched with admiring sympathy the gallant bearing of the Danes, and the bold front with which they had met the calamities that had swept over them. They had encountered their fate with dignity, firmness, and valour; and our admiration for them had been enhanced by the shame and disgust with which even those who advocated the German side had witnessed the rapacity, the reckless and brutal violence of the Allied Powers—or rather, he should say, of Prussia. Every generous impulse made us long to protect Denmark by force of arms. But not merely the statesmen, but the people of this country had felt that it was not by impulses of indignation that they ought to be swayed, but that it behoved them to investigate rigidly the whole bearings of the case; and distressing as many of them had felt that conclusion to be to which they had been driven, they could not on that account the less acknowledge, that in refraining from giving material aid to Denmark without any support from either Russia or France, our Government had acted wisely and well. It was admitted, he believed, on all sides, that if England had intervened on behalf of Denmark it would have been simply a piece of generous chivalry on her part, not a course imposed upon this country by any material interest of our own. Now, he cordially allowed that in many cases such a course might be the right and wise one for England to pursue; but what he ventured to affirm was, that the circumstances of this case did not permit us to adopt that fascinating and attractive policy. At the outset we could not blind ourselves to this, that the case on behalf of Denmark was by no means free from complications. This was not, in its commencement at least, an unprovoked aggression by two great Powers, with the view of spoliation. No one who had studied the matter could deny, however warmly we might feel for the Danes, that they had not been guiltless of their own blood. It must be owned that in a very great degree it was owing to their own want of judgment —nay, more, to their own want of justice— when the power rested in their own hands, that these calamities had come upon them. In their treatment of Holstein and Schleswig they were led by violent partisan feeling to act with deplorable harshness and folly, and that, too, in defiance of the urgent remonstrances of England; and thus they had given to Germany a right, which no man could question who had studied the case, to interfere. Some had talked as if England might have aided Denmark with her fleet alone. But she must undoubtedly have landed a large army to prevent the irruption of the German hosts; and, whatever they might think of England's power of waging war, surely no statesman but must pause at the thought of a collision with the enormous force wielded by the 40,000,000 who inhabit Germany, and whose peace establishment was said to be little short of a million men; and we were to encounter those serious risks for a cause the justice of which was far from clear, at a moment when already our energies were seriously taxed, and the horizon seemed to be lowering with coming storms. At the commencement of the year when these affairs in the North of Europe wore their most ominous aspect, we were either actually engaged in war, or war seemed likely to arise in Japan, China, India, and New Zealand; above all, at that time, there was grave reason to fear that the excessive irritation of the Federals might involve us in war with them on behalf of Canada. But then they had been told that we possessed an extraordinary power of assailing Germany in the rear, by stirring up revolution among the oppressed nationalities of Southern Europe; but, even had that task been easy, he asked what British statesman worthy of the name —he asked what man of common sense or common humanity—would have cared to take the awful responsibility of lighting the flames of civil war and filling Southern Europe with bloodshed and ruin? He should shrink with horror from the idea of stepping forward to kindle such a conflagration as that. Then, again, as Earl Russell had more than once hinted, who could say what attempt France might make were we at war with Germany, to seize on the left bank of the Rhine? and no one could think without dismay of the calamities which such a step might bring upon Europe. These considerations might seem ample, but they could not also forget the frightful risks to our commerce which such a war would engender. If honour demanded war, all considerations of expediency must, of course, give way; but without the compulsion of honour or duty it would be little less than wickedness for a statesman to involve his country in a war that must involve a fearful loss of life and fearful suffering. He thought the Government deserved the thanks and not the condemnation of the House, inasmuch as they had kept the country at peace, when there were great temptations to involve it in war. He would now touch very briefly on the third and last main feature of the policy of the Government. In deciding for peace they might have taken either the one or the other of two courses. They might, like France and Russia, have looked on with cold indifference and refused to move a finger to stave off or to soften the disasters that had befallen Denmark. Such a course would have had all the prudence that attends upon unalloyed selfishness; and they had learnt in that debate that such a course would have been approved by some on both sides of the House. As a Member of the Liberal party, he rejoiced that their leaders did not take that cold and selfish course. He rejoiced that they were moved by generous sympathy for Denmark, by an earnest desire to prevent wrong from being done, and to preserve the peace of Europe. Actuated by such motives they came forward as mediators in the strife, and earnestly and strenuously endeavoured to prevent, and then to stop the war between Germany and Denmark. In doing so they had, of course, to urge upon Denmark to make great sacrifices; they had at the same time to force the German statesmen to remember the obligations that bound them and the claims of justice and humanity. It was inevitable that a mediator playing such a part and allaying the pretensions of either side should incur condemnation from all sides, and encounter ridicule and abuse from those who found their schemes opposed. The generous endeavour of England to restore peace failed. It remained for them to bear with dignity the misconstruction to which failure could not but expose them from those who cared little for peace and humanity, but much for seeing what they called the humiliation of England, or of the Liberal Government.

His own conviction was that when the excitement had died away, and the policy of England was calmly judged, then, despite some errors, it would be owned to have been a policy statesmanlike and prudent as regarded ourselves, towards others generous and humane.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, that the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken had fallen into the same error that had been committed by many hon. Members on his side of the House, who had spoken in this debate — he had mis-stated the nature of the case against the Government, and had misunderstood the arguments by which it was supported. The hon. Gentleman, like others, had argued the question as if the whole matter depended on the production of meagre extracts from despatches. They turned and twisted these extracts as they pleased, and when they had compared one sentence with another, and said that the Opposition had attached too much importance to this or that passage, they thought they had upset the case against the Government. But that was not the way in which this question was to be dealt with. The charge against the Government did not rest upon a few meagre extracts which might be twisted and turned, this way and that, but upon the evidence on which the Resolution was founded affirming that England had been humiliated and her just influence lowered in the recent negotiations. The charge against the Government rested on the want of sagacity and statesmanship shown by them in the whole course of the negotiations, and the supporters of the Resolution maintained, not that England had been humiliated, but that through the conduct of the Administration she had lost a portion of her just influence among the nations of Europe. When the Treaty of 1852 was concluded the best arrangement which the circumstances of the time admitted of was made, but it was an arrangement containing in itself great difficulties, because it involved the maintenance of relations of a complicated description between Germany and Denmark. In the course of the ten years which followed, it appeared that neither Denmark nor Germany were prepared to carry out the arrangement of 1852, and by 1862 it ought to have become obvious to any statesman of sagacity that it had become extremely difficult or impossible to maintain that arrangement. What, then, was the position which England ought to have occupied and the course she should have taken? Having no personal or distinct private interest in the maintenance of the treaty, but interested in preserving the balance of power, England ought to have occupied the position of mediator and arbitrator, and thus she would have been able to mediate with effect and influence. Now, what was required of a mediator and arbitrator who desired to act effectually in the matter? It was essential that he should be recognized as impartial and as prepared to take a fair view of the question. Did England, under the guidance of the noble Earl at the head of the Foreign Office, occupy that position? On the contrary, she had been notoriously placed in the opposite position by the noble Earl the Foreign Secretary. In September, 1862, the noble Earl, instead of maintaining this attitude of reserve and inpartiality, stepped forward without necessity, and by the despatch of the 24th of September he expressed his opinion that Denmark was wrong in the questions between her and Germany, and pointed out concessions which she ought to make in order to set herself right. The effect of that announcement was such as might have been expected. It encouraged the German feeling throughout the Continent, while upon Denmark the effect was depressing and discouraging; and she remonstrated, and replied with so much indignation that the noble Earl was obliged in November to send out a second despatch, somewhat modifying the expressions he had previously used. The consequence was that on this second despatch Denmark pretended to found the Patent of March, which was the foundation of the ensuing troubles. He did not say that the despatch justified Denmark in what she did, but it furnished her with an excuse. The consequence was that England no longer stood in the position of an impartial mediator, but was looked upon as a partisan. Was not this an entire misconception of the position she ought to have held? It was one of the chief difficulties, as appeared from the despatches, which the English Government had to contend against when they wished to give advice. In another respect the conduct of the Government had not been such as to maintain the just influence of England. The Government had not gone with a single aim and mind. There had been a double mind. There had been a desire, on the part of one part of the Cabinet, for strong measures, and a desire on the part of another, to remain quiet. If one or other of these lines had been adopted, the dispute between Denmark and Germany might have been brought to some conclusion; but the consequence of adopting both lines and of the vacillation which ensued was to lower the influence of England. So much for the policy of the Government which the Resolution censured. With regard to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Bridgewater, which was about to be proposed and accepted, he understood, by the Government, it was his opinion that the address, amended as that hon. Member proposed, would read like an echo of the speech of the noble Lord at the head of the Government on Monday week, when the noble Lord wound up his observations that England might find herself, in the event of an attack on Copenhagen, under the necessity to take other measures; because the hon. Member for Bridgewater did not express any general or universal preference for peace, but only that it was satisfactory that the Government had not advised Her Majesty to go to war at this conjuncture. That was to say that there might be other conjunctures when war would be necessary. The Opposition side of the House had been told to lay down a policy; but the Amendment laid down no policy at all, but merely stated this, that at that particular conjuncture of affairs it would be peculiarly objectionable and dangerous to go to war, while it held out the menace that in certain circumstances England would go to war. So that there was to be kept up that policy of menace which had already brought such degradation upon the country—and that policy would have the sanction of the House. Such would be the consequence of endorsing with approval the Amendment of the hon. Member for Bridgewater. The Opposition had been asked to submit their policy, but they had not the means of laying down a definite and detailed policy, like the Government. They might, however, retort the question, and ask what was the policy of the Government for the future? Did they really mean to go to war if Zealand were invaded and Copenhagen besieged? and did those who voted for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Bridgewater intend to approve that course? The Amendment in question was not so much an expression of confidence in the Government as an approval of their conduct in this transaction. Hon. Gentlemen opposite might say they were not very well pleased with the behaviour of the Ministry, but did not wish to turn them out. Then they might either accept the Motion, appending a rider stating confidence in the Government, or meet it by a direct negative, and propose a Vote of Confidence. If the Government had, as was generally acknowledged, committed the fault of interfering unnecessarily with other countries, and uttering menaces which they did not intend to fulfil, that fault ought to be censured, as a warning for the future to this or any other Government that might happen to be in office. But care should be taken not to mix up approval of a line of conduct which was mischievous and objectionable with a general expression of confidence in the Government.

Mr. CLAY, at this exhausted stage of the debate, would not allude to many topics which had been introduced into it without any very distinct bearing on the matter at issue. He would not even discuss with his hon. friend the Member for Liskeard the state of the Liberal party, further than to say that, when that party had been purified by the defection of his hon. Friend, the poor residuum must do as well as it could without him. He would not even inquire whether a better Government might not be found, taken from hon. Gentlemen opposite, than that which sat below him. Thank Heaven, on either side of the House, England could find a Government in which she and Parliament could place confidence. This was not the question. It was—and a very simple one—has the Government so conducted these negotiations as to sully the honour of England, and forfeit the confidence of the House of Commons? He would state his reasons for the vote he was about to give, and hoped to find a better one than that which he had heard, not without pain, from too many speakers on his side of the House, namely, that they disapproved of the policy of the Government from beginning to end. Before he censured any man for doing badly, he liked to feel some confidence that he in their place, or that others in their place, would have done better. They had heard a great deal of what Government ought not to have done, but next to nothing of what they ought to have done. Hon. Gentlemen opposite had been very niggardly in gratifying the natural curiosity of their opponents, and of saying what ought to have been done in the past, what should be done in the future. Two speakers alone — both distinguished speakers, the one among the oldest in parliamentary age, the other amongst the youngest of their companions, the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield and the hon. Member for Canterbury—had alone had the courage to say what ought to have been done, what they themselves would have done. The hon. Member for Canterbury said, that we should have told the Danes, "Act on our advice, and, if so doing does not secure to you peace and the integrity of your dominions, we will fight for you." The hon. Member for Sheffield says, that we should have told Germany, and this comes to much the same thing, that we should consider the entry of German troops into the Duchies to be a *casus belli.* They both tell the House that the course they recommend would have prevented war. He (Mr. Clay) could come to no such conclusion. Under all ordinary circumstances this might have been the case, but the circumstances attending this Dano-German question were altogether exceptional. Such was the excited feeling of the German people for their nationality —so strong was it, and so universal—that it was clear that their rulers must either be its leaders or its victims. The German Courts, with perhaps the exception of Austria, were placed between war and revolution; and even last year, when it was commonly said, "Austria and Prussia can never be so mad as to go to war," he had never doubted which alternative they would choose. War was a great evil, no doubt; it was a wound, it left a scar, but it healed. Revolution, from the point of view of a German Court, was a far greater evil. It was the destruction of dynasties, the utter upsetting of the existing order of things, the inauguration of a new order, than which nothing was to be more deprecated. The course, then, which has been recommended by the only two speakers who have had the courage to recommend anything would not have secured peace, but, on the contrary, would have landed England some months back in a war in which she has no very distinct interest. But the right hon. and gallant General the Member for Huntingdon had laid down a principle for the foreign policy of this country in a speech — nor was this any disparagement to other speakers — which received and deserved as much attention as any during the debate. Yet, what did his principle come to, repeated with much variety of illustration? It came to this — In all foreign squabbles England must hold her tongue or be prepared to fight. Nor was it doubtful which course the gallant General would take. He very naturally prefers the sword to the pen. His (Mr. Clay's) answer was, that the country would not permit either of the alternatives which the gallant General presented to the Government. The policy of this country, and no part of that policy more than its foreign policy, was of necessity a reflection, more or less accurate, of the feeling of the people. Imperfect as the representative system might be, it at least secured this much. He might be told that it was the duty of Government to lead popular feeling, and not to follow it. He would not stay to discuss this proposition, but would leave it, with the remark, that any Government which acted on it would be very short-lived. At least, when the issue was whether the honour of the country had been tarnished, it was not beside the question to ask how the country understood her own honour. Well, he believed that the Government in these negotiations had accurately represented the feeling of the country ["No, no!"] No, no, why not? Would the country have permitted its Government to be silent while blood was poured forth like water, and might was over-riding defenceless right in Europe? Would they have been content that Government, with folded hands, should have stood by an unconcerned spectator, while the bloody drama of Poland was acted over again in Denmark? No. The country would have dismissed with contempt the Government which had been unmindful of the call of humanity. On the other hand, would it have been tolerated that this country should have been plunged, single-handed, in a war for a cause which only remotely can concern England? No. The country would have dismissed in wrath the Government which had been unmindful of the interests of England. The feeling of the country was to use every possible means, short of war, to avert its horrors from Europe. Entreaty, remonstrances, search for foreign co-operation, menace, if you please, but not a single-handed war. This feeling had been accurately represented by the Government, and, if so, nothing remained of this mighty matter but a question of style and manner unworthy a serious discussion. It would be strange indeed if, ranging over 1,500 pages of despatches, passages—many of them—were not to be found open to the animadversion of 300 critics, not ill-disposed to find fault. He would now, in the fewest words he could find, consider what the Government had

had to do, and how they had done it. They had to deal with a question surrounded by very unusual difficulty. They had to deal with one nation, obstinate to a proverb—with the German people madly excited by the feeling of nationality beyond any parallel, in their history—and with the German courts; nor was this the smallest difficulty, forced, when face to face with revolutions, which he ventured to prophesy were only postponed—to abandon the traditions of a prudent policy which had hitherto distinguished them—they had to deal with Allies having different interests in the matter in dispute. How did they come out of this difficulty? Why, they had approached within a hair's breadth of a settlement, ["Oh, oh!"] Hon. Gentlemen opposite would say, "What a settlement? How unlike the Treaty of 1852!" Yes. But was it so new either in the affairs of private life, or in diplomacy, to start with terms very different from those which would be ultimately accepted. He would ask the gallant General, did he always ask, at first, for his horse the price which he would be contented to accept, or was it the practice in diplomacy to commence with an ultimatum? If he (Mr. Clay) wished to know whether a bargain was a good one, he looked—not at the first terms asked—but at those which might be eventually agreed to. Well, the settlement of this question, to which the Government had so nearly approached, would have been so advantageous, that he ventured to say that England would have found no terms of laudation too glowing for the Government, who, while they would have restored peace to Europe, would have satisfied German nationality, and would have left Denmark all the stronger from the loss of a population disaffected to her sway. So nearly had the Government arrived at this great settlement—a mere strip and ribbon of territory dividing the disputants—that he charged it as a crime against the obstinacy of the one and the wicked ambition of the other that it had not been concluded, and that war's torch had again been set a-blaze in Europe. Against Denmark he charged a folly—against Germany a crime—against the Government, a failure, if they liked—but a failure which ought to have been a success—a failure which was so near a success that he, for one, would not, on account of it, help to propitiate foreign courts—and it might be their own—by the disgrace of the noble Lord at the head of the Government, and of the foreign Secretary. He, on its account, would not displace a Ministry; still more strongly he refused, on its account, to append his signature on the journals of the House, to the record, to which this Resolution invited him, of the humiliation of his country.

Mr. WALPOLE: Sir, in the graver parts of the very lively speech which we heard at the commencement of the evening, two remarks were made by the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Osborne) which require more than a passing observation. One of those remarks had reference to the causes of the troubles which now unfortunately exist in the North of Europe; the other had reference to the Treaty of 1852. As to the causes of those disturbances which exist in the North of Europe, the hon. Member found fault with the hon. Member for Rochdale (Mr. Cobden) and the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck), whose powerful and characteristic speeches appear to me, both upon that and upon other parts of the question, to have exhausted almost everything which can be said upon it. If I have read the papers which have been placed in the hands of hon. Members to any purpose, it is to my mind demonstratively clear that to allege that the populations of Schleswig and Holstein were the cause of the troubles in the North of Europe is to allege that which is totally unfounded in fact. On the contrary, those troubles were an import from a foreign land. They were fomented, they were encouraged, they were excited, and enforced by a revolutionary spirit working in Germany, which, acting on the idea of a fatherland, and adopting the dangerous doctrine of nationalities, determined the German people to appropriate to themselves territories and possessions which never belonged to them. When I look to the conduct of the two Great Powers who ought to have exercised some influence over the minor States of Germany, I own that I feel astonished at the manner in which they have allowed themselves to be borne away by that violent current until they themselves became the principal movers in a transaction which history will brand with a mark as black as the partition of Poland. Those Powers seem to me to have been gathering up the shreds of that wild movement which burst over Europe in 1848; and, having done so, they seem to have given to it a force and a consistency which would not be satisfied with anything less than the disruption of solemn obligations which they could no longer keep, because they were under a pressure too great to allow them to be maintained. This leads me to the extraordinary statements of the hon. Member for Liskeard, in reference to the Treaty of 1852. If the observations which have fallen from the hon. Member are really to be the arguments which are to guide the policy of this House with regard to the affairs of Europe and with reference to treaties of this kind—if the alleged discontent of Prussia and the protest she has made with regard to the Protocols is to be a reason why, after putting her hand to a solemn instrument, she is to be allowed to repudiate it, then I say, deliberately, that the public law of Europe is broken up, and with the breaking up of that public law you have no security for the rights of nations, nor for the maintenance of future peace. Although it is true that the name of Prussia does not appear to the Protocol of London, yet the name of Prussia, through her Ambassador, does appear to the Protocol signed at Berlin, which is to the same effect. She is bound by that Protocol. Both Austria and Prussia had given in their adhesion to the Protocols of 1850: both those Powers entered into a correspondence in 1851; both signed the Treaty of 1852; and then; forsooth, they try to import into those treaties something different to supersede them, whereas, if any such object was in their mind, they were bound to communicate it at the time the treaties were signed, and not to insist upon engagements which were never incorporated into such treaties. That is a most serious matter for the House to consider; for if it amounts to anything it amounts to this—that prior engagements contained only in diplomatic notes, and never incorporated in a subsequent treaty, are to supersede and set at nought the most solemn obligations. If such a doctrine were established, you would have no security for the maintenance of international rights. That was the first great blunder in these transactions. I am astonished to find that even these diplomatic notes have had a consequence assigned to them which they do not bear; for Germany seems always to be insisting on the one condition in them—the non-incorporation of Schleswig, but seems to have forgotten the other condition on which alone that first condition was made, namely, the non-amalgamation of Schleswig and Holstein. If you look to these notes, the one fact is as clear as the other; and, to my utter astonishment, it does not appear to have occurred to the minds of all the great Ministers and diplomatists in dealing with this question, until it was mentioned by Earl Russell in the autumn of last year. When it was communicated to the French Ambassador, the French Ambassador was astonished to find that the non-amalgamation of the two Duchies had been so provided for. One false step is sure to lead to another, and this false step led unquestionably to that of which we have heard so much—an interference and an intermeddling with the affairs of a foreign State which would have made that State the abject vassal of the Power who interfered with her. Throughout 1861, 1862, and 1863 this was going on. No doubt, Germany, on the part of Holstein, was demanding too much when she demanded the right to interfere with the affairs of Denmark Proper; but Denmark also demanded too much when she desired to limit to an undue extent the powers of Holstein. The hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State draws a distinction between intervening and interfering, and says that interfering means intermeddling with the internal affairs of foreign countries, and that intervening is a course taken in the interests of peace. But the charge which I cannot help bringing against the Government is, that during the years 1861 and 1862, they did not intervene in the sense in which you say that they did, but that they interfered to an extent and in a manner which no Government had heretofore done with the affairs of another. The noble Lord the Foreign Secretary, having, I suppose, lost the opportunity of bringing in a Reform Bill for his own country, proposed no less than three Reform Bills for Schleswig-Holstein, and one of those three was of such a nature that the Minister of Denmark was forced to tell our Minister that it must lead either to anarchy or to absolutism. But, as one false step leads to another, this second false step led on to a third. When Germany succeeded in getting this right to interfere in the affairs of Denmark she set up another pretence for doing so—namely, nationality. Nationalities, indeed! What are they? How can you define them—by natural boundaries, unity of laws, unity of religion, or unity of language? Depend upon it that if you, or if Austria or Prussia set up that doctrine, whether on the ground of natural boundaries or of unity of religion, laws, or language, the argument can be turned against themselves with tenfold force; and I hope the House and the country will never listen to a doctrine of that kind, which must end in throwing Europe into a state of anarchy. How can Germany set up the ground of natural boundaries? How can she set up the ground of unity of religion? The Thirty Years' War and the Treaty of Westphalia are the answer to that. Then if they take the ground of language, have Prussia and Austria no subjects who may set up a counter-claim against them? And are they going to press these claims where there are people of German extraction in other countries, as, for instance, in Alsatia, Lorraine, and elsewhere? See what difficulties ultimately arose in attempting to settle these matters in the Conference. You could not draw the boundary line between the German and the Danish parts of Schleswig. You got a narrow strip of land, and the only thing you could do was to propose that an arbitrator should fix upon an artificial line—and you must also remember that a grave and conclusive objection on the point was taken by Denmark, who said, "You cannot decide on the question of boundary without determining for me what is to be my military and commercial security. I cannot part with this portion of the subject without turning for a moment to the monstrous notion, that when Powers claim a right to themselves, they are to make themselves judges and executioners in their own cause, and are to take material possession of the countries in dispute. Different reasons are assigned by Prussia and Austria for this movement. First it is said that they could not control the German people, who, unless this war had been undertaken, would have created a civil war; and next it is said that the movement could not be stopped unless Denmark made a *coup d'état* and got rid of her too democratic institutions. And now, forsooth, the German Powers have taken possession of these countries and inflicted on them the cruellest wrongs. I need not describe how they have treated the Danish functionaries, nor say that they have established a censorship of the press where it did not exist before. They have also gone into Jutland to collect war contributions and imposts in order to feed the war so unrighteously entered upon. And the climax is that we are now told that war breaks up treaties, and so they may treat their victims, who ought to be secure under those treaties, as they may see fit. Let me ask how, then, the Government ought to have dealt with these questions. I entirely agree with the observation of my right hon. Friend (Mr. Disraeli) that you were perfectly entitled to take either of two courses. You might, on the one hand, have said, "As there is no guarantee, we do not promise to give you material aid, because we did not think we have sufficient interest involved." On the other hand, when such wrongs as I have referred to were committed, you would have been perfectly justified, in the interests of justice and peace, in giving that aid to Denmark which she required. Which of those two courses was the best I will not say. That may be open to different constructions by different minds. The hon. Member for Rochdale (Mr. Cobden) would never interfere at all. That is an intelligible policy. Others would have interfered, if necessary, by war. That also might have been an intelligible policy. But this, I think, is clear, that you ought to have a definite and distinct policy marked out for yourselves one way or the other. There is no doubt the wrongs committed were so great that if you intend to protect the rights and independence of nations you were fully entitled—and, provided you had the co-operation of others, in my opinion you ought to have exercised your right—you were fairly entitled to arrest or check the perpetration of those wrongs. That is my deliberate opinion. And the reason for it is, I must say, very strong. We have heard much of Poland in this debate. Remember its partition. How has history dealt with that great crime? It has fixed the worst blame on the perpetrators; but it has also blamed France, England, and other Powers for standing by and allowing its consummation. You might have said, then, that you could not allow this wrong to be done towards Denmark without contracting some portion of its guilt. But why did you not take that course? The answer is that you were isolated and left alone. And why were you thus isolated? Because by your own conduct you had estranged France and Russia from you and forced them into the cold reserve of wounded pride. You had irritated and offended the very Powers by whom this great mischief could have been averted. Without their co-operation half your influence was taken away. But the influence which may be exercised—and I trust always will be exercised—by England can only be preserved if, when she threatens, she is prepared in case of need to strike ; but you must not threaten with words unless you are ready to follow them up by deeds. And now you have given inducements to Denmark to persevere in a course under the promise of assistance, or very nearly the promise of it, and then you have abandoned her. But, it is said, it ill becomes this House to take notice of these facts. Sir, I think it would ill become this House to be silent when these facts are patent. Had Parliament not spoken, our just influence would have been much injured by obviously shrinking from the duty plainly devolving upon us, just as the influence of England is lowered by the course you have taken. And what is the reason for all this ? History often repeats herself, and history is repeating herself now. Remember the Crimean war. What was the cause of your misfortunes then ? Divided counsels. What is the misfortune of your position now ? Divided counsels. In the case of the Crimean war you went on drifting, drifting, drifting ; in this case you have also gone on drifting, drifting, drifting ; but there is this difference—in the one case you drifted into war, in this case you have drifted into shame and disgrace. Your motto then was too late ! too late into the Principalities, too late into the Black Sea. Your motto now is again too late ! too late in applying to France and Russia for the co-operation you would have obtained earlier —too late in not protecting Denmark before the islands are taken—and you will be too late again in protecting Copenhagen and the King, for you will not undertake again to do more than re-consider the question until Copenhagen is taken. I say, then, it is the duty of this House to speak out. And in what sense should it speak out ? There is only one sense in which it can speak out, and that is to speak the truth. There is only one way in which it can speak the truth, and that is to say what this resolution says—namely, that you have not maintained the independence of Denmark—that you have not maintained her rights and her integrity, but that you have lowered the influence of England, and you have thereby diminished your means of preserving the peace of the world. Well, but I am told that we on this side of the House ought to declare the policy which we would pursue. The noble Viscount at the head of Her Majesty's Government has had a great career, and his name will go down to posterity I hope honoured and respected ; but I will venture to say that throughout the whole of that career the noble Viscount never heard the notion that it was the duty of an Opposition to find a policy for a Government. It is not the duty of the House to interfere in foreign questions till we have the whole matter before us. It is our duty to leave the initiative with the Government. But the duty enunciated by hon. Gentlemen opposite is that they will take counsel only with Gentlemen on those (the Ministerial) benches as to how the Foreign affairs of the country shall be conducted, and that you who are in office will consult with those out of office, and who cannot know all the facts as to what policy you should adopt. That would be, to use Sir Robert Peel's illustration, when the patient is sick and requires aid, you who receive the fees and ought to find the cure will pocket the fees and leave the responsibility with those who, not having full information, cannot give advice. You are, in short, to have the power and we the responsibility. I say that is a doctrine which inverts the order of things. It transfers a question to the House that ought never to be transferred — (namely, the initiative in matters of war)—to it. Then there is another objection which takes a double form — as urged by the Chancellor of the Exchequer — namely, that if we are to have any vote of this kind at all, we ought to go to the old fashioned way, and have a Vote of Want of Confidence —not a vote with regard to any particular point in the Ministerial policy. It is also said, "Do not humiliate the country by placing on the records of the House a Resolution that the influence of the country is lowered." Now, I say it is much better and fairer to bring the matter to a distinct, clear, indisputable point, whether the Government has done right or wrong in a particular line of policy, than to move a general Vote of Want of Confidence. Then, as to the idea of humiliation in placing this Resolution on record : there is no humiliation in the record ; the humiliation is in the circumstances that require you to make such a record in your Journals. My right hon. Friend says, Where are the precedents ? The same argument was used in the Crimean War, but I myself pointed out precedent after precedent ; and I am persuaded if in the retrospect of the past you find anything justly entitled to blame you will do good instead of harm by placing it on record, because you will warn

Ministers not to interfere under such circumstances again in the affairs of other countries. If there be humiliation in such a Resolution, it is in your power to avoid that humiliation by placing before the House a distinct Resolution affirming that the House has confidence in the Government, upon the ground that they have upheld the authority and dignity and just influence of the country. Will you venture to do that? If you did, you would not have ten votes on the other side of the House. Your ablest defenders one and all condemn your conduct in the very strongest terms. That, then, is my justification of this Resolution. Your own supporters condemn your policy, though they give you their votes. Sir, when the Session commenced, the one great anxiety in the public mind was that the Dano-German question should be satisfactorily settled; the one strong desire and feeling of the public heart was that Denmark should be saved and peace preserved. The public looked to the noble Viscount, and they had confidence in him that he would effect that double purpose; and what is the result? Their expectations have failed. Denmark has been ruined — a devastating war has broken out—peace has not been preserved —and now we are told we shall have to go to the country. Well, let us go to the country. Will you go to the country upon this question? Will you go to the country? I will venture for once to prophesy. I will venture to predict that if you do go to the country your constituents will say that had the Government employed more firmness and fewer menaces—had they used more vigour and less vacillation —had they shown more consistency and less uncertainty — they would then have supported the policy pursued. But not having done this, I think they will also tell you this—that, as you had right and justice on your side, you ought to have shown yourselves firmer in counsel. You ought to have used language which you were prepared to abide by. You ought to have exercised strong will and an unwavering hand. If you had done that the public law of Europe, which is the best and perhaps the only guarantee for the permanent peace of Europe, would have been upheld, your own influence would have been unimpaired, and Denmark would not have been ruined. For all these things the country will also add that the responsibility must rest somewhere. According to the Constitution it rests there (the Ministerial Bench). And such will, I believe, be the verdict of a mortified and indignant people.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Sir, if any doubt could have existed when the notice of this Motion was first given as to its object and importance, that doubt must have been fully dispelled by the debate that has ensued upon it; for we are now told, fairly and plainly, that although the words simply imply censure on one act of the Government, it is intended as a vote of "No confidence;" and that the issue which the House is called upon to determine is, whether Gentlemen on this side of the House or Gentlemen on that side shall be charged with the conduct of the affairs of the country. Now, Sir, I object to much that has passed in this debate—but to two things mainly—first of all, to the attempt to separate my noble Friend at the head of the Foreign Office from the rest of his Colleagues—a most unconstitutional attempt—a most unfair attempt; an attempt which ought to have been reprobated by those who, having been in office, know the joint responsibility of the Members of a Cabinet. Sir, I declare on my own part and on the part of my Colleagues, that we are all equally responsible for what the noble Lord at the head of the Foreign Office has done; and therefore I trust that we shall not have any more of these personal attacks upon Earl Russell, but that whatever censure any man may wish to cast upon the conduct of the Government may be aimed at the Government itself, and not at any individual member of it. I also, Sir, regret deeply for my country the pains that have been taken, by many of those who have taken part in this debate, to villify and degrade this country. Not content with blaming the Government, which they were entitled to do, and endeavouring to prove that we were wrong— which they had a right to do if they could prove it—in every step of these transactions, they have maintained that England is degraded, and that she has sunk in the estimation of foreign nations. And when forsooth? and since when? Why, since the termination of the Conferences, which closed a few days ago. Sir, I deny, on the part of the Government, the statements that have been made. I say that England stands as high as she ever did. And those who say she has fallen in the estimation of the world are not the men to whom the honour and dignity of England should be confided.

Well, Sir, but this bill of indictment was most singularly brought in by the right hon. Gentleman who moved the Resolution; because, in the early part of his speech, he step by step expressed his approval of what the Government had done. He began by admitting that the Treaty of 1852 was, when it was concluded, a wise and good arrangement. He does not deny that all the Governments who were parties to it congratulated each other for having made what they then thought—and there were grounds for the opinion—a settlement that would insure the peace of Europe. And when we are told that the Prussian Minister of that day, the Chevalier de Bunsen, refused to put his name to a certain Protocol, I believe I am right in saying that so eager was the Prussian Government for the treaty, that the draught was sent from Berlin to London, with a special order that he was to sign it as he received it, and was not to make any objections of his own. Well, then, whatever may have been the feelings of the Chevalier Bunsen, who was known to be a very enthusiastic champion of German unity at the time, his feelings were not shared by his Government, and it is a misrepresentation to infer, because of any objections he may have felt, that Prussia was not sincere and anxious for the conclusion of that Treaty. Saxony was equally pleased with the arrangement then made. That arrangement violated no rights. It simply was that the Danish Parliament should be invited to change the law of succession in Denmark legally, which they did—that the King should be empowered, by his prerogative, to name his successor, which he did; and that that successor should be acknowledged by the contracting Powers as heir to the Danish Crown; and that the States which were then and had been for a long time under the sway of the King of Denmark, should (as far as the object of the treaty went) remain united under the Danish sceptre. It was thought that this arrangement was secured by the change in the law of succession in Denmark, and the renunciation of the Duke of Augustenburg, who was next in succession to Holstein. Well, Sir, we know that the reason why that arrangement failed was, that the Danish Government did not give the German subjects of Schleswig the liberal administrative system to which they were entitled, and that the late King of Denmark committed the same errors which the King of Holland committed with regard to Belgium, by interfering in their language, laws, religion, and all those things that are dear to man. That has been a constant source of expostulation on the part of the Germans, and those expostulations were not attended to as they ought to have been. The result of it was, that when the late King died these discontents, which had been smothered during his reign, burst forth as to the disputed succession to Holstein. Then came the Federal Execution in Holstein for the purpose of compelling the King Duke to revoke his Patent.

And that brings me to the point to which I have often been referred—namely, the answer I made to the hon. Member for Horsham (Mr. S. FitzGerald) at the end of last Session. It is said that we began at that time to threaten Germany. I deny that what I said implied any threat of war on the part of England, and the words which I am going to read will, I think, prove it. What I said in answer to the hon. Member was—

> "I have said that we concur entirely with him, and I am satisfied with all reasonable men in Europe, including those in France and Austria, in desiring that the independence and integrity, the rights of Denmark, may be maintained. We are convinced—I am convinced, at least—that if any violent attempt were made to overthrow those rights, and interfere with that independence, those who made the attempt would find in the result that it would not be Denmark alone with whom they would have to contend."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxii. 1252.]

The context shows, and it is quite plain, when I talked of every man in Europe—when I talked of France and Russia—I did not confine myself to this country. But what preceded that passage? I said just before

> "It is impossible for any man who looks at the map of Europe—I did not say the map of Aldershot and Portsmouth--and who knows the great interests which the Powers of Europe feel in the independence of the Danish Monarchy, to shut his eyes to the fact that the war, begun about a petty dispute concerning the institutions of Holstein, would in all probability not end where it began, and might draw after it consequences that the parties who commenced it would be exceedingly sorry to have caused." [3 *Hansard*, clxxii. 1251.]

What I was pointing to was an European war, not a war between this country and the German Powers. But, then, what was it that the hon. Gentleman, who is so much against interference, said which called forth the reply I am now quoting? Why, the hon. Gentleman said, "If the Government would say"—he had said that he apprehended danger from the Execution in Holstein—that the entrance of the Federal troops into Holstein upon grounds of execution might involve consequences fatal to the integrity of Denmark, and then he went on to say,

> "If the Government would say that under pretence of Federal rights the Germanic Confederation were not to interfere with the rights of the Danish Crown, and if France and Russia held similar language, the danger to which he had adverted might be obviated."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxii. 1249.]

The hon. Gentleman, therefore, wanted the English Government to say to the Diet, "You shall not go into Holstein for the purpose of executing your Federal law." He said, "Even if England were to say it, the danger might be avoided ; but if England were to persuade France and Russia to say it also, the danger which he apprehended would be obviated." Therefore, I say, it is not for the hon. Gentleman who attacks us to say that our expostulations to Prussia and Austria against the course they were taking were not justifiable representations, since he would have had us take a still higher course, and try to prevent them doing that which by the law of Germany and the law of Europe they had a perfect right to do. We did not do that ; our representations were of an entirely different character. Well, when the occupation took place, the Danish Government was recommended, not by England alone, but by England and other Powers, not to resist. They did not resist ; and when the further invasion of Schleswig was threatened, we endeavoured to persuade the King of Denmark to take steps to revoke that constitution which was made the ground of the occupation of Schleswig as a guarantee for its revocation. He promised that he would do what he could, and as early as he could, for that purpose. Well, then, what was the time when, according to hon. Gentlemen opposite, who complain so much, and at the bottom of whose thoughts lies an interference by force—what was the time when, in their opinion, that interference ought to have been made ? The German troops entered Schleswig about the beginning of the year—the middle of winter. That was not a time when any military or naval operations could have been undertaken by this country. Well, what did we do ? From the beginning we endeavoured to persuade France and Russia to concur with us in every step which we took. Menacing language is said to have been used. Why, the menacing language was warning to the German Powers of the dangers to Europe and to themselves which might arise from an extension of the war beyond the quarter in which it had arisen. But the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) in his speech approved our conduct up to September. He says it was wise and judicious, because France was with us. But he went on to say, in September a change took place, and then we disgusted France and lost her support. How, according to him, did that come to pass ? It was on account of Poland and the Congress. He says, we abandoned France about Poland. But what was our course with regard to Poland ? Were we not told in this House over and over again, that we ought only to interfere diplomatically in favour of Poland ? Did not the hon. Member for the King's County repeatedly urge us in that direction, and was not his urging backed by hon. Gentlemen who sit near him ? Even the mode of representation was pointed out. We were told not to content ourselves with simple remonstrances on the part of England, but to get France, Austria, and Prussia, and all the Powers of Europe, to concur with us in representing to Russia the expediency of dealing leniently with Poland, and acting towards the Poles in accordance with her treaty engagements. We did so ; but we did not do that which we never undertook to do —make war against Russia for that object. My noble Friend avowed that such was not his intention, and the right hon. Gentleman approved the course which we pursued ; for he said a little time ago, to make war against Russia for Poland would have been an act of insanity. Therefore, it is unreasonable to allege that the course which we pursued with regard to Poland could have justly offended the Emperor of the French. It is a reflection on the French Emperor to attribute to him a feeling of that kind. Then came the Congress ; and with regard to that also the right hon. Gentleman says we were quite right. No one of common understanding, I think, could imagine that a Congress under the existing circumstances could have been attended with any success. The right hon. Gentleman says that a Congress ought to follow action, and not to precede it ; and a very just distinction it is, and one entirely applicable. Well, when it is alleged that the conduct of France about Denmark was influenced by what the British Government did in these two instances, it is to impute to the Government of the Emperor of the French motives and conduct unworthy a great Power which has a due regard for its own honour and dignity. France was actuated by quite different motives, and she never concealed them from us. We were certainly led in the beginning to expect that France and Russia would join us in pressing strongly upon the German Powers the impropriety and injustice of their conduct. But France very fairly told us, "A war about Denmark to you would be a naval war, to us it would be a land war. We have all Germany upon our frontier. It would be a great undertaking, costly both in men and treasure, and one, therefore, we are not disposed to undertake for an object which is not a French object, and does not concern the dignity, the possessions, or the welfare of France." I think that was a fair argument, and we had no right to press France any further to adopt the course we had suggested. We lost, therefore, the support of France except morally and diplomatically. Russia we also applied to, and Russia gave us answers which amounted to declining any co-operation. And when one considers the bond of union which exists between Russia, Austria, and Prussia, with respect to Polish affairs, he cannot be much surprised that Russia should not be very willing to employ force against her neighbours. Well, then, step by step up to September, the right hon. Gentleman deems that our policy was wise and judicious. And I contend that after that date likewise it was wise, judicious, and honourable to the country. We laboured to persuade the contending parties to come to an agreement; we recommended just concessions to Denmark; and we remonstrated with the Germans for conduct which was unjustifiable towards Denmark. At last a Conference was proposed; the proposal came from Prussia first. We agreed to it. Some time elapsed before it could be assembled. Questions arose whether an armistice should precede it. We should have preferred that it had; but failing of that, we stipulated that it should be the first subject of discussion. We found it impossible to obtain an armistice, and therefore the first point with us was to assemble the Conference as early as possible. Well, Sir, it is said our influence is gone—we have no influence in Europe; yet, remark that we were invited by other Powers to take steps to bring about the Conference. In that Conference, as the Protocols show, step by step the neutral Powers — France, Russia, and Sweden—went in accordance with England. Nothing was done or proposed by England which was not previously agreed on and concerted with those Powers —and then you say that England is degraded and lowered in the eyes of other nations, and that they have no confidence in her.

Sir, we are accused of having in the Conference departed from the provisions of the Treaty of 1852. They have certainly been departed from. Necessity compelled that. When the Conference assembled, all the Powers acknowledged themselves bound by the provisions of the treaty —at least as a starting point for negotiations. We did not make it the basis of the Conference because we knew that objections were entertained to it by Prussia, and possibly by Austria and by the Confederation, whose assent to it had never been asked. We took the broader basis —namely, that of endeavouring to arrive at a pacific solution of the question, and to restore peace to Europe. Was that an unworthy object? Was that a defective basis? Why, if that object had been attained, would not that have been acknowledged to be a proper basis for the Conference, and would not the result have been satisfactory? The Germans were asked to state what the terms were on which they were willing to conclude peace. There were certain difficulties in getting them to state those terms. They at last proposed a personal union of the Duchies with Denmark, which the Danish Government were unwilling to accept. Then another proposition was made to separate from Denmark, Holstein and the whole of Schleswig. That was deemed objectionable. They were induced to relax from that pretension; and at last the parties were brought to this —that the Danes consented that the question should be settled by the separation of Holstein from Denmark, together with the German portion of Schleswig. No doubt that was a departure from the provisions of the Treaty of 1852; but I am not on the whole sure that it would have been disadvantageous to Denmark to be quit of a population which had long been discontented and was difficult to be governed— as had been shown at the time of the Royal marriage, when the Holsteiners refused to contribute to the dower offered by the King. So far the parties were brought together that they agreed to a division of Schleswig, a certain part of which was to be united to Holstein; and the whole question came at last to this—where the line should be drawn. There was an impossibility to bring the parties to agree on this point. The Danes demanded the line of the Schlei, the Germans the line from Apenrade to Tondern. We proposed arbitration. If the parties had accepted arbitration, and if the arbitrator had been empowered peremptorily to decide, that would have settled the question; and then, instead of the censure and the condemnations we have heard so lavishly pronounced on us in these debates, all mankind would have acknowledged that our exertions had been crowned with success, and that we had made an honourable agreement between the two parties, and that the peace of Europe had been secured. It was not our fault that the two parties objected to arbitration, which was a most reasonable proposition in itself. It has been said that the English Minister promised to the Danes that if they agreed to the line of the Schlei he would not propose any other line, or support any other line if proposed by any other Power, and that the proposal of arbitration was a departure from that promise. He did make that promise and abided by that arrangement; but that did not fetter his hands from proposing arbitration when it was found impossible to bring the Germans and Danes to an agreement respecting the line that should be adopted. Would it have been a sufficient answer if, after the Conference was broken up, we had been asked, "Why did you not propose arbitration?" to say that, we were bound to propose no other line but the Schlei? I say that it was proper and our duty to propose arbitration, which, if the proposal had been accepted, would have restored peace. The French Plenipotentiary proposed another solution—namely, an appeal to the population of the disputed districts. That proposal though honourably made was not acceded to. Then, I say, when hon. Gentlemen, not looking to the main features of the transaction, pick out sentences in these blue-books on which to found a vote of condemnation against the Government, though that may be a proceeding which may suit those who wish to blacken and displace the Government, I am persuaded that the country will not think that it is the proper way of treating a great European question. I am sure the country will not join in the proposed condemnation.

Let us examine what the Resolution is —I speak not of the first and second paragraphs, but of the last. The right hon. Gentleman in the last paragraph proposes that the House should affirm that the influence of England is lowered in the eyes of Europe, and that thereby the security for peace is diminished. That is supported by a great number of gentlemen, who maintain that we ought never to interfere in anything beyond our own shores. What, then, is the use of our influence if we are not to interfere, and how is the peace of Europe endangered by the loss of our influence, if that influence is to be confined to influence within these walls? The Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman is an admission that the doctrine of many of those who support it is unsound in the existing circumstances of the world, and that the great interests connecting a country like ours with every part of the world render it impossible for her to be passive or indifferent as to what is passing among other nations, and that circumstances requiring vigilant watching must sometimes cause her to interfere in transactions in which we are not directly concerned. Then we are told that the balance of power is an exploded doctrine belonging to ancient times. Why, it is a doctrine founded on the nature of man. It means that it is to the interest of the community of nations that no one nation should acquire such a preponderance as to endanger the security of the rest; and it is for the advantage of all that the smaller Powers should be respected in their independence and not swallowed up by their more powerful neighbours. That is the doctrine of the balance of power, and it is a doctrine worthy of being acted upon. We have done our best to rescue Denmark from the danger to which she was exposed, first by counselling her to put herself right when she was wrong, and next by endeavouring to induce her aggressors to refrain from continuing their aggression; and by inducing the neutral Powers to join us in adopting the same course. And what said the right hon. Gentleman in his opening speech on this subject? He said that if England and France were agreed upon the same policy, war would be difficult; but that if England, France, and Russia were agreed, war would be impossible. Well, we tried to make war impossible. But France and Russia would not combine with us, and therefore war became possible, and took place. The right hon. Gentleman has therefore pronounced a panegyric upon our policy, and he ought to vote against his own Resolution. We adopted the best means of rendering war impossible, and the failure was not our fault. At the time I answered the question of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, we had reason to believe that Sweden was going to conclude a treaty offensive and defensive with Denmark; but it was not carried into effect.

Sir, I deny utterly that the influence of England has been lowered. There is no proof of it whatever. It is a mere assertion. Now, the assertion must refer either to the period before or to the period after the Conference. To the period before the Conference it cannot apply, because it was by the influence of England that the Conference was assembled, in the capital of this country. Neither can it apply to the period subsequent to the Conference, because nothing has taken place during the last fortnight on which such an assertion could be founded. It is, therefore, a gratuitous libel on the country. It is a libel by a great party on the country which they want to govern. Why, such a Resolution being voted, if they came into office and went to a foreign Government saying, "Join us in this or that," would not the answer be, "No, you have put it yourselves on record, that your country is degraded!" At all events it might be said, "If, as you allege, the influence of your country is lowered, you are not the people to restore it." It is, I repeat, a most unfounded assertion, and I trust the House will not be induced to countenance it. It is a libel on our country to record by a vote of the House what is not the fact—namely, that the influence and position of England have been lowered. Sir, the influence of a country depends upon other things than protocols and despatches. It depends on its power to defend itself, on its wealth and prosperity, on its intelligence and cultivation of mind, on the development of the arts and sciences, and on all those things which make a nation truly great and powerful. As long as England retains these conditions, so long shall I deny that her influence has been diminished. I contend, then, that the Resolution which the right hon. Gentleman has proposed is not one which it is fitting for the House to adopt. Observations have been made on the Amendment which my hon. Friend the Member for Bridgewater (Mr. Kinglake) has put on the paper, and it is said by some, that it is intended as an escape from voting on the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman. I have no hesitation in saying that, for my part, I regret that my hon. Friend has given notice of this Amendment, because I should have been better pleased to have met directly the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bucks. We have, however, just been told by the hon. Baronet the Member for Stamford (Sir Stafford Northcote), that the Amendment of my hon. Friend expresses entirely the statement which I made to the House not very long ago. If that be so, then the hon. Baronet must admit that we should accept the Amendment. The hon. Baronet went through it step by step to show that it tallied with everything which I stated when I announced the result of the Conference. Nobody can say that, in accepting the Amendment, we are in any way shirking the Resolution. At the same time I certainly did express to my hon. Friend a wish that he would not move the Amendment, so that we might vote on the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman. He declined to comply with that desire, and we are now prepared to vote with him. The real character of the Motion has been more plainly disclosed by some of those who have taken part in the debate, and more especially by the hon. Member for Tipperary (The O'Donoghue). It has been acknowledged that this is not simply a censure upon one individual act or course of action of the Government. It is a declaration of a general want of confidence in the Government, and is intended for the purpose for which such votes are usually moved to oust the Government. I do not complain of the object in view; but I complain of the mode in which it is sought to be attained. I think it would have been more manly, open, and straightforward to put that expression of opinion in the constitutional shape of a Motion of Want of Confidence, instead of endeavouring to wrap it up in extracts from these 1,500 pages of blue-book. Hon. Gentlemen opposite might as well have said frankly, "We think you have been in power for a sufficient period; your continuance there any longer is too much for human patience; everything must have its limit; and the time has come when Parliament should be called upon to say, whether the present Government should be retained, or whether it will have us in their stead." I have not the slightest reproach to address to hon. Gentlemen opposite, except that they have not candidly avowed and set forth in plain language what their true aim is. Some complaints have been made that our despatches are not clear in their language; but I think that objection may well be taken to the Resolution. It would have been far more fair, and far more in accordance with the general custom, if hon. Gentlemen opposite had put their expression of opinion into the shape of a formal Vote of Want of Confidence. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Tipperary said very truly, that this being the case, the House ought to look not merely to the limited action of the Government in this particular case, but to their general conduct in other matters. That would be quite proper and fair; and if a Vote of No Confidence had been proposed, it would have led to a discussion of all the measures of the Government. I contend that if the House would take that view of the matter, it would find that in the five years during which we have been honoured with the confidence of the House and have carried on the Government, the country has continued in an unexampled state of prosperity. More has been done in those years in everything connected with the material interests of the country than perhaps was ever done in the same period of time before; and on that ground alone we may stand and defy any attacks that may be made on us from any quarter whatever. At this hour of the night I know that to go into the details which may be applicable to this argument would be encroaching too much on the time and patience of the House. I would, however, beg leave to state two or three facts which bear on the question, by showing what has been the conduct of the Government, what we have done, and what improvements have taken place in the country during our administration. ["Question."] We listened very patiently to hon. Gentlemen opposite in their abuse of us, and I think it is now but fair that they should listen to the reasons which we think may be fairly stated in our general justification. Between 1860 and 1864 we have reduced the taxation of the country by £12,000,000. With the assistance of the hon. Member for Rochdale, to whom I have repeatedly said the country is much indebted, a commercial treaty was negotiated between France and England, which has wonderfully increased the mercantile relations of the two countries; for whereas the imports from France in 1859 were in value £16,000,000 and odd, in 1863 they reached £24,000,000. In 1859 the exports to France amounted to £9,500,000, while in 1860 they had increased to £22,900,000. It is obvious that this great development of the commerce of the country must have been of the greatest advantage at a time when we are suffering so severely from the supply of cotton from America. During our administration, the permanent National Debt has been reduced by £11,000,000—that is, £6,000,000 has been actually paid off and £5,000,000 have been converted into terminable annuities. The private income of the country has increased to such an extent that the assessment of the Income Tax has been augmented by £27,000,000 in the course of those four or five years. Further, the expenditure has been diminished by £3,000,000 odd. [A VOICE: In what time?] I am now speaking of the years from 1860-1 to 1864-5. Nor have we been unmindful of other matters. Our national defences are naturally of great importance, owing to our insular position, and liability to attack from various quarters. We have endeavoured to place these defences on a satisfactory footing. I willingly give hon. Gentlemen opposite the credit of originating the Volunteer movement; but that means of defence has been wonderfully developed during our administration. Our dockyards are now in course of being made secure. We no longer read pamphlets about the perils of Portsmouth, and I trust that that and the other dockyards will soon be rendered safe from any enemy. The foreign trade of the country has risen from £377,000,000 in 1861 to £444,000,000 in 1863—an increase of no less than £67,000,000 in that short space of time. It is not necessary to go into further details, or I could show the various other improvements which have been effected in savings banks and in other matters which are deeply interesting to the working classes. We have been enabled to go through that great calamity, as it was expected to be, which befel us in the Cotton famine with less disturbance than might have been expected, and with less suffering and privation to those who are engaged in our manufacturing industry. And we have not been solely occupied with the concerns of the United Kingdom. My right hon. Friend who has the management of the affairs of India, has also done great things in regard to that empire. I recollect when the change in the Government of India first took place, that it was said that India was inextricably in debt, and that the time would come when this country would be called upon to defray that debt for her. In 1858, the deficit in the Indian revenue amounted to more than £14,000,000, and in 1864-5 there was a surplus of £823,000. Thus, by the wise administration of my right hon. Friend, a large deficit on our Indian finances has been converted into a growing surplus ; the employment of Natives has increased, and the material well being of the people is well known to everybody, railways have been constructed, telegraphs erected, numerous public works commenced, and every improvement which modern science has produced has been introduced into that country. The exports from India, which in 1858-9 amounted to £29,862,871, had increased in 1862-3 to £46,485,169. Well, then, I say that all these indications of national prosperity show that the contentment and well-being which we know to exist among all classes of Her Majesty's subjects have a good foundation, and that the Government of the Queen which has been intrusted during the last five years with the task of conducting the affairs of the country, has not neglected any of the interests to which its attention ought to have been directed. On the contrary, they have been the promoters of great improvements in all matters connected with the general interests of the country. We have during our period of office also preserved this country from war. There were many people ready to urge us to take an active part in that war which is now being carried on in North America. We were not without reasons and motives which might have afforded us a fair justification for taking part in that contest ; but we abstained. No doubt there are some who thought that we ought to have leant more to one side, and some that we ought to have leant more to the other ; but our conduct has been that of rigid and impartial neutrality, and we have saved the country from all the calamities which would have been created by a state of war. I know there are Gentlemen in this House who do not entirely approve of the policy we have pursued in China. That may be a subject for discussion ; but the result certainly has been a great development of our trade with China, and a good understanding with the Government of China. Therefore I say, that whatever may be said of the steps by which we arrived at that conclusion, no one can deny that the result has been advantageous to the country. We have also preserved good relations with all the countries of Europe. A statement has been made that in the last Speech from the Throne for the first time was omitted the sentence in which Her Majesty stated that she had received friendly assurances from Foreign Powers. The hon. Gentlemen who made that assertion are very ill-read in Royal Speeches ; because I can assure them that it is not this year for the first time that that very unmeaning passage has been left out. Indeed, I trust that it will never appear again, because such friendly assurances are never given or received. The only meaning of the passage is, that the Sovereign was in good relations with Foreign Powers, and it is better to say that plainly than to have this roundabout and stereotyped phrase, which for so many years had been inserted as a matter of course. In the present case we could not say so sincerely, because we had differences with Austria and Prussia which rendered it impossible to make that assertion ; but when these differences are over, I hope it may be shown in the Queen's Speech that the manner in which affairs of this country have been conducted for some years past have produced that result. Well, Sir, that being the case, I contend that we are entitled to the confidence of this House. I quite admit that hon. Gentlemen opposite are perfectly entitled to make a great struggle for power. It is an honourable struggle, and I make it no matter of reproach. They are a great party, comprising a great number of men of ability and influence in the country ; and they are perfectly entitled, whenever they think the prize is within their reach, to make an attack upon those who hold it. But, on the other hand, I say that we have not done anything to deserve that that prize should be taken from us. I think that we have conducted the affairs of the country during the five years we have been on these seats with honour and advantage to the country, with credit to ourselves, and in a manner deserving the approbation of this House and the confidence of the country. ["No!"] Although hon. Gentlemen opposite meet that assertion with "No, no, no!" I am very strongly inclined to think that whatever the decision of this closely packed assembly may be to-night, the country at large will answer in the affirmative, and will re-echo the assertion which I have just made. I think there has been no sufficient ground established for the Motion. It evades and shirks the real object of the

Movers; namely, a declaration, which they ought to have come forward and proposed in a manly way, that the Government have lost the confidence of the country. I think this a Motion not founded on justice or on facts. I confidently believe that the decision of the House to-night will be the rejection of the Motion and the substitution of the Amendment of my hon. Friend the Member for Bridgewater; but whatever the decision of the House may be—and I am satisfied it will be in our favour—I am confident that the acceptance of the Resolution would not be in accordance with the general feeling of the people of this country.

Mr. DISRAELI: Sir, on Monday last I moved an Address to the Crown thanking Her Majesty for the papers connected with the late negotiations which had been placed on the table; and at the same time in that Address I made three statements which I trusted the House would accept. The first was that Her Majesty's Government had failed in their avowed policy, which was to uphold the integrity and independence of Denmark; the second was to represent to Her Majesty that by the course of their proceedings the just influence of this country in the councils of Europe had been lowered; and the third was that by the lowering of the just influence of the country in the councils of Europe the securities for peace were diminished. In introducing that Resolution to the consideration of the House I had—as is inevitable under such circumstances—to quote considerably, though in as small a proportion as I could, from the mass of diplomatic Correspondence which had been laid on the table. I have observed that frequently under similar circumstances—in the case of the first China debate, for instance, in which Sir James Graham took a leading part—where the opinion of the House has been asked upon multifarious papers, somewhat needless accusations have been made on both sides of the House that documents have been unfairly quoted. I was therefore careful to avoid such imputations in the present instance. I quoted no passage without at the same time giving the page, so that detection might be immediate; and I never quoted secondhand, but read from extracts copied by myself. I am not conscious of ever having intentionally garbled or misquoted any passage; and having listened with the utmost attention throughout this debate of four days, and having read the despatches referred to by hon. Members on both sides of the House, who have drawn from the same documents different inferences, I am bound to say that, as far as I can judge, there have been no quotations of an unfair character. On the contrary, the documents have been handled in a legitimate manner; and it is my belief that that is the invariable practice of this House. Indeed, it seems to me, totally irrespective of higher considerations, that it would be absurd for any person who founds his arguments on documents of this character willingly to misquote or misrepresent them. What would he render himself liable to? There sit opposite to him hon. Gentlemen who have the very same papers in their hands, and therefore have the means of correcting him; they can instantly refer to the document he is quoting. Therefore, that it should for a moment be supposed under such circumstances that any hon. Gentlemen would attempt to misquote or misrepresent documents appears to me very extraordinary. Therefore, nothing impressed me with the weakness of the case of the Government more than when the most distinguished orator on the Treasury bench rose to answer me, and at once resorted to the old and, I will not say, vulgar habit, because the epithet might be misunderstood — but a habit certainly which ought not to be sanctioned by the House—namely, that of accusing one of misquoting and misrepresenting papers on the table. That person must not only be incompetent, but absolutely silly, who should attempt to address the House of Commons on an occasion of this kind and bring forward a case founded on the misquotation or garbling of public correspondence. I am conscious that I did nothing of the sort. Of course, at this period of the debate, I will not go into any details as to that charge; I should be quite content to meet any half dozen of my opponents in a private room on the matter, where I am persuaded they would acquit me of any intention of that kind. If I refer to one point at all, it is only because the merits of the case are concerned in it; and that is my reference to the despatch to Lord Russell from our *Chargé d'Affaires* at Paris. I had a copy of that despatch in my hand; but I did not read the whole of it, only as much as I thought sufficiently proved the fact I desired to impress upon the House. The rest of the despatch confirmed my view, or I should not have copied it; but I omitted it to save the time of the House. What was my object in quoting that despatch? It was the answer from Mr. Grey to Lord Russell, describing a conversation with M. Drouyn de Lhuys. What I wished to show was—not as the Chancellor of the Exchequer and others who followed him have represented, — that the Emperor of the French, out of mere pique, would not act with the English Government — I do not think that any Prince or Government in Europe would act out of pique—I assume they understand their own interests too keenly for that; and I should think the Emperor of the French, a very sagacious Prince, is about the last who would be likely to do such a thing. I did not mean to say that the Emperor had washed his hands of all concern about the affairs of Denmark, and would have nothing more to do with them; but I wanted to show — and I think the extract which I read certainly did show—that the Emperor, in consequence of what had occurred between England and France in regard to the negotiations respecting Poland, had not sufficient confidence any longer in the steadfast policy of the English Government that he would act with them. I did not think it necessary to trouble the House with the whole of the despatch; but the part which I omitted strengthened my position, because, what did it say? The French Minister says you are not to suppose that we are indifferent about Denmark, but we decline to act with you. Therefore, the very passage which I am charged with omitting, actually confirmed my statement. The Chancellor of the Exchequer also accused me of "falsifying" a document. After the gracious manner in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer apologized for that expression, I do not recall it to give him the slightest annoyance; but I ask what was the despatch to which that accusation against me applied? I described a despatch as menacing to the Diet, and I will assume that I may have made the mistake of treating a menace applicable to the decree of the Diet in reference to the inheritance of the Duchies, as being applicable to the Federal Execution. I really have not had an opportunity to verify this point, but it is possible that I may have put the matter in that way. But assuming that, it is evidently a most insignificant point, and one that would by no means justify the serious charge that was made. I dismiss all this idle matter, which has really taken up much too much of the time of the House, and which, through so distinguished a person as the Chancellor of the Exchequer having dealt with it, has led to his example being followed by many other hon. Members in this debate; and I come to the material parts of his speech.

The right hon. Gentleman says, "There are two positions which I lay down: first, you say that the English Government were acting in a very irregular and impolitic manner; that they were menacing here and cajoling there; that Germany was threatened on one day and Denmark misled on another? But I maintain," he said, "that we did nothing that was not done by the other great Powers,—France and Russia." That was stated broadly by the right hon. Gentleman, and has been repeated since; but there is not a tittle of proof of it. We have had plenty of proof that the Government menaced and cajoled, but we have no evidence whatever beyond this stout statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, reiterated as it has been by the Under Secretary. On the contrary, from all we can judge from the papers on the table, the truth is that whenever we announced to the Courts of France and Russia, that we were going to take a certain step, they sometimes gave a qualified and reluctant assent, and occasionally there may have been one of those mechanical applications to the German Courts recommending or acknowledging with approbation our policy; but there is no proof whatever that the same tone taken by the English Government with respect to the German Courts or the Danish Court was ever adopted by those Powers. If so, why does not Denmark complain of them as of England? Denmark never pretends that France or Russia misled her. The second position of the Chancellor of the Exchequer is, that our Government never renewed their menaces after they knew that other Powers would not join them. That is an admission that they did menace before that time. There is no proof of that second position, but there is an immense mass of proof the other way. Sir, I want to know when Her Majesty's Government ceased to menace. The despatch quoted very properly in the excellent speech of my right hon. Friend the Member for Dublin University (Mr. Whiteside)—I mean the letter to Lord Bloomfield from Lord Russell, where he gives an account of his conversation with Count Bernstorff—shows that for nine months from the month of May preceding, Her Majesty's Government were in fact threatening Germany with war; when Count Bernstorff adverted shortly and pointedly to the dangers that would be incurred by Europe if Germany and England should ever become enemies,— Lord Russell fully admitted them and as fully regretted their existence—

> "But I (Lord Russell) said that, since the month of May, Great Britain had warned Austria of these dangers; that Prussia and Germany had likewise been warned; but that the voice of England was unheeded, and little time was now left for counsel, wisdom, and moderation. I hoped it would not be thrown away."—No. 4, 535.

I hoped it would not be thrown away! What is a menace if that be not one? What do they mean by saying they have not menaced? What has happened in Parliament this year — in both Houses? Have we not had the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the House of Lords making mysterious announcements about the Channel fleet? What did that mean? Why should the Secretary of State in his place in Parliament tell us that the Channel fleet was ready, and that he did not think the Prussian and Austrian fleet united would dare to meet it? I ask the House what does that mean? Was it merely a playful phrase, just designed to amuse the Peers before dinner, who are not always so busily engaged as they are to-night? What is the meaning of the Secretary of the Admiralty coming down and hitching his trowsers like a celebrated performer in nautical pieces. ["Oh!"] I assure the noble Lord that I only meant an allusion to the profession of which he is an ornament, and declaring that the Channel fleet was all ready to go anywhere in twenty-four hours—what did that mean?

Lord CLARENCE PAGET: I beg to say that that was spoken in answer to a question from the right hon. Baronet the Member for Droitwich.

Mr. DISRAELI: I have no doubt it was in answer to a question of my right hon. Friend the Member for Droitwich—but it was not the question of my right hon. Friend that sent the funds down the next day one per cent. Well, Sir, I say there has been a continuous system of menaces; and I must remind the House that none of the circumstances to which I have just referred have ever been explained or vindicated. There is another point which has come out very much in this debate and never been satisfactorily met by any speaker on behalf of the Government. All the materials on which they formed their ultimate decision respecting interference between Germany and Denmark were in their possession months and months ago; and yet the decision was never formed until after the Conference, when the noble Lord (Viscount Palmerston) came down and finally communicated it to the House — and communicated it even then with a gloomy and somewhat terrific proviso at the end of his statement, which certainly did not convey to the country the idea that their policy was even then fixed. I want to have that explained. Why was Europe disturbed and the country distracted with the idea of going to war about Denmark, when all the materials on which the ultimate decision of the Government was formed had been in their possession for months and months? They were perfectly acquainted with the fact that France and Russia would not act with them—they knew the exact determination and policy of the German Courts—all those considerations with regard to our finance and commerce, the effect of blockades upon our mercantile intercourse, all these and other considerations must have presented themselves to them; and yet for months and months, with these materials in their possession upon which to come to a decision, that decision was taken at the last moment, and without any satisfactory explanation? "But," says the Chancellor of the Exchequer, "I object to the course you are taking. If we have mismanaged your affairs, this is not the manner in which a great party in opposition should act. You ought to address the Crown to dismiss its Ministers. In the days of the Norths and the Foxes they addressed the Crown in an unequivocal manner to dismiss the Ministers. They never had discussions on Resolutions as to the conduct of negotiations and matters of detail of this kind. They went forward boldly and addressed the Crown." The right hon. Gentleman says, "Not only do you not act in a straightforward manner and address the Crown to dismiss the Ministers, but you use language in your address unprecedented in Parliament—language which depreciates the position of this country, so unusual, so unparliamentary, so unprecedented—language which it will be a disgrace to Parliament to adopt, and which in the great days of the Norths and Foxes was never adopted." Now, I contest the position taken by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on both these points. I take the case of the fall of the

Administration of Lord Shelburne. A peace had been concluded with France, Spain, and America, the independence of our colonies being recognized. Lord Shelburne negotiated that peace. The papers were laid on the table; the Opposition did not approve that peace; and how did they proceed? Did they address the Crown for the dismissal of Ministers? On the contrary, they took a perfectly different course, but not so decided a course as that I have recommended and am prepared to vindicate. They proceeded by Resolution. Lord George Cavendish moved among others, "That the concessions made to the adversaries of Great Britain were greater than they were entitled to." Why, that is not only a proceeding by Resolution, but by a Resolution which would show at least that the Government had made concessions which they were not entitled to make. We might then have proceeded by way of Resolution. But I now come to the other statement of the right hon. Gentleman, echoed by the noble Lord (Viscount Palmerston) and received always with a chorus of cheers, that there is something unparliamentary, even disgraceful, in the House of Commons proposing in an Address to the Crown to make an allusion to the just influence of the country being lowered. This, said the right hon. Gentleman, is not the course which was taken in the great days of the Norths and Foxes. Well, I take the Address moved by Mr. Fox on one of the most celebrated occasions of this kind that ever occurred, and I will read it to the House, and if Her Majesty's Ministers will accept it instead of mine—a more modest Address, adapted to the temperate spirit of our times, I shall be perfectly ready to make arrangements to that effect. Mr. Fox said, in his Address to the Crown—

> "We can neither give any credit to the Ministry for their profession of a wish for peace, nor repose any confidence in their capacity for conducting negotiations to prosperous issues, odious as they are to any enemy and contemptible in the eyes of all Europe from the display of insincerity and incapacity which has marked their conduct."

These are the expressions used by Mr. Fox in his address to the Crown in 1796. I did not use such language; but I think I have answered the objections of the right hon. Gentleman. ["No, no!"] I have proposed an Address to the Crown, which, because it alludes to the just influence of this country having been lowered, is said to be unprecedented, although Mr. Fox, whom the right hon. Gentleman recommended to me as an authority, moved an Address in which the Ministry of the country, which for foreign nations is the country, are described as contemptible in the eyes of Europe. The right hon. Gentleman complains of our not meeting the question in a more explicit and straightforward way. But are we met in an explicit and straightforward way? I never believed, until I heard the speech of the noble Lord, that the Government were really going to shelter themselves under the Amendment, the Amendment which has never been moved, of the hon. Member for Bridgewater (Mr. Kinglake). I thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer met us fairly the other night and said, "The real question at issue is this—Are you or are you not satisfied with our administration of your foreign affairs in these negotiations? That is the interpretation I put upon the question. It is a vote of want of confidence in our conduct of those negotiations?" If that be your interpretation of the position you occupy, how can you fall back on the Amendment of the hon. Member for Bridgewater? What is that Amendment? It is the previous Question, drawn up by an amateur diplomatist, and moved by the historian of the campaign in the Crimea as a compliment, I suppose, to the Emperor of the French. But the noble Lord who has just sat down, and who is going to support the Amendment of the "previous Question" declines to meet the case at all. ["No, no!"] I understand the noble Lord to say that his opinion is that the Government should support it. But the noble Lord has been very careful, though he shields himself formally under the Amendment of the Member for Bridgewater, to make as wide an issue as possible. What consolation Denmark will have from that last account of the investments in our savings banks, I am at a loss to understand. We have had too the Indian Budget to-night, which usually is not brought forward till late in July; and we have also been treated with the marvellous efforts of Government (Providence, of course, having had nothing to do with it) in alleviating the disasters of the Cotton famine. Sir, the issue before the House will be the Amendment of the hon. Member for Bridgewater, which gives no approbation to the conduct of the Government. As far as I can understand it, although they argue on the merits of their case, the Government will not take the opinion of the House boldly upon it. That, I think, is not acting with the fairness we should have expected from Her Majesty's Government. The House has collectively incurred some very hard words, because acting, I think, from very proper motives, they have not hastened to a decision on the policy of the Government; and therefore, as we have at last, and I think at the right time, asked the opinion of the House, we had a right to expect that Her Majesty's Government would not have evaded a decision. We must remember we have all of us been taunted by the right hon. Member for Stroud (Mr. Horsman) with absolute complicity with Government in avoiding a decision on this question. I will not trespass now upon the indulgence of the House in detail; but one result of this debate will be, that the House of Commons—I do not speak of the Opposition alone—are completely exonerated from any such imputation. I was rather surprised to hear the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs expatiating on our delay in bringing forward this question. Many of the most important despatches were not in our hands until after the Easter holydays, and, although the right hon. Member for Stroud is of opinion that it was my duty to come forward and step in between the Conference when it was announced as about to sit, and its result, and to call upon the House for an opinion that the Government were not justified in calling that Conference together, I am still of opinion that it was far wiser on the part of the Opposition to take the course we did. When the Minister of the Crown, in his place in Parliament, and speaking on his own responsibility, assured the House of Commons that a Conference had been called together, and that he was not without hopes of a satisfactory result, I think that, if I had proposed to interfere between the Government and the Conference, I should have taken a step the country would not have approved. Yet, for abstaining from this interference, we are made the objects of an invective of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Horsman) of an unprecedented kind. He denounces the Government, he derides the Opposition, he detests the Peace party, he attacks the whole body of the House of Commons, and tells them that they are guilty of complicity with the Ministry because we did not move in this question. But why did not the right hon. Gentleman move in it? He had for three months on the paper a motion which was without exception the most unconstitutional that was ever placed on the table of this House. Why did he not move that preposterous proposition, which struck at the prerogative of the Crown, and would have changed the whole spirit of our constitution? Why, because he knew that if he had moved that revolutionary rigmarole he would have been left without a teller had he gone to a division. And this is the Gentleman who lectures Parliament as a body, and every individual in particular, with a recklessness of assertion unequalled. We know that in private life there is always in every circle some person, male or female, who is regarded as "a superior person." They decide on everything, they lecture everybody; all acknowledge their transcendant qualities; but everyone gets out of their way. The right hon. Member for Stroud is the "superior person" of the House of Commons. I am quite surprised that the hon. Gentleman the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck), who has been sitting opposite the right hon. Member for Stroud with that colossal lantern which he always uses to find an honest man, has not the ingenuousness to acknowledge that he has at last found the object of his search. The first Minister of the Crown having brought forward the state of the revenue and of our exports and imports, I want to know why he did not bring those interesting documents in to the debate on the Ashantee war—because they were equally applicable there. Her Majesty's Government have mismanaged the affairs of Denmark, but then, they say, our exports and imports have increased. The House will have something to say about New Zealand before long, and I want to know what documents the President of the Board of Trade will furnish the noble Lord with on that occasion. The noble Lord says the influence of the country has not been lowered by the action of the Government, but that influence depends on intelligence, wealth, and so on. If our influence merely depends upon wealth, intelligence, success in the arts, and the development of our industry, I shall begin to think with the hon. Member for Rochdale (Mr. Cobden) that it would be quite as well to do away with the Foreign Office. The noble Lord asks where our influence is lessened? And he reminded the House that I had said that if England and France were united war would be difficult; and that if England, France, and Russia were united war would be impossible. He says the Government have adopted what I laid down as the cardinal principle of foreign affairs. The noble Lord says, "We did apply to France and Russia." Yes; but France and Russia would not act with you. That was the element wanting in the administration of your foreign policy. You failed. I ask you why you failed? We know very well that in July—ten days after the speech of the noble Lord, which he has abjured to-night—the French Government communicated to us that they were eager and anxious to act with us in this matter. You had then the ready sympathy and willing assistance of France. Why did you forfeit it? I say you forfeited it by the manner in which you conducted your negotiations with respect to Poland. And what is your defence on that point? The hon. Gentleman the Member for the King's County (Mr. Hennessy) gave notice of an Address to the Crown in favour of Poland, and there was an apprehension that the Opposition were going to support it. And so our gifted Ministry plunged headlong into these portentous Polish negotiations, which have tended to destroy our influence in Europe, and have been one of the main causes of the fall of Denmark. I say it is impossible that Ministers so experienced could be influenced by a notice given by an independent Member of this House, and by an idle rumour that we were going to support his Motion. I do not believe that men upon whom so much responsibility rests could be influenced and controlled by such slight events. "But," says the noble Lord, "the Motion was very strong and very dangerous." Well, Sir, so far as I was concerned, I recommended my hon. Friend the Member for the King's County to withdraw his Resolution; but when some one tried to induce him to alter it, I recommended him not to follow that advice. I approved it because in its terms it was copied *verbatim* from the principal despatch of the noble Lord himself, when Foreign Secretary, on Polish affairs. I said, if we are to have an Address to the Crown, let us have the language used by an experienced statesman who has considered this subject in every light; and do not let us make a mistake in an Address which we propose to bear to the foot of the Throne. I deny that the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stroud, as to the course which I pursued on the Motion relative to Poland, has the slightest foundation. As for the romance of the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, it is entirely due to the energy and ardour of his imagination. I dont find fault with those qualities. We must take a man as we find him, and, although we might wish that the hon. Gentleman possessed a little more tact in debate, yet in that case he might never have discovered the bulls of Nineveh. That a man filling so responsible an office as that of Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs should relate to the House that monstrous and marvellous story of a conspiracy to restore Poland and turn out the Ministry, is one of those eccentricities that only occur in prolonged debates. The noble Lord asks, Where is the influence of this country lowered? I say "everywhere." It can be said of you what cannot be said of any other Ministry that this country ever had. Twice within the last twelve months you have made the most importunate appeals to St. Petersburg, and twice they have been rejected, and once with a haughty reprimand. You have not once or twice but many times, applied to France in your difficulties, but France has declined to act with you. I say that proves you have lost your influence. You have menaced Austria—you have menaced Prussia—you have menaced the Diet—and in every instance your representations have been treated with indifference. Is not that evidence that the just influence of this country has been lowered? It is said that my Resolution is retrospective, and does not refer to the future. That is not the case. I have said nothing about indicating a policy, because every one now admits that it is not our duty to go to the foot of the Throne and indicate a policy. But, Sir, I say that the Address which I will in a moment place in your hands is not retrospective, does refer to the future, and is essentially practical. That can be shown in a moment. Suppose we had really pursued the course which had been denounced by the Member for Stroud—suppose when the papers had been all produced we had not asked the opinion of the House upon the conduct of the Government—that, indeed, would have been shameful complicity. Suppose the House had been prorogued without our having solicited its opinion, and suppose that in the interval, before Parliament meets again, some other State in Europe—Holland, Belgium, Switzerland was in danger—what security have we that Her Majesty's Ministers would not pursue towards that

State the identical policy which they have pursued with regard to Denmark? They would naturally say, the House of Commons have not disapproved our policy, they have sanctioned menaces at one time, retractation at another. Therefore, I say, we can prevent in the future a policy so disastrous only by passing the Resolution which now, Sir, I place in your hands; and I am confident that it will recommend itself to the opinion of the House, and approve itself to the feelings of the country.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: I hope the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) will not put the House to the trouble of dividing on his Amendment. He must have ascertained that the feeling of the House is not in its favour, and it would be very inconvenient to go to a division upon it at this hour. [*Loud cries for the withdrawal of the Amendment.*]

MR. NEWDEGATE replied: It would afford me great pleasure to comply with anything which the noble Lord suggests; but I ask for an answer; the Danish people are a free people, and I wish for a decision from this House as the representatives of another free people, whether this House will consent to afford any assistance to the Danish people in defence of their independence as a nation by adopting the terms proposed by the neutral Powers in the recent Conference? [*Continued cries, urging the hon. Member to withdraw his Motion.*]

MR. SPEAKER put the Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question;" and the great majority of voices appearing to be in the affirmative, Mr. Speaker declared that in his judgment the "Ayes" have it. Whereupon the hon. Member for North Warwickshire called that "the Noes have it."

MR. SPEAKER said, that before he again put the Question on the hon. Gentleman's Amendment, he wished to call the attention of the House to a matter affecting their proceeding in verification of the voices. If the hon. Member should persist in dividing the House, inconvenience might result, and it would be necessary to have some change made in their arrangements. It appeared that the "Noes" would form a very small portion of the Members present, and that, therefore, the lobby would not contain all the "Ayes." The difficulty had been foreseen, and considered by himself and the officers of the House; and he proposed a slight change in the arrangements, interfering as little as possible with the established forms. The "Ayes" would go to the right, but the door of the lobby would be kept open; they would pass on and be counted without delay. But in order that the incoming stream might not be commingled in the House with the outgoing stream, the Members as they were counted would pass into the lobby outside of the House; when all should have been told, they would re-enter the House. He trusted this arrangement would obviate the inconvenience that must otherwise arise.

MR. SPEAKER then again put the Question, and not more than two or three voices declaring in the negative, Mr. Speaker said that in his judgment the "Ayes" have it.

Whereupon—

MR. NEWDEGATE said—I think, Sir, that the decision of the House is now evident. I have no wish to put the House to inconvenience by a division. I therefore withdraw my Amendment.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

MR. KINGLAKE, who attempted to address the House in explanation, but was prevented proceeding by the impatience of the House, then moved his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out the last paragraph of the proposed Question, in order to add the words "To express the satisfaction with which we have learnt that, at this conjuncture, Her Majesty has been advised to abstain from armed interference in the War now going on between Denmark and the German Powers,"—(*Mr. Kinglake,*)

—instead thereof.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 295; Noes 313: Majority 18.

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Resolved,

That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, to thank Her Majesty for directing the Correspondence on Denmark and Germany, and the Protocols of the Conference recently held in London, to be laid before Parliament:

To assure Her Majesty, that we have heard with deep concern, that the sittings of that Conference have been brought to a close without accomplishing the important purposes for which it was convened:

To express the satisfaction with which we have learnt that, at this conjuncture, Her Majesty has been advised to abstain from armed interference in the War now going on between Denmark and the German Powers.

To be presented by Privy Councillors.

AYES.

Acton, Sir J. D.
Adderley, rt. hon. C. B.
Annesley, hon. Col. H.
Arbuthnott, hon. Gen.
Archdall, Captain M.
Astell, J. H.
Bailey, C.
Baillie, H. J.
Baring, A. H.
Baring, T.
Barttelot, Colonel
Bateson, Sir T.
Bathurst, A. A.
Bathurst, Colonel H.
Beach, W. W. B.
Bective, Earl of
Beecroft, G. S.
Bentinck, G. W. P.
Bentinck, G. C.
Benyon, R.
Beresford, rt. hon. W.
Beresford, D. W. P.
Bernard, hon. Colonel
Bernard, T. T.
Blake, J. A.
Bond, J. W. M'G.
Booth, Sir R. G.
Bovill, W.
Bowyer, Sir G.
Brady, Dr.
Bramley-Moore, J.
Bramston, T. W.
Bremridge, R.
Bridges, Sir B. W.
Brooks, R.
Bruce, Sir H. H.
Bruen, H.
Burghley, Lord
Butler-Johnstone, H. A.
Cairns, Sir H. M'C.
Cargill, W. W.
Cartwright, Colonel
Cave, S.
Cecil, Lord R.
Clive, Capt. hon. G. W.
Cobbold, J. C.
Cochrane, A. D. R. W. B.
Cogan, W. H. F.
Cole, hon. H.
Cole, hon. J. L.
Collins, T.
Conolly, T.
Copeland, Mr. Ald.
Corbally, M. E.
Corry, rt. hon. H. L.
Cubitt, G.
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Damer, S. D.
Dawson, R. P.
Dickson, Colonel
Disraeli, rt. hon. B.
Drax, J. S. W. S. E. D.
Du Cane, C.
Duncombe, hon. W. E.
Dunne, Colonel
Du Pre, C. G.
Edwards, Colonel
Egerton, Sir P. G.
Egerton, hon. A. F.
Egerton, E. C.
Egerton, hon. W.
Elphinstone, Sir J. D.
Estcourt, rt. hon. T. H. S.
Fane, Colonel J. W.
Farquhar, Sir M.
Farrer, J.
Fellowes, E.
Fergusson, Sir J.
Ferrand, W.
Filmer, Sir E.
FitzGerald, W. R. S.
Fleming, T. W.
Forde, Colonel
Forester, rt. hon. Gen.
Franklyn, G. W.
Fraser, Sir W. A.
Gallwey, Sir W. P.
Galway, Viscount
Gard, R. S.
George, J.
Getty, S. G.
Gilpin, Colonel
Goddard, A. L.
Gore, J. R. O.
Gore, W. R. O.
Graham, Lord W.
Greaves, E.
Greenall, G.
Greene, J.
Greville, Colonel F.
Gray, Captain
Grey de Wilton, Visct.
Griffith, C. D.
Grogan, Sir E.
Haliburton, T. C.
Hamilton, Lord C.
Hamilton, Major
Hamilton, Viscount
Hamilton, I. T.
Hardy, G.
Hardy, J.
Hartopp, E. B.
Harvey, R. B.
Hassard, M.
Hay, Sir J. C. D.
Heathcote, Sir W.
Hennessy, J. P.
Henniker, Lord
Hesketh, Sir T. G.
Heygate, Sir F. W.
Heygate, W. U.
Hill, hon. R. C.
Hodgson, R.
Holford, R. S.
Holmesdale, Viscount
Hood, Sir A. A.
Hopwood, J. T.
Hornby, W. H.
Horsfall, T. B.
Hotham, Lord
Howes, E.
Hubbard, J. G.
Humberston, P. S.
Hume, W. W. F.
Humphery, W. H.
Hunt, G. W.
Ingestre, Viscount
Jermyn, Earl
Jervis, Captain
Jolliffe, rt. hon. Sir W. G. H.
Jolliffe, H. H.
Jones, D.
Kekewich, S. T.
Kelly, Sir F.
Kendall, N.
Kennard, R. W.
Ker, D. S.
Kerrison, Sir E. C.
King, J. K.
Knatchbull, W. F.
Knight, F. W.
Knightley, R.
Knox, Colonel
Knox, hon. Major S.
Lacon, Sir E.
Laird, J.
Langton, W. G.
Leader, N. P.
Leeke, Sir H.
Lefroy, A.
Legh, W. J.
Lennox, Lord G. G.
Lennox, Lord H. G.
Lennox, C. S. B. H. K.
Leslie, C. P.
Leslie, W.
Liddell, hon. H. G.
Long, R. P.
Longfield, R.
Lopes, Sir M.
Lovaine, Lord
Lowther, hon. Colonel
Lowther, Captain
Lyall, G.
Lygon, hon. F.
Lytton, rt. hon. Sir G. E. L. B.
Macaulay, K.
M'Cann, J.
M'Cormick, W.
Macdonogh, F.
MacEvoy, E.
M'Mahon, P.
Malcolm, J. W.
Malins, R.
Manners, rt. hn. Lord J.
Manners, Lord G. J.
Maxwell, hon. Colonel
Miles, Sir W.
Miller, T. J.
Mills, A.
Mitford, W. T.
Montagu, Lord R.
Montgomery, Sir G.
Mordaunt, Sir C.
Morgan, O.
Morgan, hon. Major
Morritt, W. J. S.
Mowbray, rt. hon. J. R.
Mundy, W.
Mure, D.
Naas, Lord
Nicol, W.
Noel, hon. G. J.
North, Colonel
Northcote, Sir S. H.
O'Conor Don, The
O'Donoghue, The
O'Ferrall, rt. hon. R. M.
O'Neill, E.
O'Reilly, M. W.
Packe, C. W.
Pakenham, Colonel
Pakington, rt. hn. Sir J.
Palk, Sir L.
Palmer, R. W.
Papillon, P. O.
Parker, Major W.
Patten, Colonel W.
Paull, H.
Peacocke, G. M. W.
Peel, rt. hon. General
Pennant, hon. Colonel
Pevensey, Viscount
Phillips, G. L.
Powell, F. S.
Powys-Lybbe, P. L.
Quinn, P.
Redmond, J. E.
Repton, G. W. J.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Rogers, J. J.
Rolt, J.
Rose, W. A.
Rowley, hon. R. T.
Salt, T.
Sclater-Booth, G.
Scott, Lord H.
Scully, V.
Selwyn, C. J.
Shirley, E. P.
Smith, A. (Herts)
Smith, Sir F.
Smith, M.
Smith, S. G.
Smyth, Colonel
Smollett, P. B.
Somerset, Colonel
Somes, J.
Stanhope, J. B.
Stanhope, Lord
Stanley, Lord
Stirling, W.
Stracey, Sir H.
Stronge, Colonel
Stewart, Sir M. R. S.
Stuart, Lieut.-Col. W.
Sturt, H. G.
Sturt, Lieut.-Col. N.
Sullivan, M.
Surtees, H. E.
Talbot, hon. W. C.
Thynne, Lord E.
Thynne, Lord H.
Tollemache, J.
Torrens, R.
Tottenham, Lieut.-Col. C. G.
Trefusis, hon. C. H. R.
Treherne, M.
Trevor, Lord A. E. H.
Trollope, rt. hon. Sir J.
Turner, C.
Vance, J.
Vandeleur, Colonel
Vansittart, W.
Verner, Sir W.
Verner, E. W.
Vyse, Colonel H.
Walcott, Admiral
Waldron, L.
Walker, J. R.
Walpole, rt. hon. S. H.
Walsh, Sir J.
Waterhouse, S.
Watlington, J. W. P.
Welby, W. E.
Whiteside, rt. hon. J.

Williams, Colonel
Willoughby, Sir H.
Woodd, B. T.
Wyndham, hon. H.
Wyndham, hon. P.
Wynn, C. W. W.
Yorke, hon. E. T.
Yorke, J. R.

TELLERS.
Taylor, Colonel
Whitmore, H.

NOES.

Adair, H. E.
Adam, W. P.
Adeane, H. J.
Agar-Ellis, hon. L.G.F.
Agnew, Sir A.
Alcock, T.
Andover, Viscount
Angerstein, W.
Anson, hon. Major
Anstruther, Sir R.
Antrobus, E.
Ashley, Lord
Athlumney, Lord
Aytoun, R. S.
Bagwell, J.
Baines, E.
Baring, rt. hon. Sir F.T.
Baring, T. G.
Barnes, T.
Bass, M. T.
Baxter, W. E.
Bazley, T.
Beale, S.
Beamish, F. B.
Beaumont, W. B.
Beaumont, S. A.
Bellew, R. M.
Berkeley, hon. H. F.
Berkeley, hon. Colonel F. W. F.
Berkeley, hon. C. P. F.
Biddulph, Colonel
Black, A.
Blencowe, J. G.
Bonham-Carter, J.
Bouverie, rt. hon. E. P.
Bouverie, hon. P. P.
Bright, J.
Briscoe, J. I.
Brocklehurst, J.
Brown, J.
Browne, Lord J. T.
Bruce, Lord E.
Bruce, rt. hon. H. A.
Buchanan, W.
Buckley, General
Bulkeley, Sir R.
Buller, J. W.
Buller, Sir A. W.
Burke, Sir T. J.
Bury, Viscount
Butler, C. S.
Butt, I.
Buxton, C.
Caird, J.
Calthorpe, hon. F. H. W. G.
Cardwell, rt. hon. E.
Carnegie, hon. C.
Castlerosse, Viscount
Cavendish, Lord G.
Chapman, J.
Childers, H. C. E.
Cholmeley, Sir M. J.
Churchill, Lord A. S.
Clay, J.
Clifford, C. C.
Clifford, Colonel
Clifton, Sir R. J.
Clinton, Lord R.
Cobbett, J. M.
Cobden, R.
Coke, hon. Colonel
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.
Collier, Sir R. P.
Colthurst, Sir G. C.
Cowper, rt. hon. W. F.
Cox, W.
Craufurd, E. H. J.
Crawford, R. W.
Crossley, Sir F.
Dalglish, R.
Davey, R.
Davie, Sir H. R. F.
Davie, Colonel F.
Denman, hon. G.
Dent, J. D.
Dering, Sir E. C.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Dodson, J. G.
Douglas, Sir C.
Doulton, F.
Duff, M. E. G.
Duff, R. W.
Duke, Sir J.
Dunbar, Sir William
Dundas, F.
Dundas, rt. hon. Sir D.
Dunkellin, Lord
Dunlop, A. M.
Dunne, M.
Dutton, hon. R. H.
Elcho, Lord
Enfield, Viscount
Ennis, J.
Esmonde, J.
Evans, T. W.
Ewart, W.
Ewart, J. C.
Ewing, H. E. Crum-
Fenwicke, E. M.
Fenwicke, H.
Fermoy, Lord
Finlay, A. S.
Fitzwilliam, hn. C.W.W.
Foley, H. W.
Foljambe, F. J. S.
Forster, C.
Forster, W. E.
Foster, W. O.
Fortescue, hon. F. D.
Fortescue, rt. hon. C.
French, Colonel
Gavin, Major
Gibson, rt. hon. T. M.
Gilpin, C.
Gladstone, rt. hon. W.
Glyn, G. G.
Goldsmid, Sir F. H.
Goschen, G. J.
Gower, hon. F. L.
Gower, G. W. G. L.
Greenwood, J.
Gregory, W. H.
Gregson, S.
Grenfell, C. P.
Grenfell, H. R.
Grey, rt. hon. Sir G.
Grosvenor, Earl
Grosvenor, Lord R.
Gurdon, B.
Gurney, J. H.
Gurney, S.
Hadfield, G.
Hanbury, R.
Handley, John
Hankey, T.
Hanmer, Sir J.
Hardcastle, J. A.
Hartington, Marq. of
Hervey, Lord A.
Hayter, rt. hn. Sir W.G.
Headlam, rt. hon. T. E.
Heathcote, hon. G. H.
Henderson, J.
Henley, Lord
Herbert, rt. hon. H. A.
Hibbert, J. T.
Hodgkinson, G.
Hodgson, K. D.
Holland, E.
Horsman, rt. hon. E.
Howard, hon. C. W. G.
Howard, Lord E.
Hutt, rt. hon. W.
Ingham, R.
Jackson, W.
Jervoise, Sir J. C.
Johnstone, Sir J.
King, hon. P. J. L.
Kinglake, A. W.
Kinglake, J. A.
Kingscote, Colonel
Kinnaird, hon. A. F.
Layard, A. H.
Langton, W. H. G.
Lawson, W.
Leatham, E. A.
Lefevre, G. J. S.
Lee, W.
Legh, Major C.
Levinge, Sir R.
Lewis, H.
Lindsay, W. S.
Locke, J.
Lowe, rt. hon. R.
Lysley, W. J.
Mackie, J.
Mackinnon, W. A. (Lym)
Mackinnon, W. A. (Rye)
Mainwaring, T.
Marjoribanks, D. C.
Marsh, M. H.
Martin, P. W.
Martin, J.
Massey, W. N.
Matheson, A.
Merry, J.
Mildmay, H. F.
Miller, W.
Mills, J. R.
Mitchell, T. A.
Moffatt, G.
Moncreiff, rt. hon. J.
Monsell, rt. hon. W.
Morris, D.
Morrison, W.
Neate, C.
Norris, J. T.
North, F.
O'Brien, P.
Ogilvy, Sir J.
O'Hagan, rt. hon. T.
O'Loghlen, Sir C. M.
Onslow, G.
Owen, Sir H. O.
Packe, Colonel
Padmore, R.
Paget, C.
Paget, Lord A.
Paget, Lord C.
Palmer, Sir R.
Palmerston, Viscount
Paxton, Sir J.
Pease, H.
Peel, rt. hon. Sir R.
Peel, rt. hon. F.
Peel, J.
Pender, J.
Peto, Sir S. M.
Pilkington, J.
Pinney, Colonel
Ponsonby, hon. A.
Portman, hon. W. H. B.
Potter, E.
Powell, J. J.
Price, R. G.
Pryse, E. L.
Pritchard, J.
Proby, Lord
Pugh, D.
Ramsden, Sir J. W.
Ricardo, O.
Robartes, T. J. A.
Robertson, D.
Robertson, H.
Roebuck, J. A.
Rothschild, Baron L. de
Rothschild, Baron M. de
Russell, H.
Russell, A.
Russell, F. W.
Russell, Sir W.
St. Aubyn, J.
Salomons, Mr. Ald.
Scholefield, W.
Scott, Sir W.
Scourfield, J. H.
Scrope, G. P.
Seely, C.
Seymour, H. D.
Seymour, W. D.
Seymour, A.
Shafto, R. D.
Shelley, Sir J. V.
Sheridan, R. B.
Sheridan, H. B.
Sidney, T.
Smith, A. (Truro)
Smith, J. A.
Smith, J. B.
Smith, M. T.
Stacpoole, W.
Staniland, M.
Stansfeld, J.
Steel, J.

Stuart, Colonel
Sykes, Colonel W. H.
Talbot, C. R. M.
Taylor, P. A.
Thompson, H. S.
Thornhill, W. P.
Tite, W.
Tollemache, hon. F. J.
Tomline, G.
Tracy, hon. C. R. D. H.
Trelawny, Sir J. S.
Turner, J. A.
Tynte, Colonel K.
Vane, Lord H.
Verney, Sir H.
Vernon, H. F.
Villiers, rt. hon. C. P.
Vivian, H. H.
Vyner, R. A.
Walter, J.
Warner, E.
Watkin, E. W.
Watkins, Colonel L.
Weguelin, T. M.
Western, S.
Westhead, J. P. B.
Whalley, G. H.
Whitbread, S.
White, J.
White, hon. L.
Wickham, H. W.
Williams, W.
Williamson, Sir H.
Winnington, Sir T. E.
Wood, rt. hon. Sir C.
Woods, H.
Wrightson, W. B.
Wyld, J.
Wyvill, M.

TELLERS.
Brand, hon. H. B. W.
Knatchbull-Hugessen, E.

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock, till *Monday* next.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, *July* 11, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—On Library of the House (*List of the Committee*).
Public Bills — *Second Reading*— India Office* (No. 191); Thames Conservancy* (No. 173).
Committee—Life Annuities and Life Assurances* (No. 116); Lunacy (Scotland)* (No. 172).
Report—Public and Refreshment Houses (No. 184); Life Annuities and Life Assurances* (No. 116); Lunacy (Scotland)* (No. 172).
Third Reading—Summary Procedure (Scotland)* (No. 165), and *passed*.

LIBRARY OF THE HOUSE.

Select Committee to consider of certain Matters relative to the Library of this House and to the Papers and Documents delivered for their Lordships House, *appointed:* The Lords following were named of the Committee; the Committee to meet on *Friday* next, at Three o'clock:—

L. Abp. Canterbury, Ld. Chancellor, Ld. President, Ld. Privy Seal, D. Richmond, M. Lansdowne, M. Bath, E. Stanhope, E. Malmesbury, E. Russell, V. Eversley, L. Willoughby de Eresby, L. Colville of Culross, L. Ponsonby, L. Redesdale, L. Colchester, L. Somerhill, L. Brougham and Vaux, L. Monteagle of Brandon, L. Cranworth, L. St. Leonards, L. Wensleydale, L. Chelmsford, L. Kingsdown.

BURIAL SERVICE.—ADDRESS MOVED.

Lord EBURY rose to move an Address for the appointment of a Commission to consider what steps should be taken to obviate the evils complained of as arising from the present compulsory and indiscriminate use of the Burial Service of the Church of England. The noble Lord said, that before proceeding to submit the Motion, he desired to call their Lordships' notice to the position in which this question now presented itself. Last year, somewhat earlier in the Session, he proposed a similar Motion. On that occasion he could have very easily proved the extent to which those evils were felt from various sources; and he had preferred at once to point their Lordships' attention to a remarkable document which placed the question beyond all doubt, and he should do no more than refer to it now. It was a petition addressed to the right rev. Prelates by 4000 of the clergy of the Church of England (some of whom were now on the Bench, and others holding very distinguished offices in the Church), in which they used these terms—

> "We beg to express our conviction that the almost indiscriminate use of the Order for the Burial of the Dead as practically enforced by the existing state of the law imposes a heavy burden upon the consciences of clergymen, and is the occasion of a grievous scandal to many Christian people. We therefore most humbly pray that your Lordships will be pleased to give the subject now brought under your consideration such attention as the magnitude of these evils appears to require, with a view to the devising some effectual remedy."

That petition, which was not addressed to Parliament but to the right rev. Prelates, was presented thirteen years ago, and up to this time nothing has been done to relieve those parties from the grievance and scandal of which they complained. It was signed by those who felt the grievance and witnessed the scandal, and yet nothing had been done in the direction of the prayer. In the debate which arose when he made his Motion last year, very strong opinions were expressed by almost every noble Lord who took part in the discussion, that this state of things should not be allowed to continue; and the Primate of All England on that occasion undertook to see what he could do in order to produce some kind of legislation which might mitigate the evils complained of. The most rev. Prelate did not absolutely promise to provide a remedy, but he stated that he would consult his right rev. Brethren and the clergy, with a view of ascertaining whether some satisfactory arrangement might not be arrived at. A year had passed away, and about a fortnight ago he took the liberty of asking his most rev. Friend, whether in the interval that had elapsed he had been able to do anything, and whether he was able to say if any legislation was likely to take place upon the subject during the present Session. The most rev. Prelate in answer said that he had discussed the matter with his right rev. Brethren, and had endeavoured to obtain the opinions of the clergy, and the result was his belief that the great majority were averse to any change, and, under these circumstances, he was not prepared to make any proposal. Upon that occasion he (Lord Ebury) deprecated any further discussion upon the subject, as it was his intention to bring it in a more formal manner before their Lordships; but he inferred, as he thought their Lordships must have inferred, that the most rev. Prelate was not at all satisfied with the position in which the question stood. He was glad to find from what had since taken place, that he was not mistaken, and that it would not be necessary for him to urge any further arguments in support of his Motion, because the most rev. Prelate had given him to understand that though he did not take the same view as he (Lord Ebury) did, respecting the means of providing a remedy, he was not unwilling to assent to the Motion with some restrictions. His earnest desire had always been, in the conduct of this question, that the remedy should come, not from himself, but from the reverend Bench; and as they were willing to take up this question, it only remained for him to make the Motion of which he had given notice.

Moved—

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying for the Appointment of a Commission to consider what steps should be taken to obviate the evils complained of as arising from the present compulsory and indiscriminate Use of the Burial Service of the Church of England."

The Archbishop of CANTERBURY said, the noble Lord who had moved the Address had rightly interpreted his view with regard to the grievance which still existed in reference to the Burial Service. At the same time he had given the noble Lord to understand that he could not consent to any Royal Commission which should have in view that mode of remedying the grievance which contemplated an alteration of the service. Short of that, he was willing that a Royal Commission should be issued, and he would go further and say that he was ready to agree that the Royal Commission should take into consideration the question of the re-arrangement of the Table of Lessons. The noble Lord (Viscount Gage) on the opposite side of the House proposed a very small measure which he (the Archbishop of Canterbury) felt disinclined to assent to. He had no objection to the re-arrangement of the Table of Lessons, and with regard to these two points he was ready to assent to a motion for a Commission. He was not averse to change, provided it could be shown that it was reasonable, and one that could be effected without injury to the doctrines and practices of the Church.

The Bishop of LONDON said, he desired to call the attention of the noble Lord to the form of the Motion. It was to move an humble Address to Her Majesty praying for the appointment of a Commission. Now, especially after what had been said by the Primate of All England, it might fairly be doubted whether it was desirable there should be an Address to Her Majesty asking for a Royal Commission, or whether it would not be better to leave it in the hands of Her Majesty's responsible advisers, as had been the case during the past year with regard to the important question of Clerical Subscription, to take such steps as they thought right in reference to this important matter. He agreed most fully with the most rev. Prelate that the time had come when some change in this matter was required. The very discussion which took place last year, leaving the question somewhat in an unsatisfactory state, showed that the matter required to be dealt with. The very fact of the uncertainty of the law, under which there was a doubt whether the Bishop was or was not compellable to proceed against any clergyman who refused to read the Burial Service under the painful circumstances to which allusion had been made, showed that something must be done to set the matter at rest. There remained also the further question, whether or not the mode of dealing with the difficulty as was suggested by his right rev. Brother the Bishop of Exeter was the right one. The legal questions involved were in fact extremely complicated. The 68th Canon would certainly require revision, and it could not be altered with propriety without an appeal to the Houses of Convocation as well as the decision of the Legislature and the Sovereign. Then, again, the Rubric preceding the Burial Service was, of course, embodied in an Act of Parliament —the Act of Uniformity—and therefore its alteration would require, according to constitutional usage, the consent both of Parliament and Convocation. The questions presented to them were therefore complicated, and he did not know whether the consideration which had been given to the subject during the past year had at all cleared the way of difficulties. For his own part he was impressed with the conviction, that the time was come when something ought to be done by authority in the matter. No doubt if things were left as they were, difficulties would continue to present themselves even in a more aggravated form. There was the difficulty that in one diocese the clergyman was subjected to one rule and in another to another; and there was, he understood, even a different rule in the two provinces. Now, that was obviously a state of things which ought not to be allowed to continue; and, judging by the mode in which the other intricate question of Subscription by the Clergy had been dealt with, and the way in which, when a Commission was actually appointed, one difficulty after another had in that case disappeared, there was good reason to hope that if this question was dealt with in a similar mode, the difficulties which now beset it would disappear likewise. With regard to an alteration in the service, there was, no doubt, a strong opinion among a large proportion of the clergy adverse to it. And there remained the possibility of dealing with the law which prescribed its use. In France these difficulties had been removed, not by an interference with religious services, but by the provisions of the law according to which the clergy were bound to use those services. By the French law there were certain reasons which justified the priest in refusing to perform religious services at the burial. The French law adopted three reasons specified in our Rubric and the 68th Canon, but also added to these open and notorious profanity on the part of the deceased. To settle how a similar course was to be followed in England might be difficult, but this arrangement was successful in France where the State was entitled to see that no injustice was done by the clergy, and the discretion was left in the hands of the Bishop. If such difficulties could be got over in France, he did not see why they should not be also got over in this country. There remained the consideration that, as far as they could judge, the feeling of the clergy in this country was in favour not only of not altering the service, but of leaving matters alone. Of the 4,000 who had signed the memorial alluded to by the noble Lord, some had, if he had not been misinformed, since changed their minds; some of them were now in that House; but whether the Memorialists adhered to their opinions or not, there was a large body of the clergy who were strongly of opinion that things should remain as they were. It was important that they should not disregard the feeling of the clergy, but at the same time they should not attach to their opinions too much importance. The clergy, necessarily from their profession, were—and he was very thankful for it—averse to change, and those changes that were good might not receive from them that amount of favour at the time of their first proposal, which, after the alterations had been made by their superiors, they were willing to accord to them. It was doubtful whether, with regard to the abolition of non-residence and other very salutary reforms which had taken place in the Church, if the decision had rested with the whole body of the clergy, that properly Conservative spirit which animated them would not have led them to say that the safer course was to leave things as they were. He thought it would be wise on the part of the Government to take the question into their own hands, giving due weight, and not too much weight, to the opinions of the clergy.

Earl GRANVILLE said, he was not prepared to pledge the Government to the course suggested, but he assured their Lordships that it should have the immediate attention of the Government. He would put himself into communication with the noble Lord who introduced the Motion and the most rev. Prelate, with a view of adopting a course satisfactory to all parties.

Lord REDESDALE asked whether the most rev. Prelate had consulted all his right rev. Brethren on the subject of a change in the Table of Lessons?

The Archbishop of CANTERBURY said, he had not brought the question before the whole body of Bishops, but he had consulted several of them individually; and from what took place at the meeting in February he certainly gathered that a Commission such as he had described would be acceptable to the clergy generally.

Lord EBURY was quite willing to withdraw the Motion, and leave it in the hands of the most rev. Prelate and of the Government, but he had understood their Lordships on a previous occasion to be of opinion that the question ought not to be left to the clergy to decide, whether they would or would not agree to a change.

The Marquess of WESTMEATH desired to call attention to the division of the services of the Liturgy at the chapels royal, and inquired of the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of London) whether he did not think it would be better that the practice should be general, so that persons in different degrees of health might attend in different parts of the day without injury to their constitutions. When he had asked a clergyman to set the example of changing the service, the reply was that he did not think himself of sufficient weight to take so important a step, but he would gladly follow it if any one else would do so. The fact was, that the clergy were always afraid of raising a No Popery cry by changing the services or shortening them. He was as much averse to Popery as any one, but he still thought a short manual of service of the Church might be adopted with advantage, and that if it were begun in London it would soon be followed throughout the whole of the country. The question he had to put to the right rev. Prelate was, Whether he would take into consideration the expediency of putting a reasonable degree of pressure on the ministers in the different parishes in London, in order that they might put the rule in practice for the benefit of a congregation who might wish to provide for the legislation that would necessarily follow?

The Bishop of LONDON thought that distinct notice ought to have been given of such a question. He believed, as a matter of fact, that the clergy were at liberty to change the service; but it would be very unwise to act upon it without it was in accordance with the expressed wish of the congregation, and still more unwise for him to attempt to put any pressure on the clergy in reference to such a subject.

Earl STANHOPE said, he considered it highly inexpedient to put questions on an important subject like this without notice.

Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

PUBLIC AND REFRESHMENT HOUSES BILL (No. 184),

FORMERLY ENTITLED

PUBLIC AND REFRESHMENT HOUSES (METROPOLIS, &c.) BILL.

Amendments *reported* (according to Order).

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE moved to omit from Clause 2 an Amendment having the effect of extending the operation of the Act to the districts of Improvement Commissioners. He objected to the application of the Act to small villages and towns which might be within the boundaries of corporate districts, governed by local boards or commissioners. In his view such towns ought to be omitted, and the provisions of the Bill should be confined to the corporate town itself, leaving the county magistracy the power of applying the measure to the rural villages, though they might happen to lie within the municipal boundaries.

Moved to omit the words ("and Districts of Improvement Commissioners").

Earl GRANVILLE said, that several large towns such as Huddersfield and Birkenhead, were precedents for the Amendment, for there these powers were entrusted to the governing body and not to the magistrates.

Lord REDESDALE also thought that some limit to the jurisdiction of the town councils should be put, and he complained that the Amendments of the Commons had altered the whole character of the Bill.

Lord EBURY said, they were charged with legislating for the Metropolis only, and not for the rest of England. It was to remove these objections that the Bill had been extended.

On Question: "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill?" their Lordships *divided:* — Contents 34, Not-Contents 26: Majority 8.

CONTENTS.

Westbury, L. (*L. Chancellor*).

Devonshire, D.
Somerset, D.

Camden, M.

Chichester, E.
De Grey, E.
Granville, E.
Harrowby, E.
Russell, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Zetland, E.

Eversley, V.
Sydney, V.

Down, &c., Bp.

Annaly, L.
Aveland, L.
Camoys, L.
Ebury, L
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Hunsdon, L. (*V. Falkland*).
Methuen, L.
Monson, L.
Mostyn, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*) [*Teller.*]
Portman, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Seaton, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll*).
Vaux of Harrowden, L.
Wodehouse, L.
Wrottesley, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Bath, M.
Salisbury, M.

Airlie, E.
Amherst, E.
Belmore, E.
De La Warr, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mayo, E.
Nelson, E.
Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Selkirk, E.
Shrewsbury, E.

Clancarty, V. (*E. Clancarty*).
Hawarden, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)[*Teller.*]

Calthorpe, L.
Chelmsford, L.
Churston, L.
Dunsany, L.
Egerton, L. [*Teller.*]
Grinstead, L. (*E. Enniskillen*).
Inchiquin, L.
Redesdale, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford*).
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway*).

Clause 9 (Adoption of Act by Corporate Boroughs).

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE moved to omit the clause in order to substitute another, giving the power of adopting the Act to the magistrates of corporate boroughs instead of to the town councils.

Earl GRANVILLE pointed out that the control of issuing licences was still left with the magistrates; but as it was desirable that the inhabitants of a town should have the power of deciding within what hours refreshment houses must be closed, it was better to entrust this power to town councils.

Lord EGERTON of TATTON said, that this was the first time that the power of choosing, whether the provisions of a Bill affecting the regulations of public houses was to be taken out of the hands of the magistracy and vested in town councils and local commissioners. He reminded the House that the election of town councillors was very much influenced by publicans and the proceedings that took place at public-houses; therefore he hoped that clause would be rejected.

The Earl of ROMNEY thought that it would very much tend to degrade and lower town councils if this clause were affirmed, because nobody could doubt that in an election the leading question which would be put would be, whether the candidate would support the introduction of this measure; and he believed that that would lead to the election of a less influential body of townsmen as councillors.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY said, the reason of introducing the clause was to ascertain the opinion of the town itself, and not of the magistrates of the town; besides which, if it were not introduced, the whole onus of deciding whether the provisions of the measure should be introduced into certain large towns would be on the stipendiary magistracy, which would be objectionable.

Lord BROUGHAM approved in general of magistrates, and not elected bodies, exercising the powers of the Bill; but he was aware that in this he might give umbrage to his excellent friends of the Temperance League, whose Permissive Bill vested a certain authority in the majority of ratepayers. He would make compensation to the League by stating to their Lordships what he knew had a direct tendency in favour of temperance as well to improve the condition of the working classes and insure their comforts. He meant the great cooking depôts, of which he and a noble Friend (the Earl of Shrewsbury) had last week carefully examined the one established in this neighbourhood, in the New Cut, Lambeth — which he strongly recommended their Lordships to visit, and they would receive from it the same gratification which he and his noble Friend (the noble Earl) had received. Never was there a more useful establishment, or one better conducted; 1,500, working men a day had their dinner, sometimes alone, sometimes with their wives and daughters. The dinner was excellent. He saw plates of good roast beef, potatoes, and peas, at 5*d.* per plate, and the soup which he tasted was equal to any he had ate in his life. There were three kinds, and the pea soup was as good as any served on the tables of their Lordships—the price a penny for a good bowl; so that for sixpence, the working man dined as well as any one could desire. There was perfect cleanliness and order in the kitchen and all parts of the house; and as these establishments, to be useful, must be self-supporting, he had examined their accounts, which were kept with the greatest regularity and precision; and then he called for the accountant's report on the balance; when he found that, after paying every expense, even to the interest of a small sum borrowed, the net profit was 20 per cent on its capital. He earnestly hoped that eighteen or twenty more of such admirable helps to the working classes would be shortly established in this city; and he tendered this statement to his good friends of the League, as a compensation for opposing the extending the power of the Bill to elected bodies, instead of the magistrates. Temperance, as well as comfort, to the working class, was the result of this institution, for generally the workmen attending it were sober men.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY said, as he understood, the simple provision was that these houses should be closed between one and four; and if it were a good provision, he could not understand why it should not be general in its application.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said, that the whole principle of the Bill was permissive; and the only question in dispute seemed to be, whether this permissive power should be exercised by the town council or by the justices.

On Question, That Clause 9 be omitted?—their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 31; Not-Contents 31.

The numbers being equal, it was (according to ancient rule) *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

CONTENTS.

Bath, M.
Salisbury, M.

Airlie, E.
Amherst, E.
Belmore, E.
De La Warr, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry*).
Malmesbury, E.
Mayo, E.
Nelson, E.
Romney, E.
Selkirk, E.
Shrewsbury, E.

Clancarty, V. (*E. Clancarty*).
De Vesci, V.
Hawarden, V.

Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)[*Teller*].

Bateman, L.
Brougham and Vaux, L.
Calthorpe, L.
Chelmsford, L.
Churston, L.
Dunsany, L.
Egerton, L. [*Teller*].
Grinstead, L.(*E. Enniskillen*).
Inchiquin, L.
Polwarth, L.
Redesdale, L.
Sherborne, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford*).
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway*).

NOT-CONTENTS.

Westbury, L. (*L. Chancellor*).

Devonshire, D.
Somerset, D.

Camden, M.

Chichester, E.
De Grey, E.
Granville, E.
Harrowby, E.
Russell, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Eversley, V.
Sydney, V.

Down, &c., Bp.

Annaly, L.
Camoys, L.

Ebury, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller*].
Hunsdon, L. (*V. Falkland*).
Methuen, L.
Monson, L.
Mostyn, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*) [*Teller*].
Portman, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Seaton, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde*).
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll*).
Vaux of Harrowden, L.
Wodehouse, L.
Wrottesley, L.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE thought it was important, in reference to their future proceedings, that they should know whether the Question upon which they had divided had been put in the correct form; in his opinion, it had not been correctly put.

EARL GRANVILLE said, if any impropriety had taken place in putting the Question, it ought to have been mentioned before the division. But if the Question had been put in the way desired, and the numbers had been equal, the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack could have given a casting vote.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that any objection to the form of a Question must be raised before the division.

LORD CHELMSFORD admitted that it was now too late to object to the form of the Question; but, having regard to their proceedings in future, it was desirable that the irregularity should be noticed. If the Question had been put in the usual form, "That Clause 9 stand part of the Bill," the result would have been just the reverse of what it was.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that in Committee the proper form of Question was, "That the clause stand part of the Bill;" but upon the Report of the Amendments, the course which he had always followed had been to frame the Question as nearly as possible in the terms of the Motion. In this instance the Motion was "for Clause 9 substitute the following clause," and therefore he had put the Question, "That Clause 9 be struck out."

LORD REDESDALE differed from the opinion of the noble and learned Lord, and believed that the Question ought always to be, that the clause stand part of the Bill, or that the words stand part of the clause.

Viscount EVERSLEY said, that he could only state what was the practice in the other House. There the Question would not have been put with reference to a clause at all. The Motion would have been, "that all the words after the word 'that' in Clause 9 to the commencement of Clause 10 be omitted;" and the Question would have been, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill." In Committee the Question was put as to clauses; but after the Bill had left the Committee all Motions had reference to certain words, and the Question always was, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Bill to be read 3ª on *Thursday* next.

House adjourned at a quarter past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, July 11, 1864.

MINUTES.] — Public Bills — *Resolutions in Committee*—Sheriff in Chancery (Scotland)* [Salary].

Second Reading—Ionian Islands States Acts of Parliament Repeal, &c.* [Bill 197]; Militia Pay*; Expiring Laws Continuance* [Bill 193]; Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension [Bill 181]; Militia Ballots Suspension*; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* [Bill 196]; Election Petitions Act (1848) Amendment* [Bill 182]; Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension* [Bill 190].

Committee—Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* [Bill 185]; Naval and Victualling Stores (*re-committed*)* [Bill 178] (*Lords*); Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* [Bill 164]—R.P.; Thames Embankment and Improvement (Loans)* [Bill 191]; Improvement of Land Act (1864)* [Bill 187] (*Lords*)—R.P.; Mortgage Debentures* [Bill 169] (*Lords*), *Debate adjourned*; Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c.* [Bill 192].

Report—Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* [Bill 185]; Naval and Victualling Stores (*re-committed*)* [Bill 178]; Thames Embankment and Improvement (Loans)* [Bill 191]; Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. (*re-committed*)* [Bill 192].

Considered as amended—Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland)* [Bill 174] (*Lords*); Trespass (Ireland)* [Bill 195].

Third Reading—Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties)* [Bill 159]; Public Schools* [Bill 168] (*Lords*); Administration of Trusts (Scotland)* [Bill 179], and *passed*; Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers) [Bill 198] (*count out*).

Withdrawn—Court of Chancery (Ireland)* [Bill 78]; Juries in Criminal Cases* [Bill 120].

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Exchequer Bonds, Account [presented 5th July] *referred.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

THE BRADFORD RESERVOIRS.

PAPERS MOVED FOR.

Mr. FERRAND said, two years ago he had directed the attention of the Home Secretary to the state of the Bradford Reservoirs; and on the bursting of the Sheffield Reservoir he again noticed the matter, and his statements were described as being greatly exaggerated by the Mayor of Bradford, who had been communicated with by the Home Secretary, and who stated that the Bradford Reservoir had been emptied. After that statement he received communications from persons residing in the neighbourhood of the reservoir, complaining of the great danger to which they were exposed. At his instance the Home Secretary, after some hesitation, directed Mr. Rawlinson, the Government Inspector, to visit the works in his neighbourhood, and that gentleman's Report had been laid before the House. There was this alarming fact in connection with these hill reservoirs—that the people resident in their neighbourhood had no protection whatever for their lives or property. In the case of a recent Bill in regard to a reservoir in Lancashire, an application was made on the part of Colonel Towneley, for a clause enacting that the Water Company should not impound water, without having a certificate from a competent engineer that the works were secure. The Parliamentary Committee, however, who considered the Bill, refused the application, with the remark that the parties had a remedy by an action at law. Yet in that very case the embankment of the reservoir had twice before that time given way. Of what value was a right of action against a bankrupt company, and it appeared that the shareholders in the company would only be liable to the amount of their shares. The Sheffield Company, for instance, were ruined by the inundation; and if it had not been for the subscriptions collected throughout the country, the sufferers would have received no relief. There was no personal responsibility attaching to the owners of such works. Just before the dreadful calamity at Sheffield, one of the shareholders was heard boasting that the waterworks were one of the best speculations going. Now, he held that in regard to the supply of water there ought to be no speculation whatever. It ought to be furnished at the cheapest possible price as a necessary of life; and ample protection ought to be afforded to the inhabitants in the neighbourhood of every reservoir for their life and property. The sole aim of the companies, however, seemed to be to obtain high dividends; and in order to effect that object the lowest tender for the construction of a reservoir was accepted, and thus the reservoirs were too often badly constructed in the first instance, and afterwards grossly neglected. The frightful catastrophe at Holmfirth in 1852 would be in the recollection of the House. The reservoir burst in the dead of the night, and destroyed a great many lives and a vast amount of property. The jury found a verdict, declaring that the reservoir was originally defective, and that the Commissioners had been guilty of gross and culpable negligence, and regretting that they could not return a verdict of manslaughter. Notwithstanding that warning, Parliament took no steps whatever to insure the improved construction of embankments. These works continued to be erected on the same false principle as formerly, and the consequence was the Sheffield inundation in the previous March, when 265 lives were sacrificed, property was destroyed to the amount of about £1,000,000, and 20,000 persons were reduced to destitution. The jury in that case expressed their opinion that there had not been that engineering skill and attention in the construction of the works which their importance demanded, and that the Legislature ought to take such action as would result in frequent, regular, and sufficient inspection of all reservoirs of that character. In the inquiry as to the Bradford Reservoir, the engineer, under whose advice and authority it had been constructed, distinctly confessed that the embankments were all more or less dangerous. Even after the awful experience of the recent inundation the same engineer designed another reservoir for the Sheffield Company on the same unsound principle as that which gave way. Mr. Rawlinson, as soon as he heard of it, drew the attention of the Home Secretary to the fact, that every objectionable feature in the Bradford Reservoir was reproduced in this new one. The jury stated in their verdict that in their opinion the Legislature ought to take such action as would result in a governmental inspection. But Mr. Rawlinson and Mr. Beardmore declared that they could not recommend the adoption of that suggestion, inasmuch as the Government could not ensure ultimate safety, and the responsibility must rest with the engineers. He could not understand that advice. The right hon. Gentleman, however, did interfere. He wrote to the Waterworks Company and told them that they would incur the gravest responsibility if they continued the embankment; and he had no doubt that if they had persevered, the right hon. Gentleman would have applied for an Order in Council to stop the operations. Precisely the same thing had been going on in his own neighbourhood at Bradford. Eleven reservoirs were in the course of construction there on the same false and dangerous principles as the reservoir at Bradfield. One of the principal causes of the bursting of the Bradfield reservoir was that the embankments were formed of material scooped out of the interior. Mr. Rawlinson had pointed that out as a most dangerous principle, and yet every one of the reservoirs in the neighbourhood of Bradford was being constructed in accordance with it, and, as a necessary consequence, every one of them was in a dangerous state. It was under such circumstances that he had been requested by a number of persons in his own neighbourhood to bring the question under the notice of the House. At present they were in a state of constant alarm lest their lives should be sacrificed. In his opinion it was necessary that some alteration should be made in the mode in which Parliament legislated upon the subject of waterworks. Parliamentary Committees did not devote sufficient attention to the evidence brought before them in connection with water schemes, and they ought to insist on the most rigorous measures for the preservation of human life. Most of the schemes themselves were originated by engineers and land surveyors, who went all over the country in search of a water supply, and having found it, induced persons connected with the locality, under the promise of a high rate of interest for their money, to embark their capital in a speculation of this sort. Their first step was to buy off all the influence which might be used against them, and having once accomplished that object they announce the fact to a Parliamentary Committee, who were satisfied with the mere assertion of the fact, and never considered it their duty to inquire into the means by which it was brought about. The Bradford Waterworks' scheme had been promoted entirely in that way; and he believed that a large majority of the water schemes which came before Parliament were got up in a similar manner. In 1853 Bradford had become a corporate town, and the Waterworks Company sold their waterworks to the corporation at a profit of cent per cent, many persons connected with the company being also members of the corporation. The corporation, in the face of an opposition from some of the most respectable inhabitants, then came to Parliament for power to go a distance of twenty-two miles from Bradford to collect water for the supply of that town and eight other places. In carrying out that gigantic scheme, not the slightest protection was given to the landowners or farmers of the district, who were deprived of the natural flow of the water, the only persons who were protected being the millowners, who went to the heavy expense of appearing before Parliament in their own defence. The corporation obtained borrowing powers to the extent of £383,500. In 1858 the corporation again applied to Parliament for powers to supply ten other places with water, and to borrow to the extent of another £200,000. In 1862 they applied again to Parliament for powers to borrow a further sum of £100,000, and for an extension of the time for completing the works. A large number of the inhabitants were opposed to that gigantic expenditure, and he believed that the whole sum for which borrowing powers had been obtained, or nearly £700,000, had been expended, or would very shortly be so, and yet it appeared when Mr. Rawlinson was sent down the water had not been conveyed to the borough of Bradford, or to any one of the other eighteen places. He was informed that a Bill had been passed through that House, called the Sheffield Waterworks Bill, contrary to the Standing Orders, and that it was before the House of Lords, where the corporation of Sheffield were opposing it. The promoters of that Bill proposed to raise £400,000 to pay their liabilities, and to increase the water rates of Sheffield 25 per cent. A petition from 12,000 householders in that borough against the Bill had been sent to him, and the petitioners complained of the attempt to tax them for the consequence of the misdeeds and scandalous negligence of the Waterworks Company. Having endeavoured to give the House some idea of the way in which Waterworks Companies were got up as speculations and jobs, he would now touch on the means used to procure water. In the borough of Bradford the spring water of the district, one of the best gifts of Providence, had been recklessly destroyed, and the corporation had gone twenty-two miles off for water, thus creating a dearth in some of the mineral districts, where the article would yet be much needed. When a spring disappeared from a district there was no legal right given to examine whether the water had not been taken away underground, by stealth, in pipes. These parties collected all the spring water that could be found for miles around and left nothing for the supply of the district but what was collected in the compensation reservoirs. In many instances in his own neighbourhood farmers and others had been deprived of their spring water ; on three occasions his own property had been deprived of it by stealth, and once he was obliged to apply to the Court of Chancery for redress. These reservoirs were filled by the rainfall mostly during summer thunderstorms, the gush of which was necessary for cleansing the streams in which the filth and sewage of the district were pent up. No authority was placed in the hands of any local board or any magistrate to insist that the owners of these reservoirs should let sufficient water rush down the streams in order to purify them. Hence the course was stopped, malaria arose, and the health of the district was affected. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department ought to see that a clause was inserted in all future Waterworks Bills empowering local Boards of Health to order the flooding of these streams during the summer months :—

DENMARK AND GERMANY.

HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS.

LORD PROBY [The COMPTROLLER OF THE HOUSEHOLD] *reported* HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER to Address [8th July] as follows :—

I have received your Address thanking Me for directing the Correspondence on Denmark and Germany, and the Protocols of the Conference *recently held in London, to be laid before Parliament.*

I share your deep concern that the sittings of that Conference have been brought to a close without accomplishing the important purposes for which it was convened:

I am happy to be assured of your satisfaction with the course which I have felt it My Duty to take in abstaining at this conjuncture from armed interference in the War now going on between Denmark and the German Powers.

THE BRADFORD RESERVOIRS.

Mr. FERRAND resumed: He thought Mr. Rawlinson had great cause of complaint against the corporation of Bradford in keeping back from him information prejudicial to their works which it was most important for him to possess. His Report, however, was very unsatisfactory. That Report stated that the Bradford corporation had eleven of these reservoirs under their control, of which three required special notice, leaving eight on which no particular remarks were made. Now, he was prepared to assert, on the authority of those who perfectly understood the question, that five of these eight were not only unsafe, but many of them dangerous to a very serious degree. If the right hon. Gentleman were to visit the neighbourhood of the Silsden Reservoir, and call at the houses of these people, he would have a great deal of sympathy with them. He would entreat the right hon. Gentleman to pay some attention to the question, and to put a stop to the great alarm which prevailed in the North of England on the subject. In almost the concluding sentence of his Report Mr. Rawlinson said, "This Report must not be considered to involve the Government or myself in any responsibility;" but who was to be responsible? The people themselves had no power, and the magistrates were very reluctant to interfere. The public had a right to expect that some stringent power would be brought to bear to protect them. It had been suggested that none of these reservoirs should be allowed to be brought into operation after their construction until they had been reported to the Home Office as being safe by some competent engineer. Having made these observations, he left the matter in the hands of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Home Office, and he trusted that the Report of Mr. Leather would be laid on the table.

Lord Proby

GAME LAW PROSECUTIONS.

QUESTION.

Colonel SYKES said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Why the Return of Prosecutions under the Game Laws, from 1857 to 1862 inclusive, ordered by the House, was printed before the wanting Returns, 105 in number, were obtained. He could not but complain of the negligence of the clerks of the peace with respect to the Returns, but defective as they were the result of the Return as presented was, that there had been 30,673 convictions in England and Wales under the Game Laws from 1857 to 1862, and 3,326 prosecutions in Scotland. It was to the credit of the judicial authorities in Scotland that none of the Returns in reference to that country were wanting. In England, however, Returns were wanting from as many as 105 places, among which were Southampton, Horsham, Lewes, Uckfield, Marlborough, Exeter, Buckingham, Swansea, and Leamington. He might, perhaps, be told by the Home Secretary that he had no power to obtain the wanting Returns, but notwithstanding it was a just cause of complaint that £700 of the public money had been expended in printing defective Returns. No doubt that House had the power to insist that the order for the Returns should be obeyed; and if that order was not complied with, then the parties refusing to comply with it might be summoned to the Bar of the House. He thought that there ought to be some other method of getting the Returns so ordered; but, if not, he would not shrink from his duty, and would have the parties summoned to the Bar of the House, if necessary, when the parties would find themselves subjected to much heavier expense than the several Returns would have entailed upon them. Under the circumstances, he had had recourse to the annual judicial Returns of the Home Office, which were lucid in their details, and exhibited the moral condition of England and Wales in connection with offences. According to the Returns of the Home Office, the total number of offences against the Game Laws in 1857 numbered 5,480. In 1862, however, under the present most stringent law, they rose to 10,101 prosecutions, being an increase of nearly 100 per cent. In the six years ending in 1857 the prosecutions amounted to 30,673; but in the six years ending in 1863 they amounted to 49,845, of which 8,556 persons accused were discharged, and 41,209 were convicted; whereas the defective Return of which he complained comprised a total of only 30,673 for England and Wales, and 3,326 for Scotland. In the Scotch Return a touching observation was made. In reference to the 3,326 cases, some of the offenders were described as having "deserted," which meant that in consequence of some trifling trespass, perhaps, they had been obliged to abandon their home and family and desert their country. It is lamentable that so many poor persons are annually consigned to a prison or fined under the Game Laws; but there is no prospect of the number being diminished, while the poor continue to think that there can be no individual or personal property in migratory birds or animals. The people are irritated by the apparently arbitrary manner in which fines and costs were adjudged. He would just give the House a specimen of the relation between the penalty and the costs in some cases. In one case in England the penalty was *3d.* and the costs *7s. 6d.*; in another case, at Eastwood, Notts, the penalty was 6*d.* and the costs 19*s.* 6*d.*, or about thirty-eight times the amount of the penalty, and, generally speaking, the costs were four times the amount of the penalty. Surely there ought to be some more just ratio between the costs and the penalty. It had been calculated by a writer in one of the newspapers that, taking the prosecutions from 1857 to 1862, as 30,673, and assuming that the cost of the prosecutions bore a certain relation to the total cost of the judicial establishments, the result was, that every landowner out of the towns and cities of England and Wales (the number of such landowners being reckoned at 30,000) had £60 a year paid to him for the preservation of his game. He did not pretend to say that the calculation was correct, indeed it could not be correct, but such was that writer's statement. In the six years in question the number of convictions for offences and crimes, great and small, was 2,354,720, and the total cost of the medical establishments, prosecutions, &c., £5,725,197. The average cost of each offence was, therefore, £2 9*s.* per head. He hoped the Home Secretary would inform them why the Return had been presented in so imperfect a form.

Sir GEORGE GREY: Sir, I am not going to follow the hon. Gentleman opposite, who drew attention to the state of the reservoirs in the country, through all the details of the particular works to which he referred. His suggestion is, I understand, that in accordance with the opinion expressed by the jury at Sheffield, there should be regular and official inspection by Government of all the reservoirs throughout the country. Now, on the part of the Government, I must altogether decline to assume the responsibility which that system would involve. It is a duty which it would be absolutely impossible for the Government to discharge. Mr. Rawlinson said it was out of the question for Inspectors to take the responsibility of saying that reservoirs were safe. I have also had a conversation on the subject with the eminent engineer Mr. Hawkshaw, who said that no engineer, however competent, could, by merely looking at an embankment, pronounce whether it was safe. No doubt an Inspector might find occasionally a reservoir which was obviously not safe, and that is what Mr. Rawlinson did in certain cases, where an engagement was obtained that the water should not be let in till the works were made secure. The owners of these reservoirs are naturally rather in favour of the course now suggested, for it would relieve them from the legal responsibility which rests upon them. If it be true, as has been alleged to-night, that there are reservoirs in a condition so dangerous that they excite the greatest alarm among the population in the neighbourhood, then I recommend the hon. Gentleman, or any others who may be concerned, to take legal proceedings by indictment. If the works are in the state which the hon. Member has described, the law provides a remedy. Moreover, there is the criminal responsibility which rests on those against whom culpable negligence can be proved, leading to loss of life, and the pecuniary responsibility which is involved in the possible destruction of large and costly works. It would be well, however, when any Water Bill comes before Parliament, that the Committee should insist on proper clauses being inserted to secure, as far as possible, the safety of the public. There was one remark which fell from the hon. Gentleman which I heard with deep regret. I believe he sometimes speaks under great excitement, and is not really aware of what he says. He has accused Mr. Rawlinson of certifying the soundness of a work, knowing it to be unsound. Mr. Rawlinson is well known to many Members of this House, and it is hardly necessary for me to say that he is a civil engineer of great eminence, experience, and of very high character; and that he can have no possible motive whatever for in any way concealing the truth in such cases. I am sure that the hon. Gentleman himself would not repeat the charge in his cooler moments.

As to the question which has been asked by the hon. and gallant Member for Aberdeen (Colonel Sykes), the reason why the Game Conviction Return has been presented in an imperfect form is simply because it comprises all the information which it is possible to obtain. It is a Return of extraordinary length. It occupies in type 481 closely printed pages, with seven columns of figures on each page; and it was several months in passing through the press. Application was made for the required Returns by a circular letter to the clerks of the peace, of petty sessions, and so on. Many of these officers, however, declined to furnish returns which entailed so much labour without remuneration. The Government have no power of remunerating them, and the hon. and gallant Gentleman seems to be aware of the only means of compulsion, which he can put in force if he thinks it worth while.

Mr. FERRAND disclaimed any intention of saying a word against the character of Mr. Rawlinson. All he meant was that twenty years ago Mr. Rawlinson himself pointed out a substance which he said rendered a certain work dangerous, and yet he did not allude to it in his recent Report.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he believed that Mr. Rawlinson's inspection had given satisfaction at Bradford, and his Report had tended to remove the alarm which previously existed on the subject. Two reservoirs were found to be unsound, and an undertaking had been required that they should not be filled till they were rendered quite safe. There could be no doubt that there was a strong feeling in the country in regard to the matter; and it was not surprising when they recollected the catastrophes at Holmfirth and Sheffield. He quite agreed, however, with his right hon. Friend, that Government could not assume the responsibility of inspecting all the reservoirs with a view to determine their soundness. The result of such a system would be to shift the responsibility to a great extent from the shoulders of those who constructed or owned the works to the Government. It appeared to be unquestionable that the engineering science of the day was not up to the construction of these embankments; and if so, that was a rather disgraceful fact. He thought the Government ought to issue a commission to the most scientific men they could obtain, to inquire whether any general provisions could be devised applicable to all reservoirs and waterworks. For instance, both at Holmfirth and Sheffield it was known beforehand that the works were going to break; but the water could not be run off in time to prevent an inundation. It was only fair, in his opinion, that some provision should be made for such a contingency. Again, he thought that the water should not be allowed to be above a certain height in the reservoir. He thought the Government ought to appoint a commission to inquire into the whole subject, so as to ascertain whether engineering skill might not devise some means for preventing the calamity which had occurred in the case of the Sheffield reservoir.

Mr. HADFIELD said, that no expense had been spared in securing the best engineering skill for the construction of the Sheffield reservoir; and he believed the bursting of the Holmfirth Reservoir had been occasioned by an accident which it was impossible to foresee. If there had been the slightest intimation given to the directors that there was any danger, this loss of life would never have happened.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER explained that he did not mean to say that there was time for the directors to be aware of it. What he wished to intimate was, that when the accident appeared imminent from the state of the water it was possible there might be such an opportunity of letting the water out as would very much have lessened the evil that had occurred.

DENMARK AND GERMANY—THE WAR IN DENMARK.—QUESTION.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he wished to put a Question to the noble Lord the First Lord of the Treasury, of which he had given private notice. Upon that day fortnight, when the noble Lord favoured the House with a statement in reference to the policy of the Government, he made use of a remarkable expression with regard to certain contingencies which might arise in the Dano-German war, which would justify the interference of Her Majesty's Government.

Mr. SPEAKER said, the hon. Gentleman was out of order in referring to a speech delivered in the course of a past debate.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH said, the noble Lord had on a previous occasion mentioned in general terms certain contingencies which might occur, and which might justify this country in taking part with Denmark in the present war. He understood by that that the Government were prepared to prevent any attack upon the independence of Copenhagen and the personal safety of the King of Denmark, but it was doubted by many persons out of doors whether such was the intention of the noble Lord. To refrain from interfering until after Copenhagen had been bombarded would be very much like shutting the stable door when the steed had been stolen. It had been said that the Austrian fleet had received notice that if they appeared in the Baltic the English fleet would accompany them, and he wished to know if that intention would still be carried out now that the Conference had broken up. It was of immense importance to the country to know what was likely to be the course which the Government would pursue. A great debate had just taken place on the policy of the Government, in which that policy had received the approval of the majority of the House; but there were many matters still left unexplained, of which this was one of considerable interest. He would remind the House that at the commencement of the Crimean war we sent our fleet to the Dardanelles and into the Black Sea as soon as we heard of the outrage committed by the Russian fleet at Sinope. He would, therefore, ask the noble Lord to favour the House with an explanation of the real meaning of the expressions he had used a fortnight before.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: I think the best answer I can make to the question of the hon. Gentleman is to say, that as far as Her Majesty's Government are informed at present, they have no reason to believe that there is any intention of attacking Copenhagen.

ARMY—FORAGE MONEY OF CAVALRY OFFICERS.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. WHITESIDE said, he wished to call attention to the anomalous and unfair practice of making deductions from the pay of certain Cavalry Officers for the Forage supplied to their horses. Those officers must have horses in order to perform their duty, and it was most unjust to make them bear the cost of feeding them. The whole expense to the country for remedying the injustice would not exceed £20,000 a year, an amount which could not break the Treasury, especially as they had a prosperity Budget, with the prospect of everlasting peace. It was not an affair of the Horse Guards—all the evil must be laid at the door of the Treasury, as he believed that if the Commander-in-Chief could do what he liked the complaint would not have to be made. He hoped it was only necessary to mention this matter to the noble Marquess to induce him to make such a representation to that obstinate Department, the Treasury, as might cause an act of justice to be done to a very meritorious body of officers.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, that the pay of the officers of the army had not been altered for the last seventy or eighty years, and the stoppage in question had always been exacted from cavalry officers, in consequence, he supposed, of the increased pay given them. The suggestion of the hon. and learned Gentleman was nothing less than a simple suggestion to increase the pay of cavalry officers by the sum of 16*d.* a day in the case of subalterns, and by a larger sum in the case of captains and field officers. It was more a Treasury than a War Office question; and on the abolition of the stoppage being proposed by the right hon. Member for Huntingdon (General Peel) when in office, the Treasury, of which the hon. Baronet the Member for Stamford (Sir Stafford Northcote) was then Secretary, refused to entertain it. The argument of the Treasury was that these officers had purchased their commissions with the prospect of receiving a certain amount of pay, and that to increase it would be a boon to the present holders of commissions only, and would not benefit their successors, because the price of the commission would rise in proportion to the extra advantage attached to it. Whether that was a good argument or not he was not prepared to say; but there did not appear to be any reason which should induce the Treasury to assent now to a proposal which it had rejected in 1859, and again in 1861, when Lord Herbert was in office, and when there existed a reason for offering some additional boon to cavalry officers. In 1861 there was the greatest difficulty in finding cavalry officers at all, and a great number of commissions were vacant. The attention of Lord Herbert and the Commander-in-Chief was then directed towards a remedy for that, and an increase of pay was recommended, but the Treasury professed to be unable to see that such an increase would benefit any future class of officers, and therefore it refused to carry out that part of Lord Herbert's plans. The plans of Lord Herbert had been perfectly successful, and there was no longer any difficulty in finding cavalry officers. Under those circumstances, he thought it would be idle to renew that proposal at the Treasury, and he did not believe the army required it.

COLONEL NORTH said, that he had brought forward that matter almost every year for the last ten years. It might be all very well to insist on the stoppage of forage money if these officers were not bound to keep horses, but in the exercise of their duties they were obliged to keep two. The noble Lord said the pay of the officers of the army had not been altered for seventy or eighty years, but the same argument would have equally applied to the allowance of command money, which he had succeeded in getting altered last year. The stoppage was a very great piece of injustice to cavalry officers, and he did not blame one Administration more than another, as every successive Treasury had refused to meet the case. He regretted that the Treasury always refused every fair demand for the army or navy.

THE SERVICES OF SIR FRANCIS BOND HEAD.—RESOLUTION

SIR WILLIAM JOLLIFFE said, he rose to call attention to the Memorial of Sir Francis Bond Head, Bart., to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, laid upon the table of the House on the 6th day of June last, and in conclusion, That in the opinion of this House the great but hitherto unrequited services rendered by Sir Francis Bond Head, when Governor of Upper Canada, in the year 1837 and 1838, call for the favourable consideration of Her Majesty's Government. He admitted that the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary had acted in a handsome manner in causing all the documents which Sir Francis Head wished to have published appended to the memorial; but these documents having been laid before the House, he thought the House was entitled to express its opinion on the matters to which they referred, and he was sure they would at least express their sympathy with the very strong case which Sir Francis Head presented to the Colonial Secretary. The case of this distinguished man was quite distinct from the question of mere superannuation, on which the memorials of ex-Governors turned. He admitted that the excitement in home politics during the period when Sir Francis Head's services were rendered was not favourable to the full appreciation of the benefits of his administration: some time must necessarily elapse before their full bearing and effect could be appreciated. Therefore he did not blame the then existing or any particular Government for allowing these able and important services to pass unrequited. The policy then inaugurated in Canada has now been adopted as the true colonial policy, and had proved eminently successful; and he thought that, in comparison with a subject so deeply affecting the British empire, the discussions of the last two weeks were of secondary importance. The object of our colonial administration had been to make our colonies self-governing and self-dependent to the utmost possible extent. If ever a man had succeeded in furthering this object that man was Sir Francis Head; for at a critical period of our colonial history that individual had accomplished one of the greatest ends of colonial administration—namely, inspiring the colonists with the habit of self-defence. So successful had his administration proved, that when the rebellion broke out he was able to denude his own government both of troops and militia, and to send the whole to the assistance of Lord Colborne. It was the spirit of loyalty and self-dependence which he had inspired into the Canadian people that had enabled him to effect these great results. To the merits of Sir Francis Head an immense array of testimony presented itself from the colonies and from home. On Sir Francis Head's resignation of the Governorship in February, 1838, Her Majesty's Minister in the United States, Mr. Fox, wrote in these terms—

> "I must be permitted to express to you my sincere regret and sorrow at your retiring from the Government of Upper Canada at the present moment, after the noble manner in which you have vindicated the honour of the British name, and of the British Constitution. The triumph which under your auspices have been achieved for the principles of English Constitutional Liberty over American Democracy, will render the period of your administration of the colony a conspicuous part of history."

On the 17th January, 1838, the Upper House of the Canadian Parliament voted an Address containing this testimony to the merits of his Administration:—

> "We feel that not Upper Canada only, but the empire, owes to your Excellency a large debt of gratitude for your firm and manly avowal, upon all occasions, of those sentiments which became the representative of a British monarch; and for the unwavering support which your Excellency has never failed to give to the established principles of the Constitution. It is this fearless adherence to right principles, rather than to expediency, which has enabled your Excellency to rally round the Government in a moment of danger, the arms of an united people; and to exhibit this province to our Sovereign and to the world, in a posture which must command for its brave and loyal inhabitants the highest admiration and respect."

And the Commons House of the Canadian Parliament voted a similar Address on the following day, January 18, in which they say—

> "Upon looking back at the various important communications which have been made by your Excellency to the House of Assembly during the present Session, we cannot but congratulate you and the country upon the firm and noble attitude assumed by your Excellency in all those public documents which have emanated from your Excellency. When we reflect upon the occurrences that have taken place in Upper Canada, and upon its borders, within a few months past, and upon the distinguished part taken by your Excellency to maintain the honour and interests of our country, during that short but eventful period, we find equal cause of gratulation. Rebellion has been crushed; the attacks of perfidious citizens of a foreign Power have been repelled, and peace reigns triumphant within the bounds of your Excellency's Government.
>
> "The people of Upper Canada will ever retain a grateful recollection of the services of your Excellency; and they feel assured your Excellency will meet with a due reward at the hands of our youthful and beloved Queen."

The rebellion took place six months after Her Majesty's accession; and yet up to this time no reward had been offered to Sir Francis Head, with the exception of the baronetcy conferred by William the Fourth. His successor in the Government, Sir George Arthur (to whom Sir Francis Head was entirely unknown), bore a remarkable testimony to the ability of his administration; for he said—

> "Having, of course, had an opportunity of reading your correspondence with the Colonial Office, I can say sincerely that I most heartily and cordially concur in all your political views and measures, as far as I can collect them from that source, and most anxiously desire to maintain them."

And the instructions of Lord Glenelg to Sir George Arthur amounted, in fact, to instructions to follow implicitly the policy of his predecessor.' Lord Glenelg says—

> "Your conduct will also be subject to comparison with that of your immediate predecessor, an officer justly enjoying the confidence and gratitude of the great majority of the people of Upper Canada, and highly distinguished by the energy and success of his political career. In the general policy and conduct of your immediate predecessor, you will find an example worthy of imitation. I refer not, of course, to the comparatively few and unimportant measures in which I was most reluctantly compelled to dissent from his opinions, but to the main course and spirit of his policy, in which it was at once my duty and my happiness to signify to him the approbation of His late Majesty's Government.
>
> "Deeply regretting that on any ground Sir Francis Head should have considered it necessary, at the present moment, to resign his office, and, most sincerely lamenting that decision, Her Majesty's Government felt themselves compelled to submit to this inconvenience. I cannot, however, on this account, forget the nature of the services which he has rendered, nor can I testify my sense of them more strongly than by pointing out to your imitation the uncompromising firmness with which he resisted every endeavour to subvert the political institutions of Upper Canada, the energy with which he opposed himself to the enemies of order and of peace, and the frank and open bearing with which he threw himself upon the loyalty, the reason, and the public spirit of the great body of the people.
>
> "Guided by the general principles to which I have referred, and animated by Sir Francis Head's example, you will, I trust, successfully contend with any difficulties you may have to encounter."

This was twenty-six years ago, and up to this moment Sir Francis Head remained unrewarded for his great services. It was Sir Francis Head's misfortune at the period of his retirement to be supposed to be entangled in party politics. Now, he (Sir William Jolliffe) knew no man more free from political bias. The mistake arose out of the confusion which reigned in the political atmosphere of the period. The Ministers of the day, however, were very explicit in their opinions. In 1839, upon a question being raised by the Earl of Durham, Lord Melbourne expressed his regret that the publication of the Earl of Durham's Report should have anticipated its presentment to Parliament; and in the same year the Duke of Wellington brought forward the subject, when Lord Aberdeen said that the publication of Lord Durham's Report was an unprecedented occurrence. On that occasion Lord Durham denied that he had any intention in his Report of bringing any charge against Sir Francis Head. He believed that Sir Francis Head by his services had secured the attachment of the colony to this country. There was scarcely a Member of that House who was not acquainted with Sir Francis Head by means of his writings, and who had not been delighted with them. Sir Francis Head was now seventy-two years of age, and if the country acknowledged that they owed him any debt of gratitude, they must lose no time if they intended to pay it. The papers laid on the table would enable the House to judge whether Sir Francis Head had done well, and he trusted the House would come to the decision that there should be some recognition of his great services. He believed his conduct might be regarded as an example and a lesson to any public officer charged under circumstances of great difficulty with the administration of public affairs. Sir Francis Head on going out to Canada at the request of the Government gave up a lucrative situation at home, which he would willingly have filled again on his return home, but according to etiquette he could not do so. He regretted that the question had not fallen into abler hands; but he was willing to leave the case in the hands of the Government, in the hope that they would prove to Sir Francis Head, now in his old age, that his services were not forgotten.

Mr. CARDWELL said, he was quite sure that no one could feel the want of an advocate who could command the assistance of his right hon. Friend (Sir William Jolliffe.) He (Mr. Cardwell) had the pleasure of enjoying not only the literary but the personal acquaintance of Sir Francis Head, and, without entering into the controversial matters involved in the case, was quite ready to confirm all that had been said as to the abilities, courage, and zeal for the public service that had been displayed by him. As it had been justly said, this was a case which occurred not far from thirty years ago, and was then the subject of much controversy. Into that controversy it might, perhaps, be his duty to enter at some future time, and to state the views of the Colonial Department. He reserved that question now, as it was not necessary to enter upon it at the present moment; and he was glad to avoid the necessity of doing so. The observations which had fallen from his right hon. Friend he understood had arisen in this way. A proposal had been made to Parliament for conferring pensions upon Colonial Governors, and several memorials which had been received on the subject from Colonial Governors had been moved for and had been laid upon the table. Amongst others a memorial had been addressed to the Government by Sir Francis Head, and having received it, though Sir Francis Head had not served out his whole period of time as Governor, he (Mr. Cardwell), nevertheless, thought it his duty, in preparing the Return for Parliament, not to exclude that memorial. Nor had he any desire to exclude it; on the contrary, his desire was that when the question came before Parliament the just claims of every Colonial Governor should be fairly disposed of. Well, then, recognizing, as he had said, the merits of Sir Francis Head, and not entering upon the disputed parts of his conduct, his answer to his right hon. Friend was this—that the subject was under the consideration of Parliament. It was only a few nights ago that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on his part, and that of the Treasury, had said that the matter should be carefully considered during the recess, with a view to an answer being given early in next Session. The Colonial Governors who had chiefly moved in this matter had in fact framed a draught Bill, which contained a provision that pensions should be given to Governors only who had served a specified time. Sir Francis Head observed that that proposal would exclude him, and he naturally objected to it, more, however, on the ground that it would imply some disrespect to him, rather than from any pecuniary considerations. No doubt, in whatever Bill might be passed, it would be desirable to consider whether there should be a provision to enable the Government, in cases of distinguished services, to grant pensions, even where the specified length of time had not been served. That, however, would be a subject for consideration with the Government in framing the Bill, and with Parliament in reviewing it; and it appeared to him that the best time for considering this particular case would be when the general subject was before them, and when they were dealing with the Bill which might have to be prepared by the Government. If the arrangements then made on the subject should not be satisfactory to his right hon. Friend, it would be open to him to make a proposition of his own. He rejoiced to be able to concur in all those parts of his right hon. Friend's observations in which he referred to the abilities, zeal, and public spirit of Sir Francis Head. Into the disputed points of controversy respecting his conduct he declined to enter at present; and the best advice he could offer to his right hon. Friend was to reserve any Motion on the subject until such time as the Bill came under the consideration of the House.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, that nothing could be fairer than the manner in which the Colonial Secretary had met the statement of his right hon. Friend; but he hoped that the public services of Sir Francis Head—who, by his courage and public spirit had undoubtedly saved the Province of Upper Canada—would be met with something stronger than fair words. He inferred with pleasure that the right hon. Gentleman was disposed to meet this question fairly; but there was this one weak point in his speech—that he made the whole case of Sir Francis Head turn on the decision of the Government on the general question of pensions to Colonial Governors. The case of Sir Francis Head, however, did not stand on the same footing as that of other Colonial Governors: it was undoubted that by his spirit and firmness he had preserved Canada to the British Empire. He would only further notice the fact, that when Sir Francis Head was persuaded, against his own inclinations, to accept the Governorship of Canada, he gave up a permanent appointment which he then held as Poor Law Inspector, with a salary of £1,000 per annum. When he returned from his successful Governorship, Sir Francis Head applied to be permitted to resume his old office; but his request was refused. The consequence was that he had been a poor man ever since, although his claims in point of justice and good feeling were irresistible. It was to be hoped that when the House met next Session the Government would be prepared to show that they had taken a generous view of the case.

SIR FREDERIC SMITH said, he had known Sir Francis Head all his life. He was a member of the Corps (the Royal Engineers) to which he belonged, and he could bear testimony that there never was a more energetic man, or one who commanded more universal respect. He (Sir Frederic Smith) happened to know the circumstances under which Sir Francis Head went out to Canada. He was then an Inspector of Poor Law. He did not apply for the appointment. It was offered to him by Lord Glenelg. The messenger came to Sir Francis Head late in the day—he was then living at Croydon; and with his usual energy he immediately ordered a post chaise and came to London, and presented himself to Lord Glenelg in his bedroom, between three and four in the morning. Lord Glenelg said he had not expected to see Sir Francis Head so early, and asked him when he would be prepared to start. He replied, "To-morrow morning." Sir Francis Head, when in Canada, had done what was a most dangerous thing, but which exemplified his sagacity and his reliance upon the support of the people. He denuded himself of almost the whole of his military force, relying solely on the friendly spirit of the people; and the successful result showed the sagacity with which he acted. Had he failed, his name would have been as much execrated as it was now beloved. Sir Francis Head had deserved well of his country; and he (Sir Frederic Smith) hoped an effort would be made, not only by his right hon. Friend, with whose friendliness of disposition he was well acquainted, but by the noble Lord at the head of the Government, to act in no parsimonious spirit, but to treat a gallant old soldier with the liberality which became a generous Government. They should remember that Sir Francis was now seventy-two years of age; and they should, therefore, admit of no delay in bestowing on his services the reward he had so well earnt.

MR. ADDERLEY said, he did not intend to express any opinion on the general question, except to say that it would be found that the question of pensions to Colonial Governors was not so simple as was supposed. It was mixed up with the question of the self-government of the colonies. Formerly they were considered appanages of the Crown — mere dependencies of the Crown, to be managed for the advantage of the mother country. Now, however, we had acknowledged the rights of the colonists to self-government, and as a consequence the colonists were beginning slowly to pay the expenses of their own Government. It was nothing to say that Governors were appointed by the Crown, and, therefore, should be paid by England, for the Crown was the Crown of the colonies as well as of Great Britain. Nor was it anything to say that the services rendered by the Governors were public services, because they were public services to the colonies, and not, therefore, to be charged to another part of the empire. But the question now before the House was a wholly distinct question from the general question of Governors' pensions in the present day. When Sir Francis Head served as Governor of Upper Canada, the self-government of the colonists was not acknowledged at home, and therefore, as his services were rendered to the Crown of England, which at that moment regarded the colony as a sort of appanage, he was entitled to look for his reward from the English Treasury. It was not possible to consider his claims at the time of his return to England, as there then existed too much exasperation and bitterness of feeling to permit the subject to be calmly discussed. It was true that the rebels whom Sir Francis Head was sent out to subdue ceased to be considered rebels even during his administration, and became the rulers of Canada; but the fact did not diminish the value of his services, which were in strict and successful execution of his orders, nor his claims to a just and generous reward. The circumstance that his vigorous administration led, through the decomposition of the rotten old system he had to administer in very troublesome times, to the establishment of self-government in the colony, was an additional ground why his claims should be no longer overlooked. It was said that Sir Francis had not occupied his Governorship the full time; that was true; but he was brought into such violent collision with the Executive at a moment of recognized revolution that he was compelled to resign. He would impress on the Secretary for the Colonies that the case of Sir Francis Head ought not to be mixed up with the general case of Colonial Governors; and he hoped as Sir Francis was seventy-two years of age the Government would act promptly and liberally. In doing so, he was sure they would be supported by the country.

Mr. ANGERSTEIN also supported the claim, and concurred in the appeal just made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Staffordshire. He thought that the Government could not mix up this case with that of ordinary Colonial Governors, but should look to the merits and services of those who had served a great colony at a most peculiar conjuncture of affairs.

Mr. NEWDEGATE expressed his opinion, that to the constitutional loyalty infused into the colonists by Sir Francis Head the ready acquiescence of the people in the measures considered necessary for the suppression of the rebellion was in no small degree to be attributed.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE (IRELAND).—OBSERVATIONS.

Captain ARCHDALL said, he rose to call attention to the proceedings of Government in the case of James Hoey, convicted of offences against the Revenue Laws. Hoey was convicted of the offence in February, and convicted in the penalty of £50, or twelvemonths' imprisonment in default of payment. On the 14th of June he memorialized the Government for a mitigation of the sentence. On the 17th of the same month the matter was referred by General Larcom, the permanent Under Secretary for Ireland, to Sir Henry Brownrigg, the Inspector General of Constabulary, who reported, and added to his report a recommendation that the sentence ought to be mitigated to a much smaller penalty or a term of imprisonment. What the committing magistrate complained of was, that the authority of the police should override that of the Judge, for the Government had acted on the recommendation of the Inspector General, without any reference to the committing magistrate. This was one case illustrative of a general system.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, that nothing unusual had been done. There was no intention of setting aside the authority of the magistracy in Ireland, but in this case the mitigation of sentence had taken place because the Inspector General had reported that the man had not the money to pay the heavier fine.

Colonel DUNNE had no doubt that Sir Henry Brownrigg had given correct advice; but the committing magistrate and his hon. and gallant Friend (Captain Archdall) complained, not because the case was an unusual, but because it was a usual one.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY — CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

Supply *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £236,770, to complete the sum for Public Education, Ireland.

Sir ROBERT PEEL: It may be desirable, Sir, that I should make a short statement with regard to some of the details of the Vote, in order that the Committee may have an opportunity of forming a correct judgment upon it. I will first advert to the great increase which has taken place both in the schools in operation in Ireland during the past year as compared with 1861 and 1862, and also the increased number of children upon the rolls, and the average daily attendance in these schools, as showing a most satisfactory state of things. In the year ending December 31, 1861, there were 5,830 schools in operation, the average daily attendance being 284,726 children. On the 31st of December, 1862, there were 6,010 schools in operation, with an average daily attendance of 284,912 children; whereas on the 31st of December, 1863, the schools in operation numbered 6,163, with an average daily attendance of 296,986 children. Thus, comparing 1862 with 1861, there is an increase of 180 schools, and, comparing 1863 with 1862, an increase of 153 schools, the average daily attendance of children in 1862 above that of 1861 being 186 children, and that of 1863 above 1862 showing an increase of over 12,074 children. This is an immense development during the past year. It is satisfactory to find in the schools in operation that the religious denominations of the children are, on the whole, proportioned to those of the country. For instance, in 1862 there were 812,527 children on the rolls, of whom 51,021 belonged to the Established Church, 666,438 were Roman Catholics, 89,566 Presbyterians, and 5,502 belonged to other persuasions. In 1863, according to the Report just laid on the table, the total number of children upon the rolls for the entire year amounted to 840,569, who were divided as follows:—Established Church, 54,248; Roman Catholics, 687,076; Presbyterians, 93,431; other persuasions, 5,814. That is to say, in 1863 there were in these schools 18 per cent of Protestants of all denominations, whereas the Roman Catholics amounted to 81 per cent, so that the proportion of children due to the relative number of the Roman Catholic and the Protestant population is maintained in the schools. Now it is very remarkable and very gratifying that this enormous increase of education throughout the country has had a wonderful influence upon the criminal statistics of Ireland. In 1851 the number of convictions was 14,377; that is to say, there was one conviction in every 453 of the population. But in 1862 the total number of convictions amounted only to 3,796, or only one in 1,528 of the population, showing an enormous diminution of crime during this period. I will now take the juvenile offenders under 16. In 1855 there were convicted, of juvenile offenders under 16 years, 556 boys and 175 girls; whereas in 1862, which, owing to the prevalent want and privation, was marked by a general increase in crime, the convictions were only 159 boys and 36 girls, showing a most conspicuous diminution in crime during that period. The Inspector General of Prisons, in his Report for 1862, makes this important statement:—"Nearly one-half of the female juveniles committed to our gaols during 1861 were destitute of the first rudiments of education," showing that if we could have got those children into our schools, and given them the education which is imparted there, in all probability they would not have become a burden to the country. In a letter he had received from the Chief of the Constabulary Office, Dublin, it was stated that "crime was never so low in Ireland within the memory of any one in this office." It is impossible to receive a more satisfactory statement than this, and I think there can be no doubt that, as regards juvenile offenders, this gratifying result is to be attributed in great part to the general spread of education in Ireland.

With these remarks I will pass now to the general summary given in these Votes. Out of the thirteen items there are, as compared with 1863, an increase in three and a decrease in eight of them, while in two the amount is the same. The normal establishment shows a net decrease of £90, the increase being £110, due principally to the increased salaries of the two professors, and the decrease £200, which arises from a reduced scale of travelling expenses of teachers to and from Dublin. The Metropolitan Model School shows a decrease of £239, owing to a smaller attendance at the West Dublin Model Infant Schools. In the District Model Schools there is a net increase of £1,744, which is owing to a rectification in the teaching staff. In 1862 there were 75 assistant teachers, who are now reduced to 72; in 1863 there were 150 pupil-teachers, and there are now only 126; and instead of 210 monitors, there are now only 155. A saving is also effected consequent on the abolition of one assistant lecturer of physical science. In the item of minor model schools, there is a net decrease of £267, due to greater economy in printing, stationery, and gratuities to pupil-teachers. I come now to the most important item—that of salaries of teachers, &c. It is important that that body should be well provided for, because they are the heart and soul of the schools, and it is fair that they should enjoy the regular increment to which they are entitled by the regulations of the service. There is an increase under that head of £12,500, which is made up in the following manner:—For payment of salaries and natural increment we have allowed an increase of £8,500. In 1863 we had 5,638 teachers, whereas in 1864 we have 5,816, showing an increase of 178. In 1863 there were 1,236 assistant teachers; in 1864, 1,546, giving an increase of 310. In 1863 the number of capitation schools was 130; in 1864, there are 136; and perhaps there may be two or three more. A diminution of £400 is effected by greater economy in the salaries and travelling expenses of the auxiliary staff, and £1,000 in gratuities to incapacitated teachers. But, on the other hand, £1,000 additional will be required as the payment to teachers of additional schools, and increased pay to teachers on promotion. There is an increase of £4,000 for monitors, £2,000 for increase to staff, and £2,000 for new class of advanced monitors. There are two classes of monitors, the junior class from 11 to 14 years of age, who receive a salary of from £2 to £4; the senior class from 14 to 18 years of age, whose salary is from £5 to £10; and the new class of monitors, as to whom there has been some discussion in this House, whose age is from 18 to 20, and whose salaries, as proposed by the Commissioners, range from £15 to £17. £1,000 is to be given to lay schools under male teachers, £500 to lay schools under female teachers, and £500 to convent schools. I must say that, on the whole, I regard this as a very equitable arrangement. Then, there is an increase of £400 for premiums to teachers of singing, drawing, and navigation schools. The result of these arrangements is that there is an increase of £13,900, and a decrease of £1,400, giving a net increase of £12,500. The cost of the navigation schools has been decreased by £100. These schools are, in my opinion, of the greatest possible advantage to the country. I paid a visit to one of them some time since and saw men between 30 and 40 years of age benefiting by the instruction which is given in them. I now come to the Albert Agricultural Schools, and on this Vote there is a diminution of £135. I may here mention that two model schools, one at Enniskillen and the other at Cork, are in course of erection. In the year 1862-3 the sum voted for the Albert Agricultural Schools was £2,351; in the year 1863-4, £1,781; and in 1864-5 the sum proposed is £1,646. I think that the school is a great and valuable institution, and I am grieved to find that Dr. Kirkpatrick, under whose efficient management the school has been conducted, will not be likely to resume his duties, owing to the state of his health. It has been stated in this House that the young men who have been educated in this school are for the most part employed in Dublin as drapers' assistants. I have taken the trouble to extract from a Report made by Dr. Kirkpatrick the following particulars relating to the occupations pursued in after life by 175 pupils who left the Albert Agricultural Training Institution between the first of January, 1858, and the 31st of December, 1861. Of these 175, there were employed in farming at home, either for themselves or their relatives, 68; land stewards and assistant land agents, 41; agricultural teachers, 3; nurserymen, gardeners, and assistant gardeners, 9; National school teachers, 10; planters in the Islands of Jamaica and Antigua, 9; clerks in the offices of merchants, land agents, and in the Customs, &c., 14; entered the Queen's and Catholic Colleges, 6; emigrated to the Cape of Good Hope and Australia, 5; left in delicate health, and from other causes, 10. On the item for agricultural schools, I regret to say that I gave a pledge that there should be no increase; and I find that the estimate for the ensuing year is exactly the same as for the last twelve months—£3,750. I find, however, that since the year 1861-2 there has been a considerable reduction in this portion of the expenditure. On the book department there is a decrease of about £2,000, owing partly to the fact, that the money granted last year for the revision of the books will probably extend over several years, and partly to the circumstance that £1,000 has been saved by economy on books and requisites. In the school apparatus department there has been a decrease of £200 consequent upon the abolition of the office of the superintendent, whose duties are now added to those of the storekeeper. The increase on the official establishment is £278, and this increase is owing principally to the addition of eight temporary clerks to the permanent staff. These additional clerks have been chiefly employed in preparing the voluminous Returns which have been made to this House, and upon this point I wish to say a word or two as a caution. The hon. Member for the county of Longford (Mr. O'Reilly) moved for a Return some time since, and that Return, which it was deemed desirable to grant, cost the country over £400. The hon. Baronet the Member for Dublin proposed moving for a Return which, if granted, would have cost the country over £800. I think, therefore, that the cost of these Returns should somewhat cool the ardour of those hon. Members who are so eager for their production. At this moment there is a heavy Return in preparation in connection with the convent schools. As the Committee is aware, a Report of each of those schools was ordered to be drawn up at the instance of the hon. Member for Limerick. I did hope that that Report would be ready for the Committee to-night, but I find, consisting as it does of over 400 pages, that it will be impossible to lay it upon the table for another ten days. I am bound to say, however, that having looked through the book, the Reports, as regards the management of convent schools generally — I may almost say universally—are of a highly satisfactory character. It is fair to say that in King's County, the Inspector has reported unfavourably of one or two schools, but then he has reported most favourably of some others. The Report, I am convinced, will show the House that the children in these convent schools receive every attention, and that the institutions are conducted in a most able and efficient manner. I shall be willing to answer any questions as to details, but I trust that without further delay the Committee will proceed to pass the Vote.

MR. HENNESSY said, that the Vote with respect to Irish education differed in several particulars from that for education in Great Britain. In England and Scotland the money voted was distributed among the different denominations, and no school received a grant in which religious was not united with secular instruction. In Ireland exactly the reverse was the case. Again, while the population in England was increasing, the Estimates for education had been diminishing, but strange to say in Ireland it was just the opposite. [Sir ROBERT PEEL: The number of children is increasing.] Well, it was something of a mystery that while the people were diminishing, the children should be on the increase. The right hon. Baronet had stated that there were 840,000 children on the rolls. But what would the Committee think when they discovered that if they were to take any one day in the year, the attendance in the National schools would not be found to be more than 296,000? It thus appeared that there were what might be described as something like 500,000 myths on the rolls. Nor was that all — the best education given in Ireland, was not given in the National schools. The right hon. Gentleman had taken credit for the decrease of crime in Ireland, and had attributed that result to the National system. Well, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, at a recent meeting, had said that the National system "had stirred the stagnant level of the peasant's mind, and had caused the people to emigrate." That night, however, they had heard that the decrease of crime was to be attributed to it; but he was of opinion that the decrease was to be attributed to other causes. It was interesting to notice as a great political question that they gave in Ireland a Government system of education, to which beyond dispute the vast majority of the Irish people objected. It was not merely the Presbyterians who objected, or the Protestant body whom his hon. Friend (Mr. Lefroy) so efficiently represented, but the objection was felt by every religious denomination in Ireland. He had no inclination to move to cut down the grant. The fact was that money in any shape in which it was given was wanted in Ireland, so little did the people of that country get out of the national exchequer. On the subject of convent schools he wished to say that he had lately received a letter from Dr. Murphy, Dean of Cork, in which he said that he had found it to be true, as stated by the Rev. Mr. Kirby, that there was a convent school in the county of Cork in which the children had made the sign of the cross, and continued to do so up to the present day; his former denial was with reference to the city of Cork. The practice of making the sign of the cross was against the rules of the National system; but he believed that it prevailed, for all that, in the vast majority of the convent and other schools. He had seen a letter from Professor Kavanagh, who had been a Government Inspector, and he said that in nine out of ten schools the practice prevailed. He would ask the Government whether it was not absurd in a country like Ireland, and in regard to convent schools, to have rules of that kind which were broken over and over again, and would continue to be broken. The right hon. Baronet had said that there had been a complaint against some school in the King's County. He (Mr. Hennessy) was in the habit of visiting the schools there, and he thought the right hon. Gentleman must have made a mistake. [SIR ROBERT PEEL: I said a report as regards one of the schools was not so favourable.] He thought that school must have been in the Queen's County. Was it not a shame for Government to send out Inspectors to hunt up every little violation of rule. The right hon. Gentleman had dwelt with satisfaction upon the results of the Albert Model School. Now, he found that the farm attached to it consisted of 179 statute acres. It had been established to teach the best modes of farming and rural economy, and yet the sum total of its expenditure was £3,296, while its receipts amounted to only £1,650, leaving a total loss upon that model farm of £1,646.

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, that the last point referred to by the hon. Member was easily explained. The expenditure included the maintenance of fifty-eight agricultural pupils and teachers, which cost £1,250; salary for a lecturer on botany, £60, and for a practical instructor in agriculture, £200. Everybody knew that in the case of a model farm it was impossible to make the two ends meet. He believed there was a general adherence to the rules of the Board, and as regarded devotional services that they were performed after school hours. The system in Ireland brought together children of different denominations under the same school-roofs; and a proof that they were not compelled to go there was found in the fact that in the schools the children belonging to the different denominations bore a just relation to the relative numbers of the different denominations out of the schools. With respect to the number of the children attending the schools, it should be borne in mind that the number on the rolls always far exceeded the average daily attendance; and in Ireland the proportion was about the same as in this country.

MR. LEFROY said, he would not oppose the grant as he agreed that the money given to Ireland, although it had not been laid out in the way he could wish, had done a certain degree of good. When the number of children in daily attendance was considered, he certainly thought the number on the rolls was very deceptive. He was not prepared to dispute that instruction might have diminished crime; but the statement in which the right hon. Baronet appeared to exult, that the Protestant children at the schools in one part of Ireland were exceedingly numerous, while the number of the Roman Catholic children at the schools in another part of Ireland was very great, only proved that the system was becoming an entirely denominational system, for which the circumstances of Ireland were never calculated. The increase of the grant in Ireland to a decreasing population had been adverted to, and the Presbyterians had presented a petition to that House expressing their opinion that this circumstance was likely to lead to an increase of the convent schools, which increase would in turn lead to a withdrawal of the pupil-teachers from the other training schools, and be utterly subversive of the principle of united education. The hon. Members for Cork, Roscommon, and King's County, and, likewise, the Bishop of Kerry, amongst others, had borne testimony to the failure of the National system. The grant was increasing and the money was devoted to denominational purposes from which the Established Church was excluded. It was a matter of astonishment to him, that whilst large and increasing grants were given to gratify all other classes of religions — while it was attempted to please the Roman Catholics — the feelings, and desires, and sentiments of the Protestant Church of Ireland were never for one moment taken into account. It was asked, "Why do not the ministers of the Established Church avail themselves of the grants?" The answer was, that their ordination vows bound them to teach religion on the basis of the Bible, and that the rules of the National system of education did not secure such teaching; but, on the contrary, rather tended to prevent it.

MR. MONSELL said, his hon. Friend who had just sat down seemed to have entirely ignored the existence in Ireland of the non-vested schools. One-third of the schools in that country were non-vested schools, in which the patron had the right of giving what religious instruction he pleased, but where he was also compelled to give secular education to denominations differing from his own. Convent schools were conducted on the same principle as other schools, and he knew a convent school which was attended by Protestant children, and where there was a private room provided where these children could receive instruction from their own religious teachers, and he did not believe that any case of proselytism had been established. Notwithstanding the objections that had been raised respecting the enormous increase of the grant to convent schools, it only amounted to £500 for the present year. The Presbyterians had made a great outcry, but, in the case of the Queen's College, Belfast, they had displayed very little regard for the principles of religious liberty, with respect to one of the professorships there. As to the teaching in these schools, the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Robert Peel) had said quite enough. The hon. and learned Member for Belfast (Sir Hugh Cairns) had said that the children in the convent schools were only half educated, and that the ladies who taught them were not properly trained; but according to two of the Inspectors (Mr. Robinson and Mr. Shee) they underwent a thorough training, were carefully examined in their noviciate, and were set apart according to their ability and knowledge. There were many points with regard to the non-vested and model schools upon which he entertained objections, but he thought it was not desirable to raise a controversial discussion upon the subject.

MR. O'REILLY said, that he had declared his sentiments on the subject at much length last year, and he would not go over the ground that he had then traversed. He would remark, however, that the charge that, in attacking the model schools last year, he had aimed at the destruction of the whole system of education in Ireland was unfair and unfounded. A decisive check, however, had been given to the encroachments of the universal system of State education, and to that extent the discussion of last year had been productive of advantage. He had moved for a Return on the subject, which he was perfectly aware would be of a comprehensive character. Soon after he moved for it he received a letter from the Financial Secretary to the Treasury to ask whether it could not be curtailed, as the labour and expense would be considerable; but he (Mr. O'Reilly) thought that, considering the interest and importance, he was warranted in requesting that it might be furnished, notwithstanding the expense. Many might think the first-class agricultural schools did not yield a satisfactory Return, but nothing could be more useful than these schools were.

MR. WHALLEY said, that as the Committee were asked to vote a sum of £315,000 for education in Ireland, and as a portion of that amount was diverted from the system of united education and applied to the convent schools, the nature of the teaching in those establishments, moral and political, should be laid before them. If it were not he would take an early opportunity next Session of bringing the whole subject before the House.

MR. MAGUIRE said, that if the hon. Member would come to Cork he would be happy to show him the system of education adopted by the convent schools. The hon. Member would then, he was sure, demand next year an extension of the grant. He held that in an agricultural country it was the duty of the National Board to disseminate agricultural information in the most simple and popular way among the children in the schools.

MR. BRADY said, he was also in favour of diffusing as widely as possible in Ireland, through the medium of the schools, a knowledge of the most improved methods of agriculture. He considered, however, that the expenses attending the Glasnevin Agricultural College were unnecessarily high. If the hon. Member for Peterborough was aware of the manner in which the convent schools were conducted, he certainly would hesitate before he found fault with them. The only complaint which he (Mr. Brady) had to make was of the restrictions imposed with respect to those schools by the Government under which the children were not permitted to make the sign of the cross, though the cross appeared over religious edifices in this country.

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, a Return moved for by the hon. Member for Limerick would specify the regulations with respect to convent schools. There were 186,000 Protestants in attendance at the National schools in Ireland. In addition to the Glasnevin establishment there were in every county in Ireland school farms, but he admitted the force of what was said by the hon. Member for Dungarvan, and would endeavour to introduce in rural schools an educational primer.

COLONEL SYKES remarked on the enormous increase in the Educational Estimates since the year 1835, and urged that the whole of that expenditure ought to undergo a minute and thorough investigation. He did not object to any amount of money being usefully applied to the purposes of education, but they ought to insist on having stricter proofs than any which they now possessed, that so vast an outlay yielded beneficial and practical results.

Colonel DICKSON said, that if all the other agricultural schools of Ireland were conducted like the one in his own county there could not be a greater waste of public money than was involved in this expenditure. He never saw a worse farm than the one belonging to the school to which he referred, and certainly if his own steward were to manage any of his property in the same fashion he should dismiss him the next morning. The reason why it was in such a state was because it was conducted from Dublin, without the advice of people on the spot being taken. With regard to the sum of £2,000 paid in salaries to flax instructors, the whole of it was thrown away. The cultivation of flax was a new movement, and instead of spending the money upon a parcel of officials from Dublin it would be far better to let each district have its own share of the fund, and to employ its own people.

Mr. HASSARD asked for explanations with regard to the duties of the classical master in the normal establishment for special class teachers, pupil-teachers, and others. He wanted to know, whether the duty was confined to instruction in the dead languages, or whether modern languages were included?

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, he presumed that the object was to provide a superior class of teachers, and that the duty embraced classical instruction generally.

Lord CLAUD HAMILTON said, he was only anxious that the country should get full value for the money. What he complained of was, that when farming was carried on in Ireland at the public expense the same care and watchfulness were not exercised as were generally applied to farming for the interest of a particular individual. He did not consider the agricultural schools in Ireland were attended with any useful practical results, and that the farmers in the neighbourhood showed no desire to obtain the services of the pupils who had been trained in them. He doubted very much the propriety of the manner in which the cultivation of flax was encouraged.

Sir ROBERT PEEL explained, that the grant for instruction in the cultivation of flax was distributed by a joint committee of the Royal Dublin and Royal Irish Agricultural Societies, and the persons who were being sent into the districts where it was desired that the cultivation of flax should be introduced were not Inspectors, but instructors, at £90 or £100 a year.

Colonel DICKSON said, that it would be better to allow the grant to be distributed by the local agricultural societies, and urged that what were required were not instructors all the year round at salaries of £100 a year, but men at 25*s.* a week for a few weeks in the year.

Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) £805, Commissioners of Education, Ireland (Office Expenses).

(3.) £3,206, to complete the sum for the University of London.

Mr. AUGUSTUS SMITH asked, why the salary of the Registrar had been increased?

Mr. O'REILLY said, he wished to call attention to the manner in which the University was treated by the Government. The University had no fitting "local habitation" for the discharge of its duties—a name it had provided for itself. At present it was located in Burlington House, and he wished to ask the noble Lord to state what the intention of the Government was with reference to providing the University of London with a fitting building?

Mr. AYRTON said, the London University had none of the usual incidents of a university, with the exception of that of granting degrees. It had been based upon a limited and narrow basis, and he hoped the Government would place it on a broader basis for the future. If the University was to be worthy of its name, it ought to be associated with the other scientific associations in the metropolis, and within a building that might bring them into connection with the University. An attempt was made to do so some years ago at South Kensington, but that was protested against as likely to impair their utility, and it had been abandoned, but he hoped the Government would turn their attention to a central building for them. No doubt Burlington House could be made available for the requirements of the University and the scientific institutions, so as to make them more useful than at present.

Mr. O'REILLY said, the Society was

not based upon such narrow principles as the hon. and learned Gentleman appeared to suppose.

SIR HENRY WILLOUGHBY said, he also wished to ask for an explanation of the increase of £200 to the Registrar's salary?

MR. PEEL said, that when the University was first founded it was proposed that the salary of the Registrar should be £1,000 a year; but it was thought better in the first instance that a smaller salary should be given. The salary was accordingly fixed at £500, and was raised from time to time till it reached £800 last year. It had now been raised to the maximum, £1,000. Dr. Carpenter had held the office for a considerable time, and its duties having very greatly increased, it was thought he had a fair claim to the full salary originally intended to be given.

Vote *agreed to.*

(4.) £13,704, to complete the sum for Universities, &c., in Scotland, and

(5.) £2,462, for Queen's University in Ireland.

(6.) £3,400, to complete the sum for the Queen's Colleges in Ireland.

MR. HENNESSY said, he wished to know if the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Ireland could throw any light on the fire at Queen's College, Cork?

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, he could throw no light upon it, but he was happy to state that the accusation and counter statement which had been made on the subject had been entirely cleared up. Dr. Bullen had written a most handsome apology. It was not necessary to go again into the matter, and he trusted it might be allowed to rest.

MR. HENNESSY said, it was no doubt a painful subject for the Government, but the facts were too remarkable to be altogether passed by. The fire occurred on the 13th of May, 1862, and the depositions before the House fully bore out Dr. Bullen's statement, that the College was set fire to by some one within its walls. He did not understand that Dr. Bullen had withdrawn that statement, though he had others with reference to the College. After the fire took place it was stated in the Government organs that the authors of it were that mysterious body, the Ultramontane party. But there did not appear to be the shadow of a foundation for such a statement. In all probability the College was set on fire by some one within the walls. On the 12th of May, two porters had been heard to remark on the possibility of a fire occurring in the College, and a third porter had said that a fire would occur. It was a remarkable fact that all the investigations into the matter had been conducted with closed doors. He had heard a rumour which might account for the whole occurrence. A man of the name of Burke was at that time in Clonmel Gaol, awaiting his trial on a charge of having poisoned his wife. A portion of the viscera of the wife had been sent to the College for analysis by the Professor of Chemistry; and it was supposed that the friends of Burke were under the impression that those remains were lying in that part of the building which had been burnt down. It was further stated that a young woman who was attached to Burke, and to whom he was to have been married after the death of his wife, had arrived in Cork shortly before the day when the fire broke out; and the conclusion drawn from all these facts was, that she or some other friend of Burke had probably bribed one of the officers of the College to destroy the building, and with it one of the evidences of his crime. In connection with that theory, he understood the Government had in their possession some papers, and he should be glad if the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary would unbosom himself, and tell the House whether it was not to the story which he mentioned that the burning of the College was to be traced?

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, that when he spoke of the subject as a painful one, he simply referred to certain charges which had been made and withdrawn, and which he did not think it was desirable to revive. A great number of rumours, he might add, were afloat with regard to the burning, and it was, he believed, true that the viscera of Mrs. Burke were in the laboratory of the College at the time the fire took place, but he did not know whether the burning was connected with her murder or not. That, he hoped, would be a sufficient explanation for the hon. Gentleman.

LORD NAAS observed, that the mystery involved in the matter had not been made clearer by the papers relating to it for which he had moved, and which had been laid on the table. Having read the depositions taken in the case, he must confess that it did not appear to him that the Government had any ground for the course which they took in attempting to prove that the burning was malicious, and thus seeking to throw the loss upon the ratepayers of the city of Cork. When the presumption was so strong that the fire was the work of somebody connected with the establishment, that was, to say the least of it, an extraordinary mode of proceeding. Such premises ought to be insured to their full value in case a similar fire should occur.

COLONEL DUNNE said, he protested against the secresy with which the investigation of the charge was conducted. A grand jury could not make a presentment in case of a fire if there was no malice, and as the Government asked a grand jury to make a presentment, it was obvious that they thought it was a case of malicious burning. But they had failed in every quarter to prove a case of malice. Therefore their conduct was very culpable.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, there was no doubt the building was maliciously burnt, and that being so the Government thought it right to make a presentment. But it did not go before any grand jury, but before the town council of Cork, who, upon the advice of the Recorder, rejected it, and their decision was supported by the Court of Queen's Bench, and consequently the inquiry could not be gone into. The Irish law officers of the Crown were asked for their opinion, and they said that there was no case made out for going against any person, and consequently the matter fell to the ground. The Government were in no way to blame for the proceedings which they adopted.

SIR EDWARD GROGAN said, that if it was a malicious burning the Government ought to prosecute the supposed authors of the crime.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, that no evidence could be obtained in the case to sustain a criminal prosecution.

SIR HENRY WILLOUGHBY said, he wished to know whether the Government were prepared to insure the building?

MR. PEEL said, he could perceive no ground for insuring that college more than any other public edifice. The Government, as was well known, were their own insurers.

Vote *agreed to.*

(7.) £500, Royal Irish Academy.

(8.) £600, National Gallery of Ireland.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN asked whether the Government meant to grant any money for the purchase of pictures for that gallery?

MR. PEEL said, when the original design of the National Gallery in Dublin was determined upon it was to be maintained out of private funds. The plans were altered, and the building cost £28,000, and applications were made to Parliament for grants to purchase pictures. An Act of Parliament was passed, vesting the gallery in trustees, and if it was to be maintained out of grants of public money steps must be taken to declare that it was public property.

Vote *agreed to.*

(9.) £1,500, to complete the sum for the Belfast Theological Professors, &c.

(10.) £69,127, to complete the sum for the British Museum.

MR. WALPOLE: The Vote which I have to propose this year amounts to £92,127, against a Vote for last year of £90,641. This shows an increase of £1,486. At first sight a false conclusion may be drawn from this increase, but if you go over the Vote you will find there is an increase on the whole for salaries, expenses of bookbinding, catalogues, &c. of £4,724, but at the same time there has been a reduction amounting to £2,328 on building expenses, furniture, and so on, such items leaving a net increase of £1,486. This increase may be accounted for chiefly by two special purchases which have been made—both of them great acquisitions to the Museum and, as I hope, the community at large. The first of these is the purchase of the collection recently found in a cave in the south of France, and brought here under the superintendence of Professor Owen. I look upon that as one of the most valuable acquisitions we could have gained for the benefit of the country at large. There is no question which excites greater interest in a scientific, archæological, and I may say, antiquarian point of view, than that raised by Professor Lyell in his book on the antiquity of man; and this collection, I am sure, will amply repay an inspection from any hon. Member who takes an interest in this subject. For that collection we have given the large sum of £1,000, and I am sure the money could not have been better spent. The other purchase is a bronze lamp, found on the site of the Sulian Palace. It is supposed, by those who are versed in such matters, to be of Greek workmanship, of a date prior to the

Christian era. It is of most beautiful workmanship, and in perfect condition. A description of it will be found in the last number of the *Journal of Science and Art.* Another purchase we have made, with the sanction of the Treasury, but since the date of this Vote, and therefore not included in it—the contents of the Farnese Palace, sold by the King of Naples. In that collection is a beautiful equestrian statue of Mars—one of the three ancient equestrian statues which alone are known to be in existence — and the only one brought to this country. That brings me to an important question, which has been often debated in this House; while you are purchasing these collections where are you to put them—because the collections we have in the Museum now are so great that we cannot possibly exhibit them all to the public, and for a long time the new purchases must be practically lost to the public. The Government have recently intimated to us that they have a plan for the accommodation of the natural history collections upon the site purchased at South Kensington. Whether you transfer your natural history collections to another place, or whether you keep them altogether, I should wish to press on the Government the necessity of coming to a decision during this autumn. If you determine to remove your natural history collections to South Kensington you undoubtedly have a site there capable of accommodating your collection; but if you determine to keep them altogether, the only way will be to purchase from the ground landlord the houses round the Museum. The charge you will thus put on the public will be comparatively small, or at any rate not so startling as may appear at first sight, because it will only be a charge for so many of the houses as from time to time you are called on to add to the Museum. With regard to the objection of competition between the two great establishments he must say one word. Credit was due to the President of the Council for the rules which he had drawn up and which prevent the possibility of competition. In the case of any classical works of antiquity which relate to or are connected with manufacturing subjects, if the British Museum should not want them, then, with the consent of the trustees, the South Kensington Museum could purchase them. The hon. Member for Marylebone (Mr. H. Lewis) asked me the other night about the change in hours of recreation or refreshment for the attendants. Since the question was put to me I have made it my business to ascertain how the change has worked. All the assistants have spoken in the highest terms of the new regulation. The only other subject to which I need refer is the appointment of new trustees since I last had the honour of moving these Estimates. In place of that most valuable public servant in every department—the late Sir George Lewis—the official and family trustees have made a selection which I think will be admitted to be the very best they could make in the election of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe). In point of literary attainments or of administrative powers I do not think a better selection could be made. Another vacancy was caused by the death of that great Oriental scholar Dr. Cureton. In his place the Crown have nominated the Dean of Windsor, an eminent scholar and an excellent man in every way. I have now only to move that the sum of £69,127 be granted to defray the expenses of the British Museum.

MR. AYRTON said, that if anything could reconcile the Committee to the anomalous practice of moving these Estimates by an hon. Member unconnected with the Government, it would be the extremely courteous and agreeable manner in which that task was performed by the right hon. Gentleman. At the same time he must again protest against the sum of £90,000 being submitted to the House under circumstances entirely different to those under which other Votes are proposed. In that as in other cases the Vote should be proposed by a responsible Minister. With respect to the institution itself, he thought that the more interesting the collection became the greater reason there was that the fullest opportunity should be granted to the public to visit it, and, therefore, he regretted that the trustees had not been able to provide for opening the Museum in the evenings. Experience at South Kensington had shown that evening exhibitions were practicable, and if the British Museum were open from seven to ten at night, it would attract fully double the number of visitors. Having been a Member of the Committee on the British Museum which sat last year, he was inclined to agree with the right hon. Gentleman that steps should be taken to provide for the enlargement of that institution. The investigation into the property at South Kensington had shown that no obligation fell upon the Government to erect buildings upon that site. Every obligation connected with that property could be fulfilled by selling the land and applying the proceeds to the enlargement of the British Museum. The property was acquired under a trust to buy or sell property for the purposes of science and art. If it was lawful to place the British Museum at South Kensington, it was equally proper to sell property at South Kensington and to enlarge the British Museum. He hoped the Government would bear in mind the right hon. Gentleman's suggestion, and take proper steps to keep the British Museum where it was now placed. There was no place about the metropolis so much cut off from the bulk of the inhabitants as South Kensington, which was separated from the densely-inhabited parts of London by St. James's, the Green and Hyde Parks, and by Kensington Gardens. The place had been offered to nearly all the scientific societies of the metropolis, but they had one and all refused to go there, because they knew it would be their ruin. If it was a convenient site for public buildings, why were not theatres and other exhibitions for profit brought there? The managers knew better. As Parliament had spent millions on the British Museum, and voted about £90,000 a year to maintain it, it was their duty to have it in a place where it was accessible to the general public. He hoped, therefore, the Government would give up the idea of removing any portion to South Kensington.

Mr. LOCKE said, it was extraordinary that his hon. Friend should have made the very same speech as he made last year. One would have supposed that his hon. Friend was always in the Tower Hamlets, and never rode in Hyde Park or walked in Kensington Gardens. The fact was that there was no place in London which was more frequented, especially on Sundays, than Kensington Gardens and Hyde Park, and that by all conditions of people; and if both the Kensington Museum and the British Museum were opened on Sundays they also would be filled. His hon. Friend said there was no reason why they should be compelled to keep an exhibition at Kensington; but he forgot that by the contract between the Commissioners of the Exhibition and the Government it was stipulated that the Government was to give a certain sum of money for the site, and that it should be appropriated to the purposes of science and art. That site was large enough for as many museums as they wished to have. He could not account for the prejudice which existed against having the collection there.

Mr. WHITE said, he agreed in the expediency of opening the British Museum in the evening, if it were practicable with, due regard to the safety of the collections, and he would entreat the Government to take some steps to utilize the valuable works which they had acquired. He believed that the gentlemen who presided over the different departments at the British Museum were in favour of popular lectures being given, illustrative of the treasures under their charge; and such a practice would certainly tend to stimulate popular education. He should like to know whether the whole collection of the Farnese Palace had been purchased from the ex-King of Naples, and, if so, what was the amount to be paid for it?

Mr. HARVEY LEWIS said, he had received several communications with regard to the assistants at the Museum, as to which the right hon. Gentleman had given him an answer on a former occasion. The complaint came from the attendants, who were the lowest grade of persons employed at the Museum. They came at nine in the morning, and remained till six or a quarter past six in the evening. Now these persons were not allowed to leave the museum in the day on any pretence whatever; and they thought it very hard that they were compelled to take every particle of refreshment they required in the day in the new refreshment room. He had a letter in his hand from a person whom he obviously could not name, for the truth of which he could not vouch, but which stated that an address of thanks to the trustees had been recently drawn up in the printed books department, which had been signed by the assistants in many instances very reluctantly. The attendants, however, refused to sign it altogether, which caused great anger in a certain quarter, and an apology had been demanded to be signed. He thought it would be very easy to inquire whether the refreshment room was or was not fully attended, and whether or not a document requiring an apology had been tendered to the various employés. He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would find an opportunity of making these inquiries.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he was doubtful whether the rule adopted at the British Museum was at variance with the rule adopted at other public establishments. He thought it was not. But he rose to protest against the practice of reading grievances from anonymous correspondents to the House before the proper intermediate step had been taken. The House of Commons were not the managers of the Museum; and whilst he agreed that the House had authority by way of appeal, yet he thought they ought not to listen to complaints of the kind before they had been laid before the trustees of the Museum, who were the proper persons to judge of them in the first instance.

MR. WALPOLE said, that the regulations introduced at the British Museum were the same as those in other public offices, and the inconvenience which the public sustained in consequence of the absence of the officials furnished the reason for resorting to them. He had already stated that he should support the determination of the trustees, to whose decision he thought all questions should be submitted. The price of the Farnesian Collection, £4,000, was certainly large, but he did not regard it as unreasonable. The only question was as to how that sum was to be provided, and he might state that the money would not be included in the Estimates, as it was intended, with the sanction of the Government, to defray the charge from the surplus remaining from the grants of former years. He did not believe that the proposal for keeping the Museum open from six to eight, or until ten, would be found to answer. The danger did not simply arise from fire, though that was an important consideration; but if the Museum were kept open it would have to be lighted by gas, and such a course would inevitably entail great damage upon the sculpture, books, and other things contained in the Museum?

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he wished to know if it was the intention of the Government to propose at some future period the separation of the collections at the British Museum?

MR. AYRTON protested against the doctrine which had been enunciated, that there was anything in the terms upon which the land at South Kensington had been purchased which should preclude the Government from disposing of it. Such a doctrine was illusory, because it was perfectly competent for the House to put an end to the supposed trust at any moment it pleased.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that due notice would be given to the House of any proposal that it might be thought desirable to make.

MR. AUGUSTUS SMITH said, he understood that some proposal had already been made to the trustees by the Government, and he thought the House was entitled to know what it was.

MR. WALPOLE said, the Government had been considering what they should do with the site at South Kensington, and they had communicated with the trustees to know what quantity of land they would require, and what extent of building would be sufficient to accommodate the natural history collection.

Vote *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again on *Wednesday.*

BLEACHING AND DYEING WORKS ACTS EXTENSION BILL—[BILL 181.]

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. H. A. Bruce*).

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, that having been from the first a supporter of the Ten Hours Act, even at a time when it was very unpopular to advocate it, and having seen the good effects of that measure, his first impression was in favour of the present Bill. On a careful examination, however, he found that there was no ground for interference in this case, and that they were about to legislate in the dark. In the town he represented (Bradford), for instance, there were 1,500 men and boys employed in preparing and packing goods, who would be brought under the Bill. Of that number 400 were boys, and there were scarcely any women or children thus engaged—certainly not more than half-a-dozen. The hours of labour, taking the average of the year, were much shorter than those in the mills, being only about fifty-three or fifty-four hours a week in the former, and sixty hours in the latter case. Occasionally, for perhaps a week in the course of the year, under the pressure of business, the men and boys were kept longer at work, but on the whole their work was comparatively light. They stopped work at twelve or one p.m. on Saturday almost universally, and it was the custom to give them a week's holiday once a year. A much larger proportion of the boys engaged in packing, &c., attended the night schools than of the boys in the mills. The opposition to the Bill came not so much from the masters as from the men, 1,200 of the 1,500 persons employed in the business having petitioned against it. Their ground of objection was, that if the Bill became law, the masters, rather than submit to inspection, would dismiss the boys, and take men in their places. The fact was, that the Bill had been brought forward solely on an inquiry in one town; but even in Manchester there was not much cause for interference, although many children were employed in packing there, and only a very few at Bradford. He thought the Government ought to postpone the Bill for a year, in order to institute further inquiries. If they would not agree to that, they ought, at least, to limit the operation of the measure to warehouses in which there were women and children. In any case, however, they were legislating in the matter very much in the dark, and they must take care not to press the principle of the Factory Acts too far, lest it excited a prejudice against all such interference, whether necessary and moderate or otherwise. He should move that the Bill be read a second time that day three months.

Mr. BAINES, in seconding the Amendment, said, he could confirm the statements of his hon. Friend the Member for Bradford from his own knowledge of what was done in the woollen district of Leeds. The Bill was of a very unprecedented character. There had been no inquiry, no grievance had been alleged, and the measure was opposed by those whom it was intended to protect. He would not, however, oppose the Bill if the right hon. Gentleman who had charge of it would exclude from the operation of the measure all large warehouses where women and children were not employed.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. William Edward Forster.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. COLLINS expressed a hope that the Government would not withdraw the Bill on the second reading, but that they would be prepared to consider any Amendments that might be proposed by the hon. Member for Bradford in Committee.

Sir HUGH CAIRNS said, that if the right hon. Gentleman who had charge of the Bill would promise to deal with the objections to the Bill in Committee, the House would probably agree to the second reading. He might add that he did not see why places of business where children or women were not employed should be subjected to any kind of inspection.

Mr. H. A. BRUCE said, he must decline to withdraw the Bill, as he considered himself under an honourable engagement to the House to proceed with it. In Committee he should be happy to consider any Amendments, but he could not pledge himself to adopt the change sketched by the hon. Member for Bradford. He thought it was unadvisable to make any difference between one class of workmen and another.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, he hoped the House would wait for a little more evidence before they proceeded further with this measure.

Mr. LEATHAM said, he should support the Amendment, as great objections were entertained against the Bill in the borough which he had the honour to represent.

Sir JOHN RAMSDEN urged the postponement of the Bill to give time for inquiry. The reason given by the hon. Member for Knaresborough (Mr. Collins) for supporting the Bill appeared to him the strongest argument for its postponement. For what said the hon. Gentleman? That the Bill was opposed on the same grounds as those on which the Factory Acts had been opposed, and that the same evils existed in this case and required the same remedy. But that was assuming the very point at issue. The persons most deeply affected by the Bill denied the existence of any such evils. But they did not ask Parliament to believe this merely on their statement. They complained that no investigation had been made—they challenge inquiry. Their language was—inquire into the facts, and then, when the materials for forming a correct judgment are fairly before you, then if a case for legislative interference is made out, legislate if you will. The request was so reasonable, and dictated by a spirit of such manifest justice, that he hoped the House would not refuse it.

Sir GEORGE GREY said, when in Committee the Government would fairly consider every Amendment which might be proposed.

LORD NAAS suggested that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided* :—Ayes 65 ; Noes 22 : Majority 43.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *Thursday.*

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES (VOTING PAPERS) BILL—[BILL 198.]

THIRD READING.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Thompson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present ; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at Two o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, July 12, 1864.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties)* (No. 198) ; Administration of Trusts (Scotland)* (No. 199).

Second Reading—Indemnity* (No. 197) ; Street Music (Metropolis) (No. 196) ; India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment* (No. 195) ; Defence Act Amendment [H.L.]* (No. 193).

Committee—India Office* (No. 191).

Report—Civil Bill Courts (Ireland)* (No. 200) ; India Office* (No. 191).

Third Reading—Facilities for Divine Service in Collegiate Schools [H.L.] (No. 183) ; Life Annuities and Life Assurances* (No. 116) ; Lunacy (Scotland)* (No. 172).

METROPOLITAN RAILWAY SCHEMES.

The Sessional Order of the 21st of April last *dispensed with :* Then Standing Order No. 179 Sec. 4, *considered* (according to Order), and *dispensed with* in respect to any Metropolitan Railway Bill which has been or may be brought from the House of Commons during the present Session.—(*The Chairman of Committees.*)

MASSACRE OF SWEDES AT DUPPEL.

QUESTION.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY wished to ask the noble Earl the Foreign Secretary, Whether he had received any further information relative to a statement made by him (the Earl of Shaftesbury), a few days since, that a certain number of Swedes, lying on the ground, were massacred by the Prussians after the battle of Duppel ?

EARL RUSSELL said, that since the answer he had given to the noble Earl on a former evening he had received a further account from the Minister for Foreign Affairs in Prussia. His statement was that, as far as could be ascertained, there were not more than seventy Swedes altogether in the Danish army, and that of these all who were known to be engaged at Duppel were five, who were taken prisoners. The total loss of the Danes in that encounter was not more than 400 killed altogether ; so that the story in the newspapers respecting the massacre of 400 Swedes was altogether false.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY said, that on the former occasion he had simply asked a question, but at the time he asked it he expressed an opinion that the story was perfectly true. He had since received a letter in which that opinion was supported, and it really appeared to be true that Swedish soldiers were fired at by the Prussians after the conflict was over. The letter was dated from Admiral Dacres, of Her Majesty's ship *Edgar*, who, writing to his (the Earl of Shaftesbury's) son, said—

"H.M.S. *Edgar*, Spithead, July 11.

"Dear Mr. Ashley,—I now hasten to give you all the information in my power, which is contained in a note from Lieutenant Nordenfalk, a Swedish lieutenant serving in the *Edgar*, which details as dastardly conduct as one could well hear of; but the fact of this officer being in Danish uniform will give a colouring to any defence that the Prussian Government might choose to set up that they were indistinguishable from Danish troops ; but I have yet to learn that firing on wounded men, whatever colours they may fight under, is justifiable. Lord Shaftesbury may make any use of Lieutenant Nordenfalk's or this note.—Yours, very truly,

"J. S. DACRES."

The note referred to in Admiral Dacres' letter was as follows :—

"My brother, Otto Nordenfalk, aged 21, in the beginning of the year joined the Danish army, and in the present war was volunteering as officer in the 3rd Regiment (2nd company) of a Danish corps. In the forenoon of the 18th, the day when the Duppel forts were taken, he was at the head of a body of soldiers defending the retreat of a part of the retreating army, and having been wounded in his face by a projectile entering on one side, and hurting tongue, jaws, &c., and swooned, he, on recovering his senses, found himself lying on the ground among a crowd of wounded and dead men, and saw Prussian soldiery standing at a few paces distance. He rose now on his elbow, and these men fired at him a volley at this very short distance, after which they left him for dead. Many bullets passed through his cloak and coat, but did not hurt him. He fell down again, and kept quiet until he heard a voice he knew belonged to another Swedish officer in the Danish service, who now assisted him to escape, closely pursued by the advancing troops. Many instances of the cruelty of the Prussian troops against the country people I have heard from my brother, but not so as to relate them in detail.

"E. NORDENFALK, Royal Swedish Navy."

He thought, then, he was fully justified in the statement that he made, that a wounded officer lying on the ground, after the conflict, was selected by the Prussian soldiers and fired at. The *Moniteur du Soir* had registered an order of the day issued by Prince Charles Frederick of Prussia, in virtue of which

> "Any foreigner made prisoner in the Danish ranks, and unable to substantiate his Danish nationality, or to prove that he has been regularly enrolled in the army of Denmark, is to be dealt with as a brigand, brought before court-martial, and on conviction duly shot."

This showed that the Prussian Government had no desire to mitigate the horrors of war.

EARL RUSSELL said, he had reason to believe that it was not the intention of the Prussian Government to carry that order into effect.

STREET MUSIC (METROPOLIS) BILL.

(No. 196.) SECOND READING.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said it had passed the other House by a considerable majority. He did not desire to stop street music altogether, but he supported the Bill, the object of which was to give to housekeepers the right of protection against the nuisance of music when it unpleasantly interfered with their quietude, by empowering the police to remove the offender. No man, he thought, had a right to ride his hobby, even if he were in the majority, at the expense of other people. The hon. Member who promoted the Bill in the other House (Mr. Bass) had published a book which contained a variety of facts showing how great was the nuisance occasioned by the music in question. He showed that the nuisance was not confined to what might be called the aristocracy who lived in the large squares and streets of the metropolis, but that the poor who lived in narrow thoroughfares and crowded alleys were equally averse to street music, and they had made strong representations against it. It was a fact that the majority of the poor were more opposed to the nuisance of street music than their Lordships were probably aware of, and therefore it was not true, as had been said, that the Bill was directed against the amusements of the lower orders. A very remarkable petition had been presented against the Bill signed by men connected with literature, science, and art, and among them were the names of Charles Dickens, the Poet Laureate, and Maclise. The First Commissioner of Police said he was unable to satisfactorily work the present Act, and the police magistrates were of the same opinion, and were in favour of this Bill. The vestries in the borough of Marylebone had passed resolutions in favour of the Bill. Under these circumstances, he thought their Lordships would not refuse to pass the Bill.

Bill read 2^a, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Friday* next.

FACILITIES FOR DIVINE SERVICE IN COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS BILL.

(No. 183.) THIRD READING.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3^a."—(*The Bishop of Oxford.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he could not allow the Bill to be read a third time without making a few observations which he had intended to make on a former stage of the Bill, and to move an Amendment; but it was not his intention to trouble their Lordships to divide upon the Bill. Their Lordships were aware how large was the number of grammar schools established in this country, and of the injunction that required that the scholars should attend the parish church. It had been a great object of the Court of Chancery so to arrange matters that these schools should educate the children of Dissenters, for a large number of Dissenters did not object that their children should attend divine worship in the parish church, though they did object that the religious tenets of their children should be interfered with by private religious teaching. The effect of this Bill would be, he contended, to set aside altogether the injunctions of these grammar schools in this respect, and would offer opportunities for the teaching of doctrines at variance with the known and received doctrines of the Church of England. The 71st canon strictly enjoined that no minister should administer the Holy Sacrament in any private house, except in cases of necessity, and not frequently in any chapel, so that families intending to communicate should ordinarily attend the parish church. Now virtually this Bill repealed that canon. In these times it was of special importance that the religious education of youth should be imparted openly, and in such a manner as that its nature should be known to the parents; but this Bill was so framed as to have an entirely opposite effect. He hoped the Bill would not be allowed to pass the other House without serious consideration.

THE BISHOP OF **OXFORD** denied that it was the principle that in all grammar schools the scholars should attend the parish church. So far from that, in a very large number of them it was provided that prayers should be read in the school-room or in some appropriate room. He had received letters from the masters of such grammar schools showing the exceeding difficulty that arose, sometimes owing to the crotchets of a new clergyman interfering with the long-standing arrangements of the schools, and throwing all into disorder. The object of the Bill was not to provide for those populous schools where there was not room for the scholars in the parish church, but to make them more perfect in the matter of religious instruction. Parliament should never forget that the parents of children select the schoolmaster to whom they would commit their children; but they could not use that freedom of choice with regard to the priest in whose parish the school might be situated. It was, therefore, palpable they were carrying out the view of the parents with regard to religious teaching in placing it in the hands of the conductors of those schools. He believed the majority of their Lordships were in favour of the Bill.

On Question, *Resolved* in the *Affirmative:* Bill read 3^a accordingly, and *passed,* and sent to the Commons.

MEMORIAL OF SIR FRANCIS BOND HEAD.—OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF **HARDWICKE**, who had given notice

"To call the Attention of the House to the Memorial of Sir Francis Bond Head to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, laid upon the Table of the House on the 6th of June last; and to move, That, in the opinion of this House, the great, successful, but heretofore unrequited services rendered by Sir Francis Bond Head, Bart., as Governor of Upper Canada in the years 1836 and 1837, call for the favourable consideration of Her Majesty's Government,"

said, it had been his intention to bring under the notice of the House a document on the table, in which was contained a memorial of Sir Francis Bond Head to the Secretary of State for the Colonies; but in consequence of what appeared to have taken place in the other House last night, he was induced, with the permission of their Lordships, to withdraw his notice. He might be permitted, however, to say a word or two as to the circumstances which induced him to bring forward the question after the lapse of so many years since Sir Francis Head was employed as a public servant. He should not certainly have thought of now reviving the question but for the document referred to, which, if it did not challenge a discussion, at all events left it open for any noble Lord to take notice of the matter. By no man now living, he believed, had the public been better served than by Sir Francis Head, who was Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada at a period of the greatest difficulty, when that valuable province was in a state of open revolt against the authority of the Crown. At that critical period Sir Francis Head was suddenly sent to administer the province of Upper Canada, and by his promptitude, energy, and courage, saved that colony to the British Crown. From that period to the present, owing to circumstances which it would be needless to mention and difficult to explain, the services of Sir Francis Head had been passed over without the slightest notice. From his modest nature, unpresuming character, from anxiety to retire from public notice, that valued public servant had not pressed the subject, as he might have done, upon Members of the Legislature and the public generally, but he (the Earl of Hardwicke), nevertheless, felt it a great misfortune to himself and to the honour of the country, that his services were not requited with public notice. He had intended to have troubled the House with a proof of Sir Francis Head's services, but he was led to believe that the Government were prepared to take the subject into consideration, and hoping for an assurance to that effect from the noble Lord who represented the Colonial Department in the House, he begged to withdraw his notice.

Viscount MELVILLE said, that whilst he did not wish to detract from the claims of Sir Francis Bond Head, it should be borne in mind that he did not complete his work—that he resigned before the revolt was crushed. Sir George Arthur, his successor, completed the work, and was entitled to a large share of the reward.

Lord LYVEDEN thought it much better to leave the distribution of rewards with the Crown, and allow the whole question of Colonial Governors to be considered generally as a question of public policy, instead of bringing forward individual cases. Though he was generally in favour of the payment by the colonies of the expenses of their government, still he thought that the pensions of Governors who were sent to the colonies by the mother country should form an exception and should be paid by the mother country. He thought that the mother country should provide for an official whom they forced upon the colony, whether they would or no.

The Earl of ELLENBOROUGH said, he quite agreed with the noble Lord. He hoped that the position of the Colonial Governors as a body, would be taken into consideration. They were in the receipt of very moderate salaries, the whole of which they generally spent at their posts; they frequently received honours for the services rendered by them ; and then they returned home as poor as when they commenced life. This was a state of things which ought not to continue, and he hoped that the Government would consider the question in a liberal spirit.

Earl GRANVILLE was understood to promise that the whole subject should undergo consideration.

The Marquess of CLANRICARDE said, he considered that Sir Francis Head had preserved Canada to this country in a dangerous crisis, when there was every danger of a war with the United States, and that it was to his energy that Canada owed that she was not involved in the miserable condition of the country adjoining her. Sir Francis was not supported as he ought to have been at home during the rebellion; but in the instructions given to Sir George Arthur, who was appointed Governor of Canada when he resigned, the energy and the success of his career were especially alluded to, and his example was held up for imitation. Sir Francis Head resigned his office because he refused to promote and reward men who had been openly and boastfully disloyal. In his present advanced age a pecuniary reward would form but a slight burden on the country, while it would be some consolation to Sir Francis Head to feel that his services were appreciated.

House adjourned at half past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, July 12, 1864.

MINUTES.] — Select Committee—*Report*—Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (House of Commons) (Second Report) (No. 480).

Public Bills — *Committee* — Highways Act Amendment (*re-committed*) [Bill 177].

Report—Highways Act Amendment (*re-committed*) [Bill 177]; Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* [Bill 152], and *re-committed.*

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

[Bill 177.]

COMMITTEE (*on Re-committal*).

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion, "That the Preamble be postponed,"

Mr. THOMPSON said, he had no doubt the measure would be useful as far as it went, but it did not deal with the principal objections to the present management of highways. The large majority of the magistrates in the country had decided in favour of the adoption of the Act of 1862, and he believed that the best change in the law would be to make that Act compulsory. He wished to impress upon the Government the necessity of bringing in an effective Act next Session, dealing also with the turnpikes which were in an expiring condition, and including in its provisions all highways except those in the immediate neighbourhood of town.

Clauses 1 to 23 were *agreed to,* with numerous verbal Amendments.

Clause 24 (Penalty as to Cattle found straying on Highways).

MR. FENWICK moved, in line thirty-four, to leave out the words "without a keeper." The effect of the clause as it at present stood was that any person might send his cattle to graze upon lands or highways, and he would not be liable to any punishment at all provided that there was a keeper with the cattle. Cattle did much injury to the highways, which only ought to be used for travelling, and not pasturing cattle; and he, therefore, moved his Amendment in order to make it illegal for any person at all to pasture their cattle on the highway. He would also propose to restrict the application of the clause to roads not more than thirty feet wide.

Amendment proposed, in page 8, line 34, to leave out the words "without a keeper."—(*Mr. Henry Fenwick.*)

LORD HENLEY trusted the hon. Member would not press his Amendment, as it would have the effect in many instances of taking away the privileges possessed by the lords of the manors.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, that the clause made no alteration in the existing law with regard to the feeding of cattle on the highway. It simply changed the remedy which could be applied.

LORD LOVAINE thought the Amendment might be agreed to with the addition of other words excepting the rights of lords of manors.

MR. BEACH said, he would support the Amendment, because the animals created great damage to the fences at the side of the roads.

SIR BALDWIN LEIGHTON said, that if the Amendment were adopted it would do a great injury to many poor persons whom the roadside pasturage enabled to keep a cow or two. This privilege was very valuable to the poor cottagers.

COLONEL GILPIN said, he quite agreed with the hon. Baronet as to the inducement which ought to be held out to cottagers, but their cows ought not to be allowed to feed upon the pasturage of other people.

MR. RICHARD HODGSON objected to the Amendment because he believed it would have the effect of depriving many poor people of valuable privileges which had been handed down to them from their forefathers. In the parish where he resided the roads were sometimes sixty feet wide, and the cottagers ought not to be deprived of a privilege which was very useful to them and did no harm.

MR. ADDERLEY regarded highways as roads formed simply for purposes of traffic, and they ought not to be wider than was necessary for that purpose. The preservation of the pasturage on the road side, was not the best way of benefiting the poor cottagers. No land should be used for pasturage that was not properly enclosed. These presumed rights of pasturage were sometimes pressed to an extent as to interfere with the rights of owners of property.

LORD HOTHAM said, he would be glad to see the unnecessary width of many of the public roads reduced, but would at the same time be sorry to see any course pursued by which existing privileges would be disturbed. Any unnecessary width of a road was to that extent a waste of productive land.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 38; Noes 42: Majority 4.

MR. FENWICK then proposed the insertion of words confining the operation of the clause to highways not being more than thirty feet wide.

SIR WILLIAM MILES said, that was provided for by the present Highway Act. Where roads were forty or sixty feet wide they had been laid out under special Acts.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, that the provisos, if agreed to, would repeal the 74th section of the Highway Act. He did not see any objection to the insertion of a proviso saving existing rights of pasturage by the sides of highways.

SIR BALDWIN LEIGHTON proposed the insertion of a proviso to that effect.

SIR WILLIAM MILES thought it would be much better to leave the law as it now stood.

Proviso *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 25 to 31 *agreed to,* with Amendments.

Clause 32 (Mode of defraying Expenses of the Highway Board).

MR. WALTER suggested the employment of a better set of forms in the collection of the rates. At present the highway rate, the county rate, and the poor's rate were all lumped together, so that the ratepayer had no means of ascertaining the specific sum which he contributed towards each rate. Nothing would tend to introduce so much harmony between the landlord and tenant as an arrangement by which the rates should be paid by the landlord. Under the present system, however, such an arrangement was impossible.

Sir GEORGE GREY said, that he quite concurred in the desirability of the plan suggested by the hon. Member. A set of forms of the character described were already employed in London in the collection of the rates.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 33 to 35 *agreed to.*

Clause 36 (Appeal against Rate).

Sir WILLIAM MILES thought that all appeals ought to be brought before the Quarter Sessions, and not before the Special Sessions.

Sir JOHN SHELLEY concurred in the opinion expressed by the hon. Baronet. The magistrates of the Special Sessions were already *ex officio* members of the Highway Board, so that they would virtually be deciding appeals which were made from their own decision.

Mr. COLLINS advocated the retention of the clause in its original form, as appeals to the Quarter Sessions would be attended with great inconvenience and expense.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 37 to 44 *agreed to.*

Clause 45 (Power of Highway Board to make Improvements and Borrow Money).

Mr. LIDDELL moved an Amendment, making the consent of two-thirds in value of the ratepayers of the townships and highway parishes to be benefited by the improvement necessary to the borrowing of money.

Amendment proposed,

In page 17, line 5, after the word "improvements," to insert the words "Provided always, That the consent of at least two-thirds in value of the ratepayers in vestry assembled of the highway parishes to be benefited by such improvements shall be given."—(*Mr. Liddell.*)

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY opposed the Amendment, which he believed would have the effect of entirely nullifying the clause.

Lord LOVAINE thought the danger arising from the clause would be a disposition on the part of the parishes to borrow money for their improvement, instead of levying rates to defray the expenses.

Sir GEORGE GREY did not think the proviso necessary, inasmuch as the Highway Board was a representative board.

Sir JOHN SHELLEY supported the Amendment, considering it desirable that the ratepayers should have a power of checking any unnecessary or excessive expenditure.

Sir BALDWIN LEIGHTON said, he did not see why Highway Boards should not be placed on the same footing as municipal bodies and various other public boards. At all events, if the Committee should sanction the Amendment, he trusted the words "in vestry assembled" would be inserted.

Mr. LIDDELL said, he was quite willing to adopt the suggestion.

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 17; Noes 88: Majority 71.

Mr. COLLINS proposed an Amendment, the object of which was to extend the time of the re-payment of any loan from ten to twenty years.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Sir WILLIAM JOLLIFFE said, he entertained a strong objection to the principle of giving borrowing powers for the first time to Boards of Highway, and moved the omission of the clause.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining Clauses and Schedules were also *agreed to.*

Sir WILLIAM MILES moved the insertion of a clause the object of which was to prevent any encroachment on roads not exceeding thirty feet in width.

Sir GEORGE GREY expressed his approval of the clause, which, with some verbal Amendments, was *agreed to.*

Mr. LEVESON GOWER moved the insertion of a clause to enable councils of boroughs by resolution to assume the powers of Highway Boards.

Clause *withdrawn,* on an understanding that it should be considered on the Report.

House *resumed:* Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

BRAZIL—SLAVE TRADE.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HARDCASTLE said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Brazilian Government have fulfilled their obligations with regard to the Africans liberated by British Cruisers, as to whom Earl Russell stated in a Despatch of June 6, 1863, that

> "Some thousands of negroes, captured in slave-trading vessels, and decreed many years ago by the Mixed Commission at Rio to be entitled to freedom, are, there is good reason to believe, up to the present time held in bondage, contrary to Law, and in violation of Treaty engagements."

Viscount PALMERSTON: Sir, I am sorry to be obliged to say that the conduct of the Brazilian Government in regard to the slave trade has invariably been marked by great neglect and violation of treaty engagements. That circumstance, as everybody knows, led first of all to the Act of 1845, and then to the proceedings under that Act in 1852. Their conduct in regard to the *emancipados* has been as flagrant as any other part of their conduct in regard to the slave trade. By the Slave Trade Treaty, Mixed Commissions were appointed, one of which, sitting in Brazil, was composed in part of Brazilian Judges, and they were to decree liberty to negroes found in slave-trading vessels which might be condemned as such by the Mixed Court. These captured negroes were entitled to be free; but the Brazilian Government said that they would require preparation for freedom, and it was ordered that they should for fourteen years be subject to education by masters. Some were kept by the Brazilian Government, some were employed by private persons, and we have reason to believe that none of them have obtained that freedom to which they were entitled. This matter has been the subject of frequent representation on the part of the British Government, but these representations have not been attended to. We have asked for lists of those negroes, but we have not succeeded in obtaining them. It has, however, been said that there is a method by which those negroes may obtain their emancipation; and, if the House will permit me, I will state what that method is, and then hon. Members may judge how far it is in accordance with the engagements of the Brazilian Government. In the first place, the negro is to ask from the Chief Clerk of the African Department a positive attestation that the fourteen years of his service have expired; secondly, he is to petition the Government through the Minister of Justice; thirdly, the Minister of Justice refers the petition to the Judge of Orphans; fourthly, the Judge of Orphans gives information and returns the petition to the Minister of Justice; fifthly, the Minister of Justice refers the petition to the Chief of Police; sixthly, the Chief of Police refers the petition to the General Guardian of Negroes (*Curador*); seventhly, the Guardian gives information and returns the petition to the Chief of Police; eighthly, the Chief of Police refers the petition to the Director of the House of Correction; ninthly, the Director of the House of Correction gives information and sends the petition back to the Chief of Police; tenthly, the Chief of Police gives information and sends back the petition to the office of the Secretary of Justice; eleventhly, the office of the Secretary of Justice makes a *précis* of the information, which is to be acted upon by the Minister of Justice himself; twelfthly, the Minister of Justice acts and orders letters of freedom to be issued. Well, now, you would think that all was done and the negro free; but far from that; thirteenthly, the petition is returned to the Judge of Orphans; fourteenthly, notification of the decision is sent to the Chief of Police; fifteenthly, the Judge of Orphans refers the petition to his own clerk, and orders letters of freedom to be given, but keeps the letters until the person applying for them shall have paid the requisite emoluments—that is to say, all the expenses of those proceedings; sixteenthly, the letters are made over to the Chief of Police; seventeenthly, the Chief of Police communicates with the Director of the House of Correction, and orders the African to appear before him; eighteenthly, the Director sends for the African, and the Chief of Police designates his future place of residence. He is not allowed to go where he likes as a freeman, but his residence is fixed for him; nineteenthly, the Chief of Police at Rio communicates with the Chief of the Provincial Police, under whose charge the place designated is, and hands over the free African, with his letter of freedom to this local chief of police; twentieth, the Provincial Chief of Police hands over the applicant to the authorities of the place approved by the Chief of the Police at Rio as his place of banishment, when the man is declared free, after being removed from the spot where he had been living for fourteen years, and where his connections had been formed. All the efforts we have made to obtain justice for those *emancipados* have failed, and we have not even been able to obtain a list of them. We know that when they are assigned to an owner he has employed them in conjunction with his slaves, and when a slave died, he put an *emancipado* in his place, and reported the death of the *emancipado*, and not the death of the slave.

MR. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD would like to ask one question of the noble Lord on this subject. The noble Lord recited the twenty steps by which the Brazilian Government proposed that the *emancipados* could obtain their freedom; and he wished to know whether those steps were stated in any despatch from the Brazilian Government, or whether the Brazilian Government having stated that there were certain steps by which the *emancipados* could obtain their freedom, the noble Lord had obtained an explanation of those steps from any other source? With respect to what the noble Lord said, that the conduct of the Brazilian Government in respect to the slave trade had been marked by the greatest neglect, he desired to ask whether it was not the case that the Brazilian Government themselves had put down the slave trade in Brazil; and whether Lord Brougham, than whom there was no greater friend of the negro, had not expressed in another place his warmest appreciation of the efforts made by the Brazilian Government in this respect?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: I do not know that this string of proceedings has ever been mentioned in any official communication from Brazil; it was extracted from a Brazilian newspaper, which gave it as an official document, and I believe it is perfectly correct. With regard to the other question which the hon. Gentleman has asked, he must know full well that if the Brazilian Government have of late years—that is since 1852—put an end to the slave trade, it has been by compulsion, and not upon conviction. The Act of 1845, as all know, lay for many years a dead letter, until the beginning of 1852, when through the agency of Sir James Hudson the provisions of that Act were brought into force. After an attempt of the Brazilian Government to evade compliance they were compelled to submit. I am quite ready to admit that when the Brazilian Government had been compelled by force to do what the treaty bound them to do, they have continued to do so, and the Brazilian slave trade is now for the time put an end to. They passed fresh laws, they gave fresh orders to all their officers, and in spite of the temptation which bribery naturally held out to many persons whose duty it was to stop the trade, I do believe that from that time to this the slave trade has ceased. I take great credit to myself for having been instrumental in bringing about that result.

MR. BRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I see that you object to my rising, but I was going to protest against the practice of the noble Lord making a speech on a matter of this nature when other Members cannot reply. I shall, therefore, move the adjournment of the House, for the purpose of making one or two observations on the subject. I was not aware that any question was intended to be put on this matter to-night; but on repeated occasions the noble Lord has stated very much what he has stated this evening. Now, I should like to ask the noble Lord, whether he does not know that it was the opinion of Lord Aberdeen, who passed the Brazilian Act, that that Act ought to be repealed, and that the circumstances under which he thought it was justified—though I believe every lawyer thought otherwise—have passed away. Further, I might appeal to my right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade for his opinion upon this matter; for I think that on one occasion the right hon. Gentleman brought forward a specific Motion in favour of the repeal of that Act. Now, Sir, I have had an opportunity of knowing that that Act was one which gave the greatest offence to the Brazilian Government, the Brazilian Legislature, and people. I might quote the opinion of the late Lord Truro, who was no mean lawyer, that a more unjustifiable Act—an Act more entirely in defiance of International Law—never was passed by any Legislature. If that be so, and if the state of things upon which the passing of that Act was justified has entirely passed away; and if, as we know, the relations between this country and Brazil have been of the most unpleasant kind from the day that Act was passed until this hour, and, as we know too, that until this Act is repealed the relations between the two countries will have no chance whatsoever of being placed upon a friendly and proper basis, I think the noble Lord might now at least give up this obstinate adherence to what was originally an indefensible law, and which is now deprived even of the defence which the noble Lord made for it. I should think that from the discussions which took place last week, when, if the House did not come to a Vote of Censure, it did unanimously—at least with a general consent which I have never seen approached in any similar case—condemn the irritating and offensive policy of the Foreign Office—I should think the noble Lord might have learned something from that, and might consent now to submit a proposal for the abolition of that Act, so difficult to defend when it was passed, which had no reference to the existing state of circumstances, and was not only calculated but certain to produce, as long as it is on our statute book, unpleasant relations and bickerings between this country and Brazil—a country with which we have extensive commercial relations, and which, I believe, might be much more extended if we only had a Government at all disposed to meet the Government of that country in a friendly spirit. I believe that a proposal of that kind would be sure to meet with the unanimous consent of the House. I also believe that in the observations I have made I have expressed very briefly an opinion which prevails in this House, and which, I believe, is universally held amongst all the commercial classes of this country who have anything to do with Brazil and its people. I therefore beg of the noble Lord to reconsider this matter. It may be too late now to introduce any measure on the subject; but if at the opening of the next Session of Parliament the noble Lord should not be prepared to do so I hope some Member of the House will move for a Committee to examine into the whole question, and I believe that no fairly constituted Committee of this House would bring up a Report in favour of the measure and of the policy of the noble Lord. But between this and the next Session of Parliament no doubt the Brazilian question will come under the notice of the noble Lord and his Colleague at the Foreign Office in connection with transactions which are, I believe, to be referred to the King of Portugal. If that be so, the noble Lord need not wait till the next meeting of Parliament, but he can promise that he will do his best in the matter; and if he does that, I have not the smallest doubt that we may have easily settled every disputed point with Brazil, and the whole of our relations with that country in future time carried on in that amicable manner which is not less to the interest of that small country than it is to the interest of the commercial classes of this powerful nation. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Bright.*)

SIR JAMES ELPHINSTONE said, he would certainly support the appointment of the Committee suggested by the hon. Gentleman; but he thought the inquiry should not be confined to this Brazilian matter, but should also embrace the state of affairs on the coast of Africa, for they had become most serious. At this moment we had 3,000 men dotted about that pestilential coast, and their condition was most appalling. Some 60 per cent had been prostrated by fever and the deadly climate in the horrible Ashantee war. The answer given by the Government in the discussion on this subject was essentially fallacious. The troops were in a state of starvation, for the country was in a state of famine. The policy of maintaining the establishments on the coast was a matter the consideration of which could not long be deferred. There was another question which was connected with this Motion, which seriously reflected on the naval administration. We maintained a squadron on that station at a cost of £600,000 or £700,000 per annum, and of that squadron not one ship excepting the *Rattlesnake* could go above eight knots. The consequence of that was that the blockade runners carrying slaves had only to turn their head to windward to escape from the British cruisers. Now, if that were the case, how should we be able to protect our vast commerce in case of any emergency? At this moment vessels were being built in this country capable of going fifteen or sixteen knots an hour, carrying cargo, and they were to be engaged in carrying cargo to the Confederate States. He had alluded to this subject in anticipation of the question respecting it which he had on the paper.

MR. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD: Sir, I am glad to take the opportunity of the Motion for adjournment of adding a few words to the question I put to the noble Lord. I desire to endorse what has been said by the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright), and to express the regret which the House must feel that the noble

Lord should have availed himself of the opportunity of answering a simple question to make an attack upon a Government with whom for years, and until lately, this country has been in friendly relations. I would point out that the answer of the noble Lord is but an amplification of the last despatch addressed by Earl Russell to the Brazilian Government, and to which, as far as this House is aware, no reply has yet been returned. The noble Lord, therefore, makes a formal indictment against the Brazilian Government, at a time when we do not know whether that Government may not be able to explain satisfactorily the charge made against them. I cordially agree with the hon. Member for Birmingham that never was there a greater violation of every principle of justice and International Law than in the passing of what is commonly called the Aberdeen Act; and although the noble Lord takes credit to himself for putting that Act in force, yet, as I have before stated, I have reason to know that no man doubted the justice and policy of the measure more than the noble Lord with whose name it is associated. I have further to state that Lord Aberdeen expressed a hope that when the Brazilian Government suppressed the slave trade, as they had now done, the earliest opportunity would be taken of repealing the Act. I quite agree in every word that has fallen from the hon. Member for Birmingham upon this subject.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: I do not think I am liable to the reproach which has been addressed to me. I did not volunteer a speech—I gave an answer to a question, and that question involved a statement which I know to be true. It is all very well for the hon. Gentleman opposite to deny it—he knows better. [Mr. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD: I do not.] Then I am sorry the hon. Gentleman is so ignorant. All I have said will be found in the papers laid on the table of the House. I have mentioned no facts which cannot be ascertained by any Gentleman who chooses to take the trouble. With regard to what has been said about the Act being a violation of every principle of International Law —[Mr. BRIGHT: I quoted Lord Truro.] I gave the words the hon. Gentleman adopted, at any rate. I can only say that the Act was exactly the counterpart of an Act which it was my duty to propose to the House in regard to Portugal; and these two Acts received the approval of the Law Officers of two different Governments. The justification of these measures is that, though the Portuguese and Brazilian Governments had each made a treaty in 1826, pledging their honour and faith to abolish the slave trade and to make it penal for their subjects to carry it on, and each had for a time consented to a treaty which supplied the means of carrying out that engagement, yet each in the course of time failed in redeeming its engagements. I do not dispute that the measure we adopted was a violent one, but it was thought that the object justified the means, and that we were entitled to use our own power to enforce the treaty which Portugal and Brazil had refused to carry into execution. Everybody knows that at that time the slave trade of Brazil amounted to the landing of 68,000 or 70,000 negroes every year, and that, of course, implied at least three times that number being torn from their home in Africa. This slave trade, or rather slave-piracy, wherever it is carried on, is the cause of the desolation of Africa, of the extinction of all legitimate commerce, and of suffering and misery to hundreds of thousands of Africans. Everybody knows that ever since the year 1815 it has been the object, not only of the English Government, but of the English nation, to put an end to that detestable traffic. Therefore, I repeat, the goodness of the end justified the means; and the expenditure of men and money was deliberately undertaken by the country for the purpose of abolishing the evil. The hon. Member for Birmingham is, I am sure, one of those who think that the actions of nations have, under the dispensation of Providence, some influence on their destinies, and is the last man, I am confident, to wish the country to give encouragement to this infamous trade for the sake of any temporary, pecuniary, or commercial advantage which might accrue. I am convinced —and I believe that every one who has turned his attention to the subject is convinced—that if the Act were repealed the Brazilian slave trade would be revived. It may be said that the opinion of the people of Brazil is altered, and that every respectable man in that country is against the slave trade. But it is not by respectable men that the trade is conducted. It is carried on by the scum of the earth in every country, and the profits are so large that they can afford to bribe the subordinate officers whose duty it is to detect and punish crime. You may depend upon it that where there is the power of evading or violating the law it will be done. Take the case of Spain and Cuba. Spain is bound by treaty to abolish the slave trade. That was the only return we asked from Spain for our assistance in the War of Independence. We said we wanted nothing from her but a slave trade treaty, and we got it. In spite, however, of that treaty the slave trade to Cuba still continues; and so it would be with Brazil if the Act in question were repealed. Portugal, too, has made a treaty to the same effect; but has the slave trade ceased? No. There is a constant exportation of negroes from the Portuguese possessions in Africa; and in this case Portugal has not even the excuse of Spain. The latter imports slaves into Cuba to cultivate the soil; but Portugal exports from Africa the hands which she ought to retain and employ there. In the Portuguese settlements the condition of slavery exists, and so it does in Cuba. France did more, for she abolished not only the trade but the condition of slavery. Yet what happened a few years ago? Under the pretence of exporting from Africa free labourers the slave trade was to all intents and purposes carried on under another name. We had difficulty in persuading the French Government to put an end to that traffic, and they agreed to do so only on condition that permission should be given to French colonists to export coolies from our possessions in India. Although the Act now in question has not been put in force since 1852, and Brazil has, therefore, no practical grievance to complain of, I am aware that it is a thorn in her side. Those who wish to carry on the slave trade find it an impediment in their way; and those who do not participate in the trade look upon it as a reproach. But I attach so much importance to carrying out the determination of the English people to put an end to the slave trade that, much as I value the goodwill and friendship of Brazil, yet if that were put in one scale and the suppression of the slave trade in the other, I should prefer the latter.

LORD JOHN MANNERS: This is not a question of the horrors of the slave trade, and the noble Lord might have spared us the well-known catalogue of evils and the inefficacy of the measures for their prevention. If, as the noble Lord has told us, the treaty with Spain has proved so useless, and the Act in reference to Brazil and Portugal so efficacious, why does he not propose a Bill with regard to Spain similar to the Aberdeen Act in regard to Brazil? [VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: We have a treaty with Spain.] Yes, you have a treaty, but you say it is inefficacious. The reason why the noble Lord does not seek to legislate as to Spain is not that which he has given, but another. I will tell the House what it is. It is because he dare not. The question concerns the liberty—never approached in this House—which the noble Lord allows himself in answering questions to abuse any independent foreign country whose conduct does not exactly please him. This is not the first time the noble Lord has made an attack on the Government of Brazil. I recollect he did so on a former occasion, a year or two ago. I join with the hon. Member for Birmingham in protesting against language such as the noble Lord, the representative of a great State, has used to-night against a small State. The noble Lord tells us that he has used no language not to be found in the blue-books, and perhaps, if we looked into them, we should find such terms as "flagrant" applied to the conduct of the Brazilian Government. It is rather curious, however, that the noble Lord had just before told us that he derived his information not from blue-books but from a foreign newspaper. Perhaps that was some of the "ribald trash of the foreign press" of which we have lately heard.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: There is the blue-book from which I quoted.

LORD JOHN MANNERS: The noble Lord simply told us that it was out of a newspaper, and my statement is entirely based upon that of the noble Lord. I do not, however, wish to prolong the discussion. I certainly protest against the language which has been made use of by the noble Lord towards an independent Power like Brazil, and I see very little prospect of establishing satisfactory relations between that or any other Power, so long as the Prime Minister of this country permits himself to make use of such language.

SIR JOHN HAY: Before the Motion is withdrawn, I wish to say a few words on the subject of the slave trade on the West Coast of Africa, and the attempts which are being made to put it down. We now maintain a squadron on the coast of Africa of eighteen steam-vessels, and I am informed that there is only one of them—the *Rattlesnake*—which is capable of going more than 8½ knots an hour. We have, therefore, seventeen vessels employed to put a stop to the slave trade which are incapable of doing so. We have recently had a striking exemplification of the effects of such an arrangement. A General Order has been issued by the commanding officer, in which it is stated that the speed of the slave steamers now on the coast is so great in comparison with that of our own cruisers that it is useless to attempt to follow them. Her Majesty's cruisers are therefore directed to remain at anchor on any part of the coast where it is likely that slavers will be embarked, and not to pursue a slaver even if they should observe one steaming away. I have no doubt that these vessels are picked for the service, and if it is an example of the kind of ships we are now building for the navy, I think the sooner we have an alteration the better.

Lord CLARENCE PAGET: I think the account which has been given to the House with regard to the speed of the slave ships and of our cruisers is somewhat exaggerated. I cannot at this moment state what the speed of our vessels is, but I may say that I have received no account of their being employed in chasing steamers, and not being able to do so. I am quite aware it is possible that very fast steamers may be constructed and used as slavers, and if we find that our steamers are unequal to the duties imposed upon them, it will undoubtedly be the duty of the Government to send out faster vessels. It is necessary, however, that the vessels we send to that station should for sanitary purposes be very roomy and airy; and as to their speed, although I do not think that any of our very fast steamers are out there, I am satisfied that the case has been much overstated.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON: I cannot help thinking that the noble Lord at the head of Her Majesty's Government has made use of expressions towards an hon. Friend near me which display a remarkable want of courtesy. The noble Lord first said that my hon. Friend must have known the reverse of what he stated, and he followed that up by imputing to my hon. Friend great ignorance if he did not know it. Now, I certainly distinctly heard the noble Lord say in answer to a question from my noble Friend (Lord John Manners) as to what despatch he had derived his information from, that he had learnt it from a newspaper. The noble Lord in answer to my noble Friend, has handed this marked paper across the table, and he says that it is taken from a blue-book. I wish to ask the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, whether the paper in question has been laid upon the table of the House; and, if so, when?

Mr. LAYARD: I am unable to say when; but, of course, it was laid upon the table.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON: We do not take it of course.

Mr. LAYARD: This paper is evidently taken from a blue-book. I believe the statement made by my noble Friend was that it was a Brazilian despatch.

Mr. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD: The date is the 30th of June last year.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

COMMUNICATION WITH RAILWAY GUARDS.—QUESTION.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, he wished to ask the President of the Board of Trade, Whether, with the view of protecting the public, it would not be possible to compel the Railway Companies to introduce into the carriages some mode of communicating with the guards? On the Continent there was a mode of communicating with the guard, and he thought the same system might be satisfactorily introduced upon the English railways.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON, in reply, said, it would no doubt be possible to compel Railway Companies by legislation to introduce into the carriages some mode of communicating with the guards, but he doubted the expediency of doing so. As our railways were constructed, the question was surrounded with considerable practical difficulties. Evidence had been taken upon the subject before a Committee upstairs, and the Inspectors of railways were not by any means unanimous in agreeing with each other as to the expediency of adopting a plan whereby the passengers might be enabled to communicate with the guards. At the same time, they were all agreed that it was desirable that the guards should be able to communicate with the drivers, and the Board of Trade had sent out circulars to all the Railway Companies in order to carry out that object. He was afraid, from the construction of our railways and also of our carriages, that it would not be as practicable as it might appear to be at first sight, to introduce the continental system into this country. At any rate, he did not consider it desirable to bring in a Bill to compel Railway Companies to afford the means of communication.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, he wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman if he does not intend to take any steps to remove the dangers which are consequent upon our present railway system?

Mr. MILNER GIBSON said, the Board of Trade had no Executive power or authority in the matter. He had no intention of introducing a Bill to compel the Railway Companies to provide means of communication.

NAVY—FLAG SHIP FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN.

QUESTION.

Sir JOHN HAY said, he rose to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, If there is any truth in the rumour that a wooden three-decker is being fitted as the new Flag Ship for the Mediterranean; and whether the Admiralty consider it prudent to employ a ship of that description on so important a duty?

Lord CLARENCE PAGET stated, in reply, that the *Victoria* was being fitted to go out to the Mediterranean. It was the intention of the Admiralty to fit some of the large armour ships as flag ships, but, at present, none had been so fitted. He thought the *Victoria* was quite capable of performing the duties which would be required of her.

DESPATCHES FROM ST. PETERSBURG.

QUESTION.

Mr. A. SEYMOUR said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If the Foreign Office has any knowledge of a Despatch, headed "Official," dated 10th February, 1864, and purporting to come from Prince Gortschakoff at St. Petersburg to M. d'Oubril at Berlin, which was published in *The Morning Post* of July 4th; and if the Foreign Office has any knowledge of another Despatch, headed "Private Communication" from Prince Gortschakoff to M. d'Oubril, of the same date, but in a completely opposite spirit?

Mr. LAYARD said, in reply, that he had no knowledge of either of the despatches referred to by the hon. Member.

THE MURDER ON THE NORTH LONDON RAILWAY.—QUESTION.

Mr. C. S. BUTLER said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to offer a reward for the apprehension of the murderer or murderers of Mr. Thomas Briggs, of Clapton Square, who was murderously assailed, plundered, and thrown from a first-class railway carriage on the North London Railway on Saturday evening last, and if the report is true that the alleged murderers have been apprehended?

Sir GEORGE GREY said, he did not know what reward the railway company had offered, but Sir John Lubbock, Robarts, and Co. had offered yesterday a reward of £100, and the Government had offered a similar sum. He had not heard that the perpetrator of the murder had been apprehended, but he was informed that the chain taken from Mr. Briggs was changed yesterday by a silversmith, who had given a very good description of the person by whom it was presented.

NAVY—THE SQUADRON ON THE WEST COAST OF AFRICA.—QUESTION.

Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE said, he rose to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, To lay upon the table of the House a list of the Steam Vessels now employed on the West Coast of Africa, with their speed as ascertained at the measured mile?

Lord CLARENCE PAGET said, in reply, that he did not think it would be desirable to enter into any details upon the subject. That was just the sort of information which the owners of the slave-trading vessels would wish to obtain.

OFFICE OF POSTMASTER GENERAL.

RESOLUTION.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he rose to move—

> "That the practice of appointing a Peer and Privy Councillor exclusively to the office of Postmaster General is one which is not directed or required by law, and does not particularly conduce to the convenience of the distribution of Ministerial appointments, or to the efficiency of the Public Service."

The hon. Gentleman was addressing the House in support of his Motion, when,

Notice taken that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at a quarter after Seven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, July 13, 1864.

Their Lordships met; and having gone through the business on the Paper without Debate,

House adjourned at half past Three o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, July 13, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills — *Resolutions in Committee*—Fortifications and Works.

Ordered—Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues*; Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex)*; Westminster Bridge Traffic*; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland)*; Supplemental Bank Notes, &c., Signatures*; Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)*.

First Reading — Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues* [Bill 202]; Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex)* [Bill 203]; Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* [Bill 204]; Westminster Bridge Traffic* [Bill 205]; Bank Notes, &c., Signatures* [Bill 206]; Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland) Supplemental* [Bill 207].

Second Reading—Uniformity Act Amendment [Bill 134], *negatived;* Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal [Bill 161] (*Lords*).

Committee — Insolvent Debtors [Bill 20] (No Report); Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. (*re-committed*) [Bill 199]—r.p.; Expiring Laws Continuance* [Bill 193]; Militia Ballots Suspension*; Criminal Justice (1855) Extension* [Bill 190].

Report—Expiring Laws Continuance* [Bill 193]; Militia Ballots Suspension*; Criminal Justice (1855) Extension* [Bill 190], and *re-committed.*

Considered as amended—Highways Act Amendment* [Bill 177]; Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* [Bill 185].

Third Reading—Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland)* [Bill 174] (*Lords*); Trespass (Ireland)* [Bill 195], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Superior Courts of Common Law (Ireland)* [Bill 86]; Court of Queen's Bench (Ireland)* [Bill 123]; Married Women's Acknowledgments* [Bill 122]; Poor Law Guardians Election* [Bill 153]; Petty Offences Law Amendment [Bill 121]; County Voters Registration* [Bill 112]; Jersey Court [Bill 48]; Election Petitions Act (1848) Amendment* [Bill 182].

UNIFORMITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

[BILL 134.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. E. P. BOUVERIE, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, he would explain its nature and effect as briefly as he could. The Bill itself was very short and simple in its provisions. Its object was to repeal certain portions of a certain section of the Act of Uniformity of Charles II.—that section which required certain dignitaries of the Church, and other persons enumerated, amongst whom were Fellows and Tutors of colleges, to make a declaration that they would conform to the Liturgy of the Church of England. That provision, so far as it related to the Fellows and Tutors of colleges, the Bill proposed to repeal. The effect and intention of this measure had been misconceived and had been much misrepresented—unintentionally no doubt. That he could quite understand, for the state of the law and the facts to which the law applied were somewhat complicated, and it required some little research and knowledge of what had been done in recent years thoroughly to comprehend what was the present state of the law. The fact, moreover, that the law on the subject applicable to Oxford and Cambridge was different had tended somewhat to complicate the question. He would endeavour to explain how the question stood with respect to oaths and declarations in the University of Cambridge. In Cambridge there never had been required any declaration of religious belief, or oath of any kind, from those who sought merely admission to the University. But up to 1856, upon taking a degree a declaration was required. Until 1776, upon taking a degree, a declaration was required of adhesion to the three articles contained in the 36th Canon, which, as was well known, involved a declaration of the Queen's supremacy, adhesion to the Thirty-nine Articles, and a declaration that the Liturgy contained in the Prayer Book contained nothing contrary to the Word of God. In 1775 or 1774, as far as regards the degree of Bachelor of Arts, an alteration was made by the University by which all that was required of a member of the University seeking a degree was a declaration that he was *bonâ fide* a member of the Church of England; but as regarded all other degrees the three articles were still required. In 1856, however, that was all changed by an Act of Parliament which he (Mr. Bouverie) had the honour of introducing, by which it was provided that as regarded all degrees except theological degrees, no oath, declaration, or subscription of any kind whatever should be required. He should have stated that the previous requisition of a declaration of religious belief and of adhesion to the Liturgy and Articles of the Church had never been a Parliamentary requisition, but was purely a University regulation imposed by a University statute. That requisition, however, was repealed by the Act of 1851, which, however, went considerably farther; for, while the Bill was passing through the House of Commons, a clause was inserted providing that as regards scholarships or exhibitions held by undergraduates no oath or declaration of religious belief should be required. The House would, therefore, observe that both as regarded the University which conferred degrees and the Colleges which gave those exhibitions to undergraduates no oath or declaration was required in Cambridge. But scholarships and exhibitions in a college were the first steps to a fellowship. Nobody, according to the Cambridge system, and he believed according to that of Oxford, with which, however, he was not so well acquainted, could become a Fellow of his college unless he had previously obtained a scholarship, and the latter was now obtained in Cambridge without any person taking it being required to make any declaration of religious belief of any kind or form. The position of any one going to the University of Cambridge was this, that he was required to take no oath and make no declaration on his admission, or on competing for scholarships and exhibitions; or on taking a degree, unless he wished to proceed to a theological degree; but if he wished to compete for a fellowship, then declarations were imposed on him. These were of a triple character. With respect to the greater part of the colleges at Cambridge, and the whole or nearly the whole of the colleges at Oxford, it was a condition that every one on becoming a Fellow should declare in one form or another that he was a member of the Church of England. This, however, was not the case with respect to all colleges; it was not the case with respect to the most important college of Trinity. Now, he did not propose to make any change in that respect. The Bill did not deal with the College Statutes at all; but what he proposed was, that Parliament should not compel colleges to elect as Fellows only those who made such a declaration. That was one of the difficulties which a Nonconformist graduate at the Universities met with. He was, moreover, obliged under the Act of 1 *George* I. c. 13, to take the oaths of allegiance, supremacy, and abjuration, which had now been fused into one by the 21 & 22 *Vict.* Lastly, a person on obtaining a fellowship must, under the Act of Uniformity, make the declaration which the present Bill proposed to repeal, that he would conform to the Liturgy of the Church of England. He made that proposition on three grounds. He contended that such a provision was unjust to the vast body of Protestant Nonconformists, who were thereby precluded from obtaining fellowships; that it was injurious to the Universities themselves; and that it was detrimental to the interests of the Church, which it was supposed to protect. It was unjust to the Nonconformists because the colleges were in no respect clerical seminaries for priests of the Church of England, and the great bulk of those who received education in them were not destined to be ministers of that Church. Why, then, should the Nonconformists be excluded from competing for fellowships, which were simply prizes for intellectual and scientific attainments, and the competition for which ought not, therefore, to be limited to persons professing one particular form of belief? Why should the colleges be compelled by Act of Parliament to exclude him from a benefit, which was open to him, under the wills of the founders in some of those colleges; and he (Mr. Bouverie) had to observe that he did not propose to disturb in any way the arrangements laid down by the founders of those establishments. It was Parliament that created a disqualification by the passing of the Act of Uniformity, and his only object was to have that disqualification removed. This exclusion of Nonconformists from the competition for fellowships, besides being unjust, was injurious to the Universities themselves, and upon this latter point he had the authority of a number of gentlemen interested in carrying on the educational system at Cambridge. Two years ago he presented to that House a remarkable petition, setting forth that the operation of the clause in the Act of Uniformity requiring Fellows to declare their conformity to the Liturgy of the Church of England was injurious to the best interests of the

University, and they therefore prayed that it might be repealed. And who were these petitioners? Were they persons animated by any desire to upset the Church of England? By no means. The petition was signed by seventy-four resident Fellows of the University of Cambridge, a majority of the Fellows of Trinity College, and a majority of the Fellows of Christ's College, as well as a majority of the Tutors and Assistant Tutors in the University. These were the men who petitioned for the repeal of a provision which had the effect of excluding from the only real prize in the University those Protestant Nonconformists who formed so important a portion of the middle class of this country. With the exception of the reputation of the distinction attached to a Wrangler, these persons were deprived of all inducements to go to the University. These men being excluded, the competition was, of course, very much less, and those who were tempted by ambition or a desire to profit by the advantages in the way of learning which the University afforded to her undergraduates, if they succeeded in getting high degrees (and who in the natural course of events would become Fellows if they took the declaration), were now shut out, and the University was deprived of their assistance in carrying out the instruction of the University. The immediate occasion of the petition to which he had referred being presented was, that the Senior Wranglers of two successive years, men of the highest distinction in the mathematical tripos, were excluded from competing for a Fellowship, because they were unable conscientiously to make the required declaration. One of these gentlemen was a member of the Scotch Church, and, as an undergraduate, he had so far conformed to the Liturgy as to attend chapel; but he scrupled, as any high-minded and conscientious man would, when he was called upon to formally subscribe to it. In what conceivable way, he asked, could the Church be injured by such a gentleman devoting his services as a Tutor and Fellow in teaching mathematics to the undergraduates? It seemed to be argued that it was the duty of the Tutors and Fellows to teach religious dogmas and doctrines; but Cambridge must have been greatly changed since his day if such was now the practice. Her Tutors, he believed, never took part in the religious instruction of the undergraduates. The undergraduates were expected to show themselves acquainted with Paley and Bishop Butler's sermons; but they did not receive religious instruction there in the sense that children received it from their parents, or little boys from the masters of private schools. The declaration was really detrimental to the Church itself. If the effect of such a declaration was substantially to exclude every one who was not conscientiously a member of the Church of England, and illustrated the purity of her doctrines by his own life, then he thought something might be said for its continuance, and it might be urged as some reason for maintaining it. But was that really the case? The declaration did not exclude the unscrupulous, the indifferent in religious matters, the sceptical, the profane; but it did occasionally exclude men who entertained a high sense of conscientious duty. This test was not a test of belief in the credibility of any of the dogmas, or a belief that the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Liturgy contained nothing contrary to the Word of God; but it was a mere declaration that the person making it would conform to the Liturgy of the Church of England. And he asked some hon. Member to state what the effect of such a declaration was? If its true meaning was that a man would not object to attend the services of the Church of England, then any one could take it; but occasionally there was found a conscientious man, who, from a sense of duty, or because he occupied a high position, and was known in his youth to belong to another religious body, scrupled to take it, and that man, above all others, was the man who ought to be admitted to a fellowship. He did not think, on striking a balance of the losses and gains, that the Church could really come to any other conclusion than that the losses were far more than equivalent to the gain of insisting on this condition. All that the Church could possibly gain by insisting on it was the petty and paltry satisfaction of robbing some man of the just reward of his industry and ability, who was either too proud or too conscientious to make a declaration which he conceived was in some way an abandonment of the Church of his fathers. The loss, however, was very considerable, for by it the Church lost the chance of obtaining the goodwill and attachment of a large portion of the Protestant Nonconformists of the country. They were now without her pale, which those who called themselves the friends of the Church studiously did everything they could on every occasion, both in the University and elsewhere, to make it as difficult to get over as possible. That, he regretted to say, had been the policy of the so-called friends of the Church for the last 200 years. It had proved a signal failure. He now recommended the House to try the other plan, and to see whether by freely giving equality of civil rights in every respect to Nonconformists, and admitting them to every advantage and privilege not inconsistent with the maintenance of the Established Church, they would not conciliate the goodwill and attachment of this influential body of their fellow-countrymen, and thereby greatly add to the stability of the Established Church. He knew that his proposal had been regarded by the clergy with alarm; and, looking to the petitions that were presented last year against it, every word in the English language which expressed fear had been introduced into them as expressing the opinions of the clergy. But these expressions were simply an emanation of the clerical mind. Lord Clarendon, one of the greatest statesmen of this country, and who was neither a Liberal nor a Whig statesman, had declared it to be the result of his experience that the clergy were the worst advisers Parliament could look to or follow on questions of this kind; and that observation had just been strongly confirmed. A few days since, the Bishop of London, in speaking on Lord Ebury's Motion for a Royal Commission relative to the Burial Service, said—

> "It was desirable not to disregard the feelings of the clergy, but it was also desirable not to attach too much importance to them. The fact was that the clergy were necessarily, from their profession—and he was very thankful for it—averse to change, and changes for the better did not receive from that body the consideration and favour which they deserved. It was doubtful whether, with regard to the abolition of non-residence and other reforms which had taken place in the Church, if the decision had rested with the whole body of the clergy, that properly Conservative spirit which animated them would not have led them to say that the safer course was to leave things as they were."

He entirely agreed with Lord Clarendon and the Bishop of London, and he asked the House to apply it to his proposal, namely, that the clergy were not safe counsellors or advisers on questions of this kind. The chief petition presented last year against the Bill was one from the University of Oxford. Now, he undertook to say—though he had not carefully studied the signatures to the petition—that the great bulk of them would be found to be the signatures of the clergy of the Established Church, who were naturally averse to change, and who were unnecessarily alarmed at anything which they thought might endanger any of the securities of the Church. The petitioners said—

> "The removal of the only test now required of Tutors and Fellows would tend to give the control, government, and instruction of youth into the hands of persons of divergent religious creed, or of no creed at all."

Well, this would be a good objection if the test now excluded that class of people. But did the test at present exclude sceptics and heretics? His case was, that the test admitted sceptics and heretics; that it professed to afford a security against the admission of improper persons, but afforded none. The petitioners went on to say that,

> "Consistently with the Articles of the Church of England, the Church could not intrust her future instruction to persons who had given no security for the soundness of their faith."

But what security was afforded by a man promising to conform to the Liturgy of the Church of England? What security did this give as to doctrine, creed, or religious faith? Look to the various classes of persons who had taken that test. They were "wide as the poles asunder." Dr. Pusey took it, and would take it again. Dr. Jowett took it, and would take it again. Dr. Newman took it, and would take it again. Bishop Colenso took it, and would take it again. Whether he would or would not, when men of such opposite opinions as Dr. Pusey, Professor Jowett, and Bishop Colenso took the test without scruple, it was a farce to talk of the test being a security. The petitioners went on to speak of "the relations between the Fellows of the colleges being intimate," and expressing an opinion that

> "The harmony at present existing must be disturbed by the admission of persons differing on the most important of all subjects."

Were the petitioners not such "potent, grave, and reverend signors," he would have thought this a joke. Had the relations between Fellows of colleges been disturbed by the difference of opinion that already existed? And were there differences of opinion likely to exist wider than those to which he had adverted? In fact, men of the widest differences of opinion could and did meet in harmony and good fellowship, and so they would if the test were abolished. Then it was said, "These men are engaged in the instruction of youth, and you would not intrust the education of your children to men who would not declare their adherence to the Liturgy of the Church of England." But he denied that parents scanned so nicely the religious belief of the Tutors as to feel any difficulty, after the repeal of the declaration, in sending their sons to the Universities. Moreover, the Tutors were selected by the Heads of Colleges; and the Heads of Colleges worshipped in the College chapel, where the worship was required by the Act of Uniformity to be conducted according to the Liturgy of the Church of England. Honourable and conscientious men would not attend a religious worship in which they did not coincide, and it was only the honourable and the conscientious that the test would catch. In all this, then, there was ample existing security against the Tutors teaching heterodoxy. He did not believe that the Church of England derived the smallest benefit from this test. On the contrary, he believed that whatever resulted from it was to her disadvantage. He believed that if she was left free from the trammels imposed by past Parliaments she would gain in strength. What had been the effect of removing from time to time the restrictions against Nonconformity? Had not the Church gained in strength by the repeal of the Tests and Coporation Act? Were not objections urged, *usque ad nauseam*, against even the admission of Dissenters to the Universities? But they were admitted, and what he now asked was, that the House would take this trifling step farther. He believed, moreover, that the Church incurred great ignominy by the attempt to monopolize the benefits of the great educational establishments of the country.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. E. P. Bouverie*).

Mr. WALPOLE said, that the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bouverie) would have done well if he had followed the course he took last year, and had not pressed the second reading at this period of the Session. If the measure would, as the right hon. Gentleman said, make no difference whatever as far as the Universities were concerned, where was the necessity for pressing its adoption upon the House? The right hon. Gentleman withdrew the Bill last year on the ground that the Session was too far advanced to allow him to proceed with it. It was then the 24th of June, and it was now the 13th of July; so that the same reason for withdrawing the Bill applied with more strength on the present occasion. He believed, however, that there was a much stronger reason for withdrawing the Bill last year—and that was that the right hon. Gentleman felt that the objections raised to it by the Universities could not be answered, and that there was a strong disinclination on the part of Members on the Ministerial side of the House to pass a measure of the kind, which, if it were to have any effect at all, would introduce into the Universities, now based on one denominational system of religion, a variety of creeds and a religious confusion which might end in withdrawing from secular education that foundation of religious instruction upon which the country desired it should stand. The petition to which the right hon. Gentleman alluded as having been presented two years ago was got up privately, without the knowledge of the members of the University of Cambridge generally; though he admitted that it was signed by some few most distinguished men there. But the great majority of the members of the University were opposed to its prayer. Last year the matter was brought before the Convocation of Oxford University, and a petition under the common seal of the University against the Bill was adopted by a majority of 182 against 51. In the Senate House of the University of Cambridge there were against the Bill 120, and only 25 for it. [Mr. E. P. Bouverie: How many residents?] He would tell his right hon. Friend how many residents. At Oxford more than 1,000 bachelors and undergraduates were against it, while there were 2,000 non-residents also on the same side. At Cambridge all the heads of houses but two, almost all the resident tutors, several Bachelors of Arts, and a large body of undergraduates, were against the measure. In the face of such facts as these, he could only say that if his right hon. Friend was going to rest his Bill on petitions, there was an end to it at once. His right hon. Friend had urged three principal reasons against the present system—that it was unjust, that it was injurious to the Universities, and that it was, moreover, injurious to the Church. Now, he wished the House to observe that all the old arguments which used to apply to the case no longer existed. Before the University Acts passed, there might have been some ground for saying that, as a large body of persons could not obtain a University education by reason of the religious tests applied on matriculation, there was some degree of injustice done to those persons. Even before that time, however, that injustice was, in point of fact, removed by the establishment in 1834 of the London University, which afforded to all who did not conform to the Established religion the fullest opportunity of obtaining a University education. Dr. Arnold was one of the chief promoters of that institution, and being anxious that it should not be purely secular and altogether without the religious element, he proposed to get over the difficulty by having lectures on general Christian topics, without going into any denominational views. When the authorities of the University came to consider this plan with the view of carrying it out they found that it was an impossibility, because the religious teaching which would be given in such a case would be sure to take its complexion from the particular bias of the lecturer. It was therefore determined to establish the University on the basis of an institution for literary and scientific objects, and not connected in any way with religion. These two circumstances, therefore, deserved notice — that the grievance of the Dissenters in not having a University education was almost entirely taken away by the erection of the London University, and that it had been found that the latter University could not be open to all unless religion were excluded. Therefore, to allow the adoption of any measure which would deprive the Universities of their substratum of religious education was a proposition which neither the Universities nor the country ever ought to sanction. From the London Universities the Dissenters received every benefit except one. There was something in the education furnished by the older Universities which gave it a certain prestige, and no doubt this was an advantage to a man in his professional career. That last grievance, however, was removed by the University Acts; for there was now nothing to prevent a Dissenter from having his son educated at either of the older Universities, and securing for him all the benefit, not only of the teaching, but even of the endowments in the shape of scholarships and exhibitions—in fact, to enjoy all the privileges except taking part in the control and management. If what the Dissenters wanted was only to secure the advantages of University education, then their claim had been satisfied; but if they were not content with that, and were seeking a share in the management of the Universities, he denied that there was any justice in that demand — unless, indeed, it could be held that everybody was entitled to come into these institutions on his own terms and in disregard of chartered rights, and that they ought not to be connected with the Established Church. The question really resolved itself into this—were they to have an Established Church at all? If there was to be one, then the House had no more right to introduce new elements into institutions founded on the principles of the Established Church and intended to be connected with it, than they had to place any Dissenting or Roman Catholic colleges in the hands of those who did not belong to the denomination which had founded and endowed it. On this point he could cite the opinion of one who was a great advocate of freedom of education and who had done much to secure it — Lord Brougham. In 1834, when Lord Brougham was Chancellor, the question of subscription came before the House of Lords; and on that occasion the noble Lord said —

> "There is another matter connected with the admission of Dissenters to the Universities, which, I think, is much more encumbered with doubt, but still, I throw it out for consideration. I refer to the expediency and the justice of admitting persons not belonging to the Established Church to all the privileges consequent upon their attendance at the Universities, besides the right to obtain degrees. And here I particularly allude, not to their acquiring any share in the government of the Universities — that is a matter which might be easily arrranged — but to the right of having fellowships and scholarships. The difficulty upon that point is considerable, and I have no hesitation in saying, strong advocate of the Dissenters as I have ever been, that I see opinions expressed in some of their petitions which show that these excellent persons, in putting forward their claim, have not well weighed the reasons for which fellowships were, for the most part, endowed. The Dissenters have no more right, strictly speaking, to admission to fellowships and scholarships, endowed by the founders for the benefit of the Established Church, than any member of the Church of England would have a right to share in the endowments founded at Highbury or Homerton, Maynooth or Stonyhurst, or any other dissenting college, Catholic or Protestant. — [3 *Hansard*, xxv. 865-6.]

Not only was the education of the Universities open to the Dissenters, but Parliament had provided the means whereby they could establish in the one University private halls, and in the other hostels for those who were unwilling to conform to the services of the Church of England. The wise and sound principle laid down in the University Acts was the only one on which they could safely take their stand—it was that the Universities should be open for the education of all, but that the government of these institutions should be confined to those who were connected with the Church of England. The next argument of his right hon. Friend (Mr. Bouverie) was that the present system was injurious to the Universities themselves. It was rather extraordinary that they should be asked on that question to accept the measure of injury from those who desired to invade those institutions, rather than from those who desired to uphold them. Surely the Universities themselves were the best judges of what was or was not an injury to them. It was said that some were excluded from the higher prizes of the Universities at present, and that might be so; but how many would practically be excluded if the measure of his right hon. Friend were carried? Would it not deprive many of confidence in the University system if every variety of creed were introduced, thus involving the necessity of doing away with religious education altogether? Why it would destroy the Universities. His right hon. Friend's Bill itself showed how much he felt the difficulties of the case. It proposed to remove the declaration required from Fellows and Tutors, but it did not touch the Masters of Colleges. On what principle were the Masters to be subject to the declaration, if it was right that that test should be removed from the Fellows? His right hon. Friend would no doubt say that as the Master was the chief person in a college, he was responsible for the religious education. But if there was an injustice in preventing young men from becoming Fellows, was there not tenfold injustice in withholding from a man who had served long and faithfully as a tutor the great prize of a mastership? The reason why his right hon. Friend would not venture to abolish the declaration in that case was because he knew that there must be some one to superintend the religious education of the students. At Cambridge his right hon. Friend said that generally speaking there was no statutory ban, but that the restriction was of a legislative character, and imposed 200 years ago. Both at Trinity and St. John's the Master and Fellows had to subscribe a form of words which his right hon. Friend described as a general declaration of Christianity; but a particular religion was distinctly pointed at in the statute which said, that if any Fellow should openly secede from the Church of England, the Master should thereupon summon the seniors, and the Master and seniors together should proceed to inquire into the case, and if the fact were established should declare the fellowship vacant. The very fact that the Masters were not included in the operation of the Bill was, in itself, an admission of the difficulty which beset those who supported the measure. He had dealt with two of the main arguments of his right hon. Friend. Need he refer to the third—that the existing system was injurious to the Church of England? He agreed with his right hon. Friend, that the National Church must necessarily comprehend men who might disagree in opinion on certain points not fundamental, but who agreed on those which were fundamental. Reference had been made to the admission of such men as Professor Jowett, Dr. Newman (but the latter would, of course, be excluded now), and others; but his answer to that was that the Church of England had always been a comprehensive Church, and was intended to embrace within its pale all those whose divergence of opinion did not relate to fundamental matters. It was not a narrow Church; but although it admitted a great variety of opinion, it did not admit a variety of creed. It was liberal in the truest sense in tolerating a difference of view on certain points; but it would sink into indifference and infidelity if it did not care for the preservation of the fundamental doctrines of our faith. His right hon. Friend put it to them, that if they would only give way here and give way there, they might do much for the reform of the Universities. There lay the broad difference between the two sides of the House. Hon. Gentlemen opposite were always assuming that the institutions of the country were bad and required alteration. On his side they assumed that our institutions were good; and while they were willing to adopt improvements where defects could be shown, they were not willing to innovate for the mere sake of introducing a new idea. His right hon. Friend, who was a great reader of Bacon, would probably remember the passage in the *Essays* where he said that "it is reformation that draweth on to change, and not the desire to change that leadeth to reformation." If any improvements could be indicated as necessary to be made there would be, on his side of the House, the fullest desire to carry them out; but they felt bound to oppose measures which were proposed for the mere sake of innovating on the present order of things, and which would have the effect of, he would not say destroying, but undermining these institutions. It was the desire of change which led in the present case to the project of reform; and he therefore begged to move that the Bill be read a second time that day three months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Walpole.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. MONSELL said, he hardly expected that the point for discussion would have been whether we should substitute for the denominational system of the Universities a mixed system of education; and was astonished to find that he had been mistaken in the scope of the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman. Having laid down the principle that the change he sought to make did not touch religion, but merely removed certain civil disabilities to which those that did not belong to the Church of England were subjected, the right hon. Gentleman, thirty-three or thirty-four years after the passing of the Emancipation Act, wished to continue these disabilities so far as they touched Roman Catholics, and to place them on a pinnacle to be pointed at by every person of any religion or no religion; and yet he presented himself with professions of liberality on his lips, whilst endeavouring to perpetrate what, on his own principles, was a monstrous injustice. He (Mr. Monsell), if he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman's premises, should protest against a course which would place his co-religionists in so degrading a position. He, however, took other ground. He felt strongly that it would be an enormous advantage to all Her Majesty's subjects to have admission to the national Universities. The only limitation recommended by the Cambridge Commissioners was this—that those who were not members of the Church of England had the right to ask from the Universities the fullest privileges that could be given without an infringement of the fundamental principle on which the University was founded, and that was that education and religion should not be dissociated—that religion should be at the basis of all education. He thought those who were not members of the Church of England had a right to ask that every privilege which did not infringe on that principle should be given to them, and he thought it was a matter that ought not to be left in the hands of a private Member. He trusted, therefore, that Her Majesty's Government would introduce early next Session a measure for obtaining that object. This Bill however, in his opinion, involved a fundamental change in the whole system of the Universities. If it were passed they might have such men—he would not name an English name because that might be invidious—such men as M. Ernest Renan as a Fellow of the colleges to which the Bill applied.

MR. E. P. BOUVERIE: He could not be, because he is a Frenchman.

MR. MONSELL said, his right hon. Friend must be hard driven to make such an observation as that. M. Ernest Renan, if he were an Englishman, might under this Bill become a Fellow of the University; and that was another instance of his right hon. Friend's liberality. How many Members of that House would send their children to a college where they would be likely to meet such tutors? How had the system, sought to be now introduced, worked in other countries? The system had been tried in Belgium, and the religious people of that country in 1830 rose up against the King of Holland. What was the case in France? What was the Comte de Gasparin's opinion? He was a Protestant, and he had shown the evils of the system at the Lycée; as also had Montalembert. In France the religious classes were abandoning the Government Lycées and establishing institutions of their own. This Bill was the first step to the principle of dissevering religion from education, and such as it ought to be resisted. Let them reject it now, and he called upon hon. Gentlemen opposite to assist in passing a measure which would allow those who were not members of the Church of England to found colleges of their own within the Universities; thus on the other hand giving them the opportunity of enjoying the inestimable advantages of University education, and on the other in no degree weakening the connection which existed between religious and secular education.

Mr. WHALLEY said, that the ritual and creed of the Church of England were framed so as to open wide the doors to a considerable variety of opinion. At the same time, the Church was intended to be a spiritual garrison against the aggressions of a foreign political power under a religious disguise—a wolf in sheep's clothing. Unfortunately the Universities had of late years served too much as a bridge from the Church of England to the Church of Rome. From Oxford, at any rate, a great number had found their way to Rome. The remarks of the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken showed that the Catholics believed the present system to be to their advantage, and that was a very suspicious circumstance. He supported the Bill because it would tend to dilute a dangerous element in the Universities.

Mr. NEATE said, that Roman Catholics might be justified in arguing that the endowments of the Universities did not belong exclusively to the Church of England; but such a plea did not lie in the mouths of individuals who had accepted the modified Church which had been established by Act of Parliament. The same Act that settled the Church settled all the subsidiary and educational arrangements. He would remind the House that there were private institutions in connection with the Church which were founded for the express benefit of the Church of England. In his opinion it was most undesirable that the barriers which now excluded those who were not members of the Church of England from all interference with such institutions should be broken down. If the Bill were passed, the Universities would be precluded from taking into consideration in the election of Fellows whether the candidate was a member of the Church of England or not, and if he had passed the best examination they would be bound to elect him. The result would be that they might have Fellows and Tutors of colleges who would be precluded from becoming members of the governing body. As the law now stood persons were allowed to leave money for the propagation of Roman Catholic and Dissenting doctrines, and the trustees of such endowments could protect themselves from the intrusion of members of the Church of England. But if this Bill passed, it would deny to members of the Church the same right of protecting themselves from the intrusion of Dissenters which the law now conceded to the Dissenters themselves. The right hon. Gentleman who introduced the Bill said the test was too mild, and not sufficiently stringent; but, although it could not secure a perfect identity of faith, it secured an identity of worship. Under these circumstances, he should vote against the second reading of the Bill.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*—Ayes 101; Noes 157: Majority 46.

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *put off* for three months.

SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CLERGY DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL [*Lords*].

(No. 161.) SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Sir WILLIAM HEATHCOTE:* Sir, I rise to move that the Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal Bill be now read a second time. Before I enter on the argument for the Bill, permit me to justify myself for presuming to take charge of it in this House. When I was asked to do so my first impression was that the removal of a grievance bearing entirely on Scottish clergymen would be more fitly committed to one of the Scotch Members of the House, among whom there are many men of eminence and ability capable of stating any arguments which may be adduced in favour of the Bill much better than I can, and with a general concurrence of opinion, although they sit on opposite sides of the House. There was, however, one consideration which weighed with me—and I hope it will weigh with the House—in leading me to believe that I was not intruding myself where I had no right, and that was, that although it is a Scotch grievance, it is really an English question. The disabilities which it is the object of this Bill to remove were imposed originally by English jealousy. The Scotch Established Church never moved for them, and at the time they were introduced the Scotch Members of Parliament were against them. They were introduced so lately as 1792 with reference to supposed interests of the Established Church in England, but without the sanction of the Prelates of that Church. They were due entirely to one man, who, whatever his eminence may have been as a lawyer, or his notoriety as a politician, is proved by his speeches on this subject to have been ignorant of the facts and the principles involved in its discussion. I refer to Lord Chancellor Thurlow. Under these circumstances, and considering that no small amount of English oppression has been inflicted upon Scotland, I think there is a special propriety in an English Member endeavouring to remove it, and above all in one who, as representing one of the Universities, stands in an intimate relation with the Church of England. Perhaps the House will now allow me to make a short statement of the facts of the case, and to show how it was that these disabilities were, at a late period, and with extraordinary inconsistency on the part of the Legislature, for the first time imposed upon the Scottish clergy in the very same Act which recognized that they were no longer to be viewed with suspicion. After the Restoration, in 1660, the Episcopal Church was restored to its position as the Established Church of Scotland. At that time nearly all the Bishops of that Establishment had died out—in fact, only one remained. Four Scotch clergymen went up to London to be consecrated, and then went down to set the restored Church in motion; so that even so late as the time of Charles II. the Scotch Episcopal Church received its orders from the Anglican branch of the Church. That went on until after the Revolution in 1688, when most of them being non-jurors politically opposed to the Government of King William III., the Episcopal Church was displaced from its position as the Established Church, and its clergy were, from political suspicion, placed under severe restrictions in the exercise of their ministry in Scotland. But there was even then no disposition to question their spiritual character or to fail to recognize their orders. Let them come to England, and they were received and recognized just as much as clergymen of English ordination. Considering that so many of them were non-jurors, and that their employment in England implied their taking the oaths, it is rather remarkable that the instances are so numerous, but a few or even one would have proved their recognition. But, in fact, this recognition was not scanty, nor as it were in a corner, or by stealth, but occurred in the cases of eminent men, who were prominently before the world. To say nothing of members of the priesthood presented to benefices and to cathedral dignities in England, and one at least who was chaplain to King William III., there were English Prelates of no less mark than Archbishop Tillotson, and Bishop Burnet the historian, who had received Scottish orders; and Dr. Cairncross, who had been a Scotch bishop, was translated in the time of William III. to the bishopric of Raphoe, in Ireland. In 1707 came the Union, on which the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Kinnaird) means, I believe, to rely, which confirmed the position of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland. After the Union, in 1712, there was an Act passed which relaxed several of the stringent regulations that were imposed in King William III.'s time. In the discussions on this Act of 1712, a doubt was raised whether this relaxation was consistent with the Act of Union, and there was a more plausible show of reason for that doubt than can be alleged now; first, because those restrictions which were relaxed in 1712 applied to Scotland only, and it might be alleged that they had been imposed in favour of the Established Presbyterian Church; secondly, because they had been imposed before the Union, and it might be suggested that they had been in the view of the Parliament which passed that measure. But these objections were overruled by the very generation who passed the Act of Union, and knew well what it meant; and I shall show that there is not a shadow of pretence for importing them into the present discussion, which is concerned with disabilities imposed long after the Union, and with reference not to the Established Presbyterian Church in Scotland, but to the Established Episcopal Church in England. After Queen Anne's time came the darkest period of the history of the Church in Scotland. When George I. and George II. were assailed by insurrections in Scotland, the greater part of the Episcopalians were Jacobites, and they became the objects of great jealousy to the Government. They were dealt with as political enemies, and were restrained by severe regulations. A series of Acts affecting them were passed between 1718 and 1748; and in 1748 the severity culminated in this remarkable circumstance, that whereas the great hostility to these men proceeded from the fact that they would not take the oaths to Government, an Act was passed which rendered it impossible for them to do so. It was enacted that no Episcopal clergyman should perform service in any congregation (except in his own house), unless he took the oaths and registered his letters of orders ; but it was also provided that no letters of orders should be registered unless they had been conferred by a Bishop of England or Ireland. That went on until the extinction of the House of Stuart, about 1788, when the last of them, I believe, died. By that time the loyalty of the Scottish Episcopal clergy and their flocks had been transferred to the reigning Sovereign ; and although up to that time they had been treated almost as criminals, there had not been the slightest attempt to question their spiritual character, or to interfere with the discharge of their spiritual functions anywhere except in Scotland. There was nothing to prevent them from officiating in England, or from being appointed to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, as Archbishop Tillotson had been before. It was not until the Act of 1792, which recites that they are no longer objects of suspicion, and that all the disabilities upon them ought to be removed, that they were for the first time subjected to other and new disabilities, being such as no one had ever proposed to impose upon them in the times of sharpest persecution. This marvellous inconsistency was no part of the Act as originally introduced, but was grafted upon it in a remarkable manner. The Government found the Episcopal clergy and their flocks loyal, and looked upon them with favour; the Scotch Presbyterian Church had no wish to oppress them ; Dr. Robertson, the historian, and others, came forward in their favour ; the Scotch Members in both Houses supported the Bill as it was first introduced ; and the celebrated Bishop Horsley, on the part of the English Church, was its warm advocate. If it had passed as it was introduced, with this great concurrence of authority, the condition of the Scottish clergy would have become in 1792 what we wish to make it now. In the House of Lords, however, they had one great enemy, who was so powerful that it was necessary to conciliate him in every way, and that was Lord Chancellor Thurlow, who put a clause into the Bill in Committee, having reference to the position of the Scottish clergy in England. He did it craftily, having drawn it so as to be harmless, and such as might have remained to the present day and hereafter, without complaint ; being merely to the effect, that under the Act no greater powers should be given than already existed for the employment of the Scottish clergy in England. This would have left to them the freedom in that respect which they enjoyed before, and all that we now ask, and the promoters of the Bill of 1792 were accordingly thrown off their guard. On the third reading, however, a most important Amendment was introduced into this clause; silently, without attracting observation, and without even the usual description in the Journals of the House, by which it was put into its present stringent form, and has for more than seventy years excluded the Scottish clergy from their just rights. At the time, however, the repeal of the laws which were actually penal was thought too important to be risked by a resistance in the House of Commons to a provision framed by so powerful a Member of the House of Lords and of the Government, who would have insisted on maintaining what he had done, and perhaps have been able to defeat the Bill if he was not conciliated. So it remained till 1840, when these restrictions were so far relaxed as to abandon all semblance of a defencible principle on which to ground them ; all pretence of absolute disqualification was thrown aside, and the Scottish clergy were admitted, under stringent limitations, to officiate in English churches. This concession admitted as much as what we now seek, the validity of their orders, and the completeness of their communion with us. But although this concession gave up the principle, it was narrow in its extent, and, moreover, was clogged by a new restriction, then added for the first time, in respect of Ireland. Ireland had been always perfectly free to the Scottish clergy, notwithstanding the exclusion from England which the legislation of 1792 had introduced. But in 1840, for the first time, Ireland was closed against them, except under the limitations within which the partial opening of England was conferred. Again, in 1840, for the first time, penalties in respect of the performance of spiritual duties beyond the prescribed limitations were imposed.

This retrospect of previous legislation brings us down to the present time, and to the disabilities which now affect the Scottish clergy, and from which it is my duty to ask the House to relieve them. What are the facts of the case ? Here there is a clergyman ordained by a Bishop, in communion with the English Church, from which was derived, at no distant date, his own consecration—a clergyman of a Church which adopts the English formularies; yet if he asks to be admitted to a curacy or benefice in England, to which he may be presented, it is not that the English Bishop may refuse him, but he must. The Bishop may know that he is the best man in the world for the post, but, nevertheless, he must refuse him. He says, "I can ordain you if you are a Dissenter, I can receive a Roman Catholic, I can receive a person belonging to the Greek Church—let them come and profess conformity by making the different subscriptions which are necessary, and I can receive them without difficulty." It is sometimes said that this is because they go through a process of recantation—but it is no such thing. There is nothing like recantation, except this, that so far as any previous opinion is inconsistent with those which are embodied in our Articles and formularies, the clergyman who adopts those Articles and formularies must, by implication, abandon what is inconsistent with them. So far there is a recantation. There is only this difference between the Scotch clergy and others, that the Scotch clergy do it at the beginning of their ministry in their own country, and have never held anything inconsistent with our Church; whereas the others, whom you will receive without any questions, do not do it until you admit them, having been previously opposed to you. That is the state of things, and it is a state of things involving the almost incredible absurdity that the very conditions which would seem to make exclusion impossible are precisely those which, under the statute, make the exclusion of a Scottish clergyman inevitable and irremediable. The first condition for his exclusion is, that his orders should be recognized by us as valid and complete, and therefore incapable of repetition. If he was a minister in some communion where he had received ordination other than Episcopal, he might receive ordination at the hands of an English Bishop, and such cases frequently occur. The second condition for his exclusion is, that his Episcopal ordination, valid, indelible, and incapable of repetition, shall have taken place in a church with which our own is in communion. If he had received his ordination in the Roman Catholic Church, which actually excommunicates our Church, then, upon his testifying his conformity with us, an English Bishop could receive him without let or hindrance. And what is the remedy we propose? The remedy we propose is not the simple repeal of these disabilities, so as to place the Scottish clergy in precisely the situation of clergy in English orders. That, perhaps, would seem to be what mere justice would require. But we are willing to take precaution against abuses, possible, however improbable; and to give to the Bishops in England the power of refusing to receive a clergyman in Scottish orders absolutely and without cause assigned. We do not seek to compel the English Bishops to receive the clergy of Scottish ordination, but only to enable them to do so. We are to be met, it seems, by an Amendment, in which the hon. Member for Perth (Mr. Kinnaird) will suggest fears lest the Union with Scotland should be damaged, by conferring what he calls "privileges" on the Episcopal clergy. The Union with Scotland! The hon. Gentleman might as well refer to the Heptarchy, so far as any connection with this Bill is concerned. The earliest of these disabilities which we seek to repeal was not enacted till near a century after the Union, and the others were very much later. And as to "privileges," he cannot point to one line in this Bill which confers any privilege at all. It only seeks to remove an oppression which weighs down the Scottish clergy, and not in any way to exalt them above the rest of their countrymen. And then the hon. Gentleman tries by his Amendment to hold out a bribe to the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, which shall induce them to concur in an ungenerous opposition to this relief. I venture to predict that they will not fall into his trap. The Presbyterians of Scotland took a more generous view of this subject in 1792, and again, at the present time, having considered this very Bill in a Committee of their General Assembly, they have come to the conclusion that it is not one which they ought to oppose. They know that it is a Bill which in no way touches the status of the Episcopal clergy in Scotland, or regulates their conduct there, but only in England; and that the penal enactments which had existed in Scotland were long ago removed by the very Act of 1792, which imposed the English restrictions which we now seek to remove. Nor is the Established Presbyterian Church of Scotland likely to forget that their Episcopalian fellow countrymen are owners of a large part of the lands of Scotland, and as such have cheerfully, and with the respect due to the law borne the burden of maintaining not only the churches, but the schools and parsonage houses, of the establishment to which they do not belong, and have never raised the anti-Church rate cry with which we are so familiar in England. And the hon. Gentleman does little justice to the acuteness of his countrymen if he thinks that they will fail to discover that there is not even the very slightest analogy between the enactments of this Bill and his proposed dealing with the Act of Uniformity. The hon. Gentleman raises the question, whether the Act of Uniformity should be altered so that Presbyterian orders should be recognized here as well as Episcopalian orders? But the provision of the Act of Uniformity is only a recognition of an essential principle of the Anglican Church; what we want to get rid of is a statutory interference with that very principle. What would the hon. Member for Perth say to this — if it is right that the Episcopal Church should be prohibited from employing in its service other episcopally-ordained clergy, fellow-subjects of the Queen, who come from the other side of the border, is it not equally right to prohibit the Presbyterian Church of Scotland from employing, if they think fit, ministers who have been ordained by Presbyteries in London or Belfast? But there are objections taken from an English point of view, on which I will say a few words. We are told—and that is a favourite topic — that if this Bill were passed, and these Scottish clergymen were employed in the Church of England, we should have an inferior race of clergy. Now, the Scottish Episcopal clergy, excepting in the Highland parishes, are educated at the old Scotch Universities; and, in addition, there is for many of them a special training at the College of Glenalmond, under an eminent scholar and divine from the University of Oxford. I doubt whether it is becoming in English Bishops, and especially those in the northern dioceses who look much to St. Bees and Birkenhead for their supply of clergy, to throw stones at Scottish education. There is another objection entirely destructive of the last, namely—that the number of the Scottish clergy preferred in England will be so great as to interfere with the expectations of the English. This implies that private lay patrons (it cannot possibly apply to others) will think the superiority of the Scottish over the English clergy so great as to outweigh all the claims of family connection or personal intimacy. I really think that objection is not worth talking about. The whole number of Episcopal clergy in Scotland is only 160, and of these men more than one-half of them are of English ordination, and can return and be employed there whenever they please. There remains one more objection, resting as I think on no foundation of fact or reason, which however is, I suspect, the only one which really operates on the minds of those who oppose the Bill. The English Prayer Book is the recognized Prayer Book of the Scottish Church, prescribed by its canons, and necessarily used at ordinations and other solemn occasions; but there is in that Church an alternative office for the Holy Communion, which may be used in such congregations as desire it, and which is, in fact, used in about one-fourth of the whole number of the congregations. This office is viewed with suspicion by some, on the allegation that it is of a Romanizing tendency. This allegation is unfounded in fact, and beside the question, if true. This is not the place to go into controversy on the shades of difference between theological terms; but the authority, on that point, of the present Bishop of St. David's (Dr. Thirlwall) will not be questioned; and he has given it as his opinion, in a charge delivered in 1857, that the Scotch office is in itself unobjectionable and more irreconcilable with the peculiarities of Roman belief than our own. In truth, I believe that a Roman Catholic Priest might use the English office though he would think it inadequate and falling short of the truth, but could not use the Scottish office without implying what he would consider to be deadly error. But if the fact were otherwise, and if this office did wear a Roman aspect, what would follow from it? If a clergyman is an actual Roman Catholic you do not exclude him. Is he to be excluded because he was ordained in a church in which there is an alternative office which you dislike, permitted, but not used by more than about one-fourth of the clergy? But if this ground is shifted, and it is said that the objection is taken not to the permission to use but to the actual use, and to those clergy who do use it, then it will follow that the mere rejection of this Bill will not answer the purpose; but there must be an extension of the existing disabilities to English clergy also, if they ever accept a cure in Scotland. Of the favourers of the Scottish office in Scotland the larger number are of English orders; and they will be equally free, whether this Bill is passed or rejected, to return to England and accept preferment without any hindrance from any Bishop, except on cause shown, according to Ecclesiastical Law; while, on the other hand, if the Bill passes, the Bishop to whom a Scottish clergyman shall first present himself will have absolute power to reject him, even on suspicion, and without reason assigned. On the other hand, this absolute veto is not unnaturally distasteful to those who most fully recognize the identity of character which unite the English and Scottish clergyman, and who accordingly desire to put them on a footing of absolute equality. I am prepared to justify the veto: first, on the ground of principle and reason; second, on that of practical expediency.

The first ground is supplied by the analogy between the first admission to ministerial functions by ordination, and the first admission to the same of an applicant *ab extra* who is already ordained. A candidate for Holy Orders is subject to absolute rejection by the Bishop to whom he applies, without reason assigned; and it does not seem unreasonable that a stranger already ordained in another branch of the Church should satisfy the Bishop that he is such a one as that Bishop would have ordained; and as after ordination by one Bishop within the English Church no other can summarily reject from a benefice, so after one admission of a Scottish clergyman to a benefice, rejection, in case of presentment to another, must be on reason assigned, and not summary. Again, there is this power in the Bishop in the case of clergy ordained in the colonies, and also, if I read the statute rightly, in the case of clergy of Roman or Greek orders who may conform.

The second ground is this. The Bill, as it now stands, is the result of deliberation in a Select Committee of the House of Lords and of compromise, to overturn which might be fatal to its success. The petitioners for it may be trusted to know their own case, and they are most anxious that it should pass in its present form. I trust the House will send back the Bill to the House of Lords with as few Amendments as possible, and retain the restriction which is in favour of those who object to the Bill. I think I have now said all that is requisite in support of the Bill; and will only add, in conclusion, that this subject has sometimes come before us in the shape of Private Bills, in cases which were certainly cases of aggravated injustice which it was considered desirable for the Legislature to remove. The last time such a Private Bill was before the House it was not agreed to, the House being of opinion that such a subject ought to be dealt with by the Government; and Sir George Lewis said that he could not conceive any argument for maintaining the present condition of the law. I believe you will find the great weight of authority on that side of the question; and I hope that the House will not make an angry struggle, but that English Members will combine to do away with the injustice which is inflicted on Scotland by England, and that Scotch Members will combine to rescue their fellow countrymen from the position in which they now stand with regard to this question.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir William Heathcote*).

MR. KINNAIRD rose to move, as an Amendment,

> "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire how far any Privileges which may be conferred upon the Clergy of the Episcopal Church in Scotland would interfere with the Treaty of Union between England and Scotland, and into the expediency of removing at the same time from the Ministers of the Established Church of Scotland the disabilities imposed on them by the Act 13 & 14 *Charles* II. c. 4."

His reasons for proposing that the subject should be referred to a Select Committee were — First, that the Bill dealt with a constitutional question. To a certain extent it set aside the provisions of the Treaty of Union between England and Scotland, by giving an adventitious advantage to an episcopal body in Scotland dissenting from the Established Church. And for what purpose? Not to supply a want in England; for already they were overburdened with clergymen who had insufficient incomes, because the endowments did not suffice to give them all a real maintenance, and thousands of curates had little hope of ever obtaining preferment; but to give the sanction of the State to episcopacy in Scotland. They heard a great deal south of the Tweed of the evils of schism, and yet by that Bill they were doing what they could to foster division in every parish of Scotland, by forcing on episcopacy, and giving the sanction of the law to the assumption of territorial titles now forbidden by law; and he could not but have a shrewd suspicion that to attain that end was one of the concealed objects of the Bill. His second reason was that the question gravely affected the Church of England as by law established. At present one of the main safeguards given to the congregations in communion with it was the ordination of clergymen by Bishops bound to certain articles of doctrine, and pledged to the supremacy of the Crown. That safeguard was effectually removed by the present Bill, which provided for the introduction of a body of clergymen who, for aught they knew, might still subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles, with the qualification expressly drawn up in 1792 by the then Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church, of "every subscriber explaining them to himself." And might he ask whether the Canons of that Church still required the following declaration to be signed by candidates for Holy Orders?

> "I, ———, do hereby solemnly promise that . . . . I will not appeal from any sentence to a civil court, but acquiesce in the decisions of the ecclesiastical authorities."

That was, in the decisions of the seven Bishops—a complete despotism. Again, the Scotch Bishops were, or were up to a very late period, pledged to the following declaration:—

> "I will co-operate with my colleagues in supporting a steady adherence to the truths and doctrines by which our Church has been so happily distinguished, and particularly to the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, as laid down in our excellent Communion Office."

If, then, that Bill unhappily passed, it would render necessary some law giving a veto to congregations for their protection against strange doctrines. But the Bill removed a second safeguard; for whereas at present before even the Colonial clergy could be admitted to the Church of England, the consent of the Archbishop of the province and the Bishop of the diocese must both be given, that Bill provided for the removal of that double safeguard with reference to a body whose doctrine and discipline were at variance with those of the Church of England, and which had no permanence in either. How differently did they act when the Irish Protestant Episcopal Church was united to that of England! The Act of Union expressly provided for unity of doctrine and discipline. Did they not see how easy the road from Rome to England might thus be made? Suppose, for example — what was not an impossible supposition — that they should have even one Bishop not ill-affected towards the Church of Rome or the Greek Church. There was nothing of a legal kind to prevent the Episcopal Church in Scotland allying itself as a sister with those Churches, and taking their ministers into its communion, without requiring the renunciation of their special doctrines. Then that Bill would make it perfectly easy to introduce them into the diocese of that Bishop, if they would only sign the Articles and other documents, according to the plan adopted in 1792 of every subscriber explaining them to himself. And now let him call attention to a clause in the Bill which provided that once admitted by a Bishop into his diocese, every other Bishop must receive the Scotch nominee without any of the special guarantees provided by the Bill; for it enacted that the provisions of section 4, which contained those guarantees, should not apply to any person who should hold, or should have held, any benefice or ecclesiastical preferment in England or Ireland. At present, by the 3 & 4 *Vict.* c. 33, Romish orders were under a ban, and those holding them forbidden to officiate in the Church of England. But he had a third reason to urge against the Bill, and that was, that it affected the Church of Scotland as by law established. That Church had hitherto religiously observed the terms of the Treaty of Union, and studiously abstained from pushing her jurisdiction south of the Tweed. The Free Church, also, which claimed to be the rightful Church of Scotland, though separated by what they deemed an unwarrantable encroachment by the State on their liberties, had likewise abstained from extending its jurisdiction into England. But that Bill was an intrusion upon the Established Church of Scotland, as it virtually raised the Scottish Episcopal Church to form a part of the English Establishment; and that, as he had said, altered the Constitution of the country. But if it were thought expedient to do that, and to remove so-called disabilities from a body consisting of some 25,000 persons in the whole of Scotland, there were, he thought, other disabilities which ought also to be removed. It certainly was a great anomaly, that whereas Her Majesty's English Chaplains could officiate in her Royal Chapels in Scotland, Her Majesty's Scotch Chaplains could not do the same in England. The Act 13 & 14 *Charles* II. c. 4 prohibited it. If, therefore, this Bill should pass, he should propose to remove that stigma from the Presbyterian Church. There would be nothing unconstitutional in doing so; for the Act of 1662 was a grievous hardship newly imposed upon the Church of Scotland, in revenge for the conduct of the English Presbyterians during the Commonwealth. If, therefore, the offence of the Episcopal Church in Scotland of the last century of non-allegiance to the House of Hanover was to be condoned, the offence of the English Presbyterians of the previous century visited upon the Scotch ought to be condoned also. It was a new thing to have a claim of sisterhood advanced on the sole ground of episcopal ordination. That belonged equally to the Church of Rome, from which they dissented, and the Church of England. The true ground of unity was unity of doctrine. But he believed that that Bill was part of a great scheme to establish at any cost episcopal claims foreign to their Protestant Church of England, dangerous to the peace of the community, and also to the very existence of the Church of England. In another place it had been said that "the spiritual jurisdiction of the Episcopal Church in Scotland had continued uninterrupted," though it was put under a ban for disloyalty. In other words, it claimed then, and it claimed now, to rule all Scotland in spiritual matters, despite the State and the Established Presbyterian Church, which it dignified with the name of a schism. Its pretensions were akin to those of the Church of Rome, which claimed to rule England spiritually. It had consequently parcelled out Scotland into territorial dioceses, for which a civil sanction was now indirectly sought. It was the granting of that sanction to which he demurred. The hon. Gentleman read a letter from Dr. M'Crie in support of his argument, and stated that the Bill was viewed by persons in Scotland as the first step towards recognizing and establishing episcopacy in that country, contrary to the Treaty of Union. On these grounds he hoped the House would consent to the Bill being referred to a Select Committee, in which case he was prepared to consent to the second reading, with the understanding that they were not thereby pledged to the principles of the measure.

MR. AUGUSTUS SMITH seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire how far any privileges which may be conferred upon the Clergy of the Episcopal Church in Scotland would interfere with the Treaty of Union between England and Scotland, and into the expediency of removing at the same time from the Ministers of the Established Church of Scotland the disabilities imposed on them by the Act 13 & 14 *Charles* II. c. 4,"—(*Mr. Kinnaird,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. WALTER: Sir, I think it may perhaps tend to shorten this discussion, and may assist myself, and probably other hon. Members, in coming to a decision, if some of the hon. Gentlemen who are particularly interested in this question would be kind enough to explain to the House what would be the precise status of a clergyman of the Scottish Episcopal Church admitted under the provisions of this Bill to an English benefice, supposing the measure to be passed. I think that is necessary and material to the question we are going to vote upon; and as my own opinion is not quite made up as to how I should vote, I wish to state what my difficulty is. The point which I wish to have cleared up is this—Will an Episcopal clergyman of the Church of Scotland who has been admitted to an English benefice be at liberty to go back to Scotland, and officiate as a clergyman of the Scottish Episcopal Church? My hon. Friend (Mr. Kinnaird) seems to be under some apprehension that there is some attempt to effect a sort of amalgamation between the English and the Scottish Episcopal Church. I do not know whether such a scheme is on foot, but I think it would be a very mistaken policy. It would be creating a sort of spiritual Schleswig-Holstein in Scotland, and indeed a more uncomfortable state of things could hardly exist. I understand the law to be that at present an English clergyman is not at liberty to go into an Episcopal Church in Scotland and read the Scotch Communion Service; that is a point about which there is a good deal of jealousy in this country, and I want to know whether under this Bill a Scotch clergyman coming into England, and appointed to an English benefice, will be at liberty to go back to Scotland and officiate as a Scotch Episcopal clergyman in Scotland. If that be answered in the negative, I shall have no difficulty in supporting this Bill; but I should deprecate any arrangement which would leave the Scotch clergyman at liberty to go back to Scotland and officiate as a clergyman of the Scotch Episcopal Church. That is a point on which my hon. Friend offered no explanation, but if it were cleared up it would do away with the doubts of some English Members.

Mr. GRANT DUFF: The difficulty which has been raised by the hon. Member for Berks is not a very serious one. Indeed, at this moment, a large proportion of the clergy of the Scotch Episcopal Church are in English orders, and amongst these are several of the best known Bishops. It is not often, Sir, that I agree with the hon. Baronet opposite, and I am accordingly all the more pleased to be able to do so on this occasion. I am not myself a member of the Scotch Episcopal body. I have no sympathy with the opinions which are popularly attributed to many of the gentlemen whom this Bill is intended to relieve. I object, however, in the strongest possible way to allowing the *odium theologicum* to be mixed up with political questions. And this, Sir, is a pure political question. The disability which we are asked to remove is not an ecclesiastical disability. It is a civil disability. As far as regards the objections of my hon. Friend the Member for Perth, they are easily disposed of. This Bill was brought before the notice of the General Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland by one of its most distinguished members, who said that his attention had been called to it by his correspondents. It was referred to a Committee. It was examined by that Committee, and the Committee reported that the interests of the Established Church of Scotland were in no wise affected by it. The Assembly adopted the Report, and it hardly lies in the mouth of an independent Member of this House to say that a Bill is dangerous to the Established Church which has not appeared dangerous to it in the eyes of the General Assembly. As for this Bill being a first step to the re-establishment of episcopacy in Scotland, who that knows Scotland is not aware that a notion more crazy —more absolutely insane—than the notion of its being possible to re-establish episcopacy in that country, never entered into the brain of mortal man?

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, I am aware that there is a desire to suppress all expression of individual opinion upon this side of the House; but I am not likely to submit to the complete suppression of opinion which is desired. My attention has been called for a considerable number of years to this subject. I am perfectly willing to leave the interests of the Church of Scotland in this matter in the hands of the hon. Member who has moved the Amendment (Mr. Kinnaird), confident that in his hands the interests of the Church of Scotland will be duly guarded. As the House well knows, I am an attached member of the Church of England; but the apprehensions which I feel in regard to this Bill in its present form are not entertained by me alone. On the contrary, the objections which I feel have been felt and expressed by some of the most eminent Bishops and clergy of the Church of England. The proposal now before us is this —I speak not presumptuously on my own authority, but on the authority of those who, if I were permitted to name, would command the respect of the House. But the proposal appears to amount to the incorporation of the Episcopal Church of Scotland—not being an Established Church, bound by any legal obligation to observe the rights of the laity or the rights of the Crown—into the Church of England, in which the laity have securities constantly re-affirmed (as they have been by the decision of the House to-day), that no strange doctrines will be imported into the Church or inculcated on an unwilling congregation. What are the facts of the case? There are doctrines taught in the Communion Office of the Scotch Episcopal Church which, as shown by my hon. Friend (Mr. Kinnaird) are alien to the doctrine of the Church of England, and which may in this way be imported into that Church. It has been urged that the Scottish Episcopal Church accepts the articles of the Church of England and the Communion Office of the Church of England, and only retains the Communion Office of its own service as an alternative. The House would be totally mistaken if they were to accept this as a valid security. In the case of a congregation belonging to the Church of England, but located in Scotland, connection with the Scotch Episcopal Church was formed on condition that in this congregation the Communion Office of the Church of England only should be used. Dr. Skinner, the Primus of the Scotch Episcopal Church, insisted on the clergyman (Sir William Dunbar) using the Communion Service of the Scotch Church. On his refusal, the Primus excommunicated this clergyman, as an indication of his determination that that peculiar Communion Office should be used. That Communion Office, in the opinion of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, favoured, if it did not affirm, the doctrine of transubstantiation, which is the peculiar doctrine of the Church of Rome. The primary and essential difference between the Church of Rome and the Church of England, is clearly recognized in our own Articles — it springs from the acceptance of the doctrine of transubstantiation by the Church of Rome and its repudiation by the Church of England. The difference, therefore, between the qualified acceptance of that doctrine by the Episcopal Church in Scotland and its absolute rejection by the Church of England is not a small difference. It is an essential difference. And what is proposed in this Bill is, that the Episcopal Church of Scotland shall be incorporated into the Church of England, because incorporation into the Church of England in the sense of an Established Church is accomplished by admission to benefices. Now, a Church cannot remain established except she has distinctive doctrines, for you cannot recognize a Church except by that means. The distinctive doctrines of the Church of England are expressed in her Formularies, her Articles, and especially in her Communion Service; and that is the point touched by the present Bill. The House of Lords did not deal with this matter lightly. They referred the question to a Select Committee; and the point which we have to consider is, whether the securities introduced by that Committee are sufficient to protect the laity against the surreptitious introduction of erroneous doctrine, and whether these securities are not so framed as to be in themselves objectionable? Now, I state—not on my own authority, but on the authority of high authorities in the Church of England—that this Bill would enable any Bishop upon his own will and judgment to admit a clergyman of the Episcopal Church in Scotland to a benefice within his diocese, or to refuse to do so without assigning any reasons, independently of all archiepiscopal supervision. This is a most unconstitutional power when exercised without any supervision. Now, Sir, I stated that, not as an opinion of my own, but an opinion entertained by some of the highest authorities in the Church. And, Sir, the opinion of these authorities also is, that these securities, as they are termed, which were introduced by the Committee of the House of Lords, are insufficient to guard the Church of England from the introduction of the foreign doctrines, to which I have alluded, and that it is unsafe for the laity of the Church of England to invest any Bishop, at his own discretion, without regulation or appeal, with a power of this kind, independent of the Archbishop of the province in which the diocese may be situated, and independent of the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts. And I happen to know that these securities were purposely framed to evade the jurisdiction of the Archbishop, and to evade also the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts. Therefore the question at issue is not a small question, and it is for that reason that I begged the hon. Baronet the Member for the University of Oxford (Sir William Heathcote) to afford this House a fair opportunity of considering this Bill, which was considered gravely by the House of Lords upon its second reading, and by the House of Lords was referred to a Select Committee, who introduced provisions that I state upon high authority are unsatisfactory to some of the highest authorities in the Church of England. The Bill seems not to have been discussed on its third reading in the House of Lords. Sir, I shall vote for the Committee suggested by my hon. Friend the Member for Perth (Mr. Kinnaird). I think it due to the people of Scotland that this Bill should be so considered, because if we take this long step towards recognizing an Episcopal Church as established in Scotland, we do virtually recognize that Church as established in Scotland; we actually recognize the establishment of a second Church in Scotland. And, Sir, if we vote for the establishment of a second Church in Scotland, we establish a precedent for the establishment of a second Church in England. It is well to look these matters in the face; the beginnings appear to be small. It is, Sir, because the difference between the doctrines of the Episcopal Church of Scotland and of the Established Church of England appears qualified and is concealed as far as possible, that I consider the danger great. If, Sir, it was openly proposed that without any adequate security, priests from the Church of Rome should be admitted to the benefices of the Church of England, the proposal would at once be scouted; but the danger is this—that the House may be induced to pass an Act which will accomplish the purpose without being aware of the dangerous door which we open for admission to the benefices of the Church of England; and I pray the House gravely to consider whether when we sanction the incorporation of these clergy into the Church of England, we may not be affording an opportunity for the introduction of opinions and of doctrines which, by the Articles of the Church of England, we, as members of that Church, distinctly repudiate. I wish that we had been spared the consideration of this subject. I have every reason to wish that; but, at the same time, seeing in this Bill an approach to that which may prove a source of many dangers of no small magnitude, I think it my duty to represent them to the House. One danger is this—that this Bill will be the means of sowing division in the Church of England, by establishing a difference of practice among her Bishops. It is perfectly well known that there are Bishops of the Church of England who, using the latitude of opinion which the Church of England permits, would admit to benefices within their dioceses men of opinions which other Bishops would think utterly unsound. Sir, I do not wish to see this difference between the opinions of the Bishops of the Church of England aggravated. I do not wish to see that difference established before the people of this country. I do not wish to see the Bishops separated from each other, and driven apart for the mere sake of admitting a few Episcopalian clergy into the benefices of the Church of England—benefices for which there are thousands of poor curates in our Church only too anxious and ready — sound, honest, hardworking clergy, but kept in poverty by the paucity of the opportunities for their preferment. If there were not cases of this sort, there might be a plea for the provisions of this Bill ; but there are thousands of clergy notoriously kept in poverty by the disproportion between the numbers of the clergy of the Church of England and the benefices to which they can be admitted ; and, although, not by any means exclusively on that ground, still upon that ground also, I object to this Bill. I object to this Bill as not guarded, as I consider it ought to be, and as insufficient on the grounds I have stated. I object not upon my own authority, but on very high authority in the Church of which I am an humble member ; and I shall, therefore, vote for the Amendment of my hon. Friend the Member for Perth.

Mr. BLACK : Sir, I am desirous of stating in a very few words my reasons for supporting the Bill now before the House. I have had the privilege and pleasure of being acquainted with some of those in whose interests this Bill has been introduced, and I will say this for them, that they are as loyal, as learned, as charitable, and as pious as their brethren in England. I must say that I consider that a great deal that has been said on this question is entirely away from the point. Let us consider what the question is—What are the grievances of which the Episcopalian clergy of Scotland have to complain, and why were they imposed upon them ? The fact is, that these penalties were imposed upon the Scotch Episcopalians not on account of their religious sentiments —these had nothing to do with it—but it was in consequence of the high church sentiments they entertained in regard to the Divine right of kings. They considered that the Stuarts were the legitimate and the only legitimate Sovereigns to whom they should pay homage, and in consequence of their opinions both in a political and in a religious point of view they did not think they were warranted in praying for King George, and refused to do so. Consequently, the Legislature imposed very heavy penalties on them for their disloyalty. But the fact is that, since the death of the last of the Royal Family of the Stuarts, in 1780, they have been the most loyal of the loyal in Scotland, and the ground upon which those penalties were imposed upon them is entirely done away with. Now, what is it that is proposed to be done ? It may be demonstrated that they are decidedly innocent of the crime for which they are punished. It is said that may be all very true, but though innocent of the crime of which they are accused, they may be guilty of something else, and it is better to continue to punish them. These penalties were imposed in consequence of their political tenets, and they are now continued because it is said they are not altogether of the same religious views as their Episcopal brethren in England. I do not know that there is very much difference. I do not pretend to understand much about the different shades of religious opinion prevailing amongst the various sections of the Church of England ; but I have no doubt that there are a great many in England entertaining the same views with many of the Episcopalian clergy of Scotland. The hon. Gentleman the Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) has stated that if you were to admit the Scottish Episcopalians to benefices in England, it would make another establishment. Why, the Church of Scotland does the very same thing, without making a second establishment. If there are any Presbyterian clergy in England, and there are such, well qualified for the ministerial office, they do not hesitate to admit them to benefices in Scotland. It is the very thing they do, and the proper thing they should do. I say that the Scotch Episcopalians, equally with their brethren in England, are qualified for the ministerial office, and that you should continue disqualifying statutes against them is quite discreditable, and a species of persecution. I wish to give full freedom to all. Provided, only, that they are worthy of the situation to which they are appointed, I do not see that there can be any fair objection made to this Bill.

LORD HENRY SCOTT, with reference to the Question put by the hon. Member for Berkshire (Mr. Walter), said, that eighty-five—the majority of the Scottish Episcopal clergy—were in English, and seventy-nine—the minority—in Scotch orders; and that the effect of the Bill, if passed, would be to place the seventy-nine clergymen in Scotch orders on the same footing with the eighty-five in English orders, who at present are allowed, and to whom no English Bishop would refuse permission to officiate in any parish, or to accept any benefice or charge in his diocese, and who are at liberty to return to Scotland to officiate there. He was glad to find that on both sides of the House and by all varieties of religious opinions the Bill had been favourably received. He, therefore, hoped the second reading would be assented to.

MR. STIRLING said, I only rise for the purpose of expressing how deeply I feel—a feeling which, I am sure, is shared in by a large majority of the Scotch Members—the kindness of my hon. Friend the Member for the University of Oxford, in having taken this matter up, and to thank him for the admirable speech in which he introduced the second reading of the Bill—a speech on which he may fairly rest the success of the measure, and which has been wholly unanswered by the speeches that have been made in opposition to the Bill.

COLONEL SYKES: As a Scotch Member I entirely concur in the Bill.

MR. HADFIELD: It seems to me a very extraordinary fact, that one denomination happening to dwell on one side of the Tweed should entertain the same sentiments as another class of Christians dwelling on another side of the Tweed, and yet should have no communication whatever. That is a remarkable fact. But there is worse than that. The Establishment of England and the Church Establishment of Scotland hold no communication whatever. One of the most eminent men in the Church of Scotland told me not many months ago, when he came to England, that every pulpit of the Nonconformists was open to him, but not one of the Church Establishment. At this time there is no communication between these two Establishments—both Church and State—supported by the Legislature of the country. That is an anomaly which Christian men cannot understand. It is a disgrace to Christianity. Some of the most eminent men the country ever produced are not permitted to enter the pulpits of the clergymen in this country; and more than that, no clergyman is allowed to enter the pulpit of a Nonconformist. If they were we should value many of them; but they are not allowed, and, in fact, the language they employ concerning us is of a most objectionable character. A Bishop, writing to one of our most eminent Ministers—one of the most eloquent and one of the most esteemed men in this kingdom—said—

> "I felt that neither the power of your intellect, nor vigour of your reason, nor mighty eloquence, nor purity of life, nor suavity of manners, nor soundness in the faith would justify me in departing from the rule of the Church of England, a tradition of eighteen centuries, which declares your orders irregular, your mission the offspring of division, and your Church system — I will not say schism— but standing apart."

For these reasons you will allow no communication with us nor between the Established Church of England and the Established Church of Scotland; and an Act of Parliament is necessary in order to allow 160 clergymen of your own denomination in Scotland to be introduced into the Established Church of England. These are elements in the Church of England that are convulsing it. There are more divergences among them than among the Dissenters. The party known in the Church of England as the Puseyite party will be strengthened by the addition of these 160 Scotch clergymen.

MR. E. P. BOUVERIE: I shall vote for this Bill, which stands on the same ground as that which I had the honour of moving this afternoon. This is a matter affecting civil and not spiritual privilege. By Act of Parliament, a number of persons have been deprived of that which is a common right of Her Majesty's subjects, and on that ground I shall vote for this

Bill; and on that ground I do not think the hon. Member for Sheffield can refuse to vote for the Bill. Here is my hon. Friend the Member for the University of Oxford proposing to introduce into the Church of England a set of gentlemen eminent for their piety and training and character, who have, by his own statement, been brought up in a University where there is no doctrinal test—where there are none of those safeguards which the Church of England insists upon in this country. I wish my hon. Friend would profit by my example, and that when I bring forward my Bill again he will give me his support.

Mr. GRANT DUFF explained that his allusion to Dr. Lee was quite incidental, and that if that gentleman, for whom he had great respect, was opposed to this Bill, he could only say he was sorry for it. The hon. Member for Perth (Mr. Kinnaird) would not, however, dream of denying that the account of the proceedings in the General Assembly which he (Mr. Grant Duff) had given, was, as far as his argument was concerned, strictly correct. He desired farther to explain, in reply to other speakers, that the Scotch Office was now merely a permitted use, and he would refer those who raised a difficulty about the Thirty-nine Articles to the proceedings which took place before the passing of the Act of 1792.

Mr. KINNAIRD said, he would not give the House the trouble to divide on his Amendment.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *Friday.*

INSOLVENT DEBTORS BILL—[Bill 20.]

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

The ATTORNEY GENERAL appealed to the hon. Member for St. Ives (Mr. Paull) not to proceed further with the measure in the present Session. The Bill related to a subject which was included in a measure proposed by the Lord Chancellor to the other House, and which measure had been withdrawn in consequence of objections that were made to certain portions of it. The Lord Chancellor was not satisfied with the present state of the law as regarded commitments by County Court Judges, and intended to consider whether a Bill might not be framed which would put an end to the injustice which now existed, and which would not be open to the objections that had been raised to the Bill he had recently introduced. He therefore moved, that the Chairman do leave the Chair.

Mr. HORSFALL said, that a very strong remonstrance had been sent from Liverpool against this Bill, and, therefore, he would urge the hon. Member not to press it at this late period of the Session.

Mr. MALINS also recommended that the Bill be withdrawn. He greatly regretted the withdrawal of the Lord Chancellor's Bill, and trusted that next Session an effective measure would be introduced to put an end to grievances which were admitted to exist. He was opposed to imprisonment for debt in any form, and in the case of small debtors especially imprisonment was often ruinous to the debtor, and was seldom or never beneficial to the creditor.

Mr. J. A. Turner, Mr. Beecroft, and Mr. Clay said, that they had received very strong remonstrances from their constituents against the Bill.

Mr. AYRTON said, he was sorry to find that the Government were not prepared to support the Bill, which only proposed a simple act of justice to the people, and ought not to be rejected solely because Chambers of Commerce, which had obtained a bankruptcy law to their liking, objected to a measure which would benefit other classes.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL denied that the Government were opposed to the principle of the Bill. The Lord Chancellor adopted the principle of this Bill, and was only desirous of considering whether the objections made to it could be met.

Mr. PAULL said, he would have liked to have adopted the course pointed out by the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton), but after the opinions which had been expressed by other Members, he should not ask the House to go on with his Bill at present. It had none of the objectionable features of the Bill of the Lord Chancellor, but instead of curtailing the credit of the working classes it would extend it. He should at an early period of next Session introduce the same Bill.

House *resumed.*

[No Report.]

PETTY OFFENCES LAW AMENDMENT BILL—[BILL 121.]

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. WHALLEY, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said, its main object was to be found in the first clause, which provided that—

> "In all cases where any person shall be charged with any offence punishable by summary conviction before Justices of the peace or a magistrate, the person so charged and his wife or her husband, as the case may be, shall be competent to give evidence on the hearing of such charge."

He had ventured to propose that change in the law because he knew that the late Attorney General had contemplated the introduction of a clause to a similar effect in a Bill of a wider character. The amendment of the law he proposed was in conformity with the tendency of law reforms in recent times. As the evidence of parties was admissible in civil causes, there could be no objection to extend the practice to petty offences. Cases sometimes occurred in which the police exceeded their duties, and it was only right that the parties accused should be allowed to state facts. Another clause in the Bill provided that where the charge should consist wholly or mainly in annoyance to the public or to individuals, other evidence than that of the police should be adduced.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Whalley.*)

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL thought this was a Bill which the House could not sanction. The first clause proposed a fundamental alteration in the law of evidence by permitting criminals to give evidence. If criminals were allowed to give evidence on their own behalf, they must be liable to be cross-examined against themselves. Then if it was enacted that a criminal might give evidence, the practical effect would be that he must give evidence, or his abstaining from doing so would be construed in his disfavour. The second section was very remarkable. It was that—

> "In cases where any persons shall be charged with any offence which consists wholly or mainly in the annoyance occasioned to the public or to individuals."

He would like to know what annoyance to an individual meant. If a man was robbed of his money, that would be an annoyance, and so again if he were assaulted. The clause went on to provide that, in such cases,

> "It shall be necessary to adduce evidence to the satisfaction of the magistrate other than that of the police or constable by whom any person shall be apprehended of such annoyance having been occasioned."

By that provision a gang might set upon a policeman alone and nearly kill him, and there would be no evidence against them. Then there was a clause giving to policemen power to determine what sum of money should be deposited with them by a prisoner to insure the appearance of the latter to answer a charge. That provision was objectionable. He thought he had said enough to show that the Bill was one which ought not to be adopted. He would, therefore, move that it be read a second time on that day three months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Solicitor General.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. HADFIELD thought the Bill was an excellent one, and only carried out a principle which was already acted upon in civil causes.

MR. WHALLEY thought the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General had not fairly represented the nature of the Bill; but in deference to the general feelings of the House he would not trouble them to divide.

Amendment, and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

JERSEY COURT BILL—[BILL 48.]

COMMITTEE. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [22nd June], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

MR. AYRTON said, he was aware of the difficulty there would be in proceeding with this Bill, but he thought the House ought to have some distinct statement of the intentions of the Government.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, this was a subject that the Government ought to take up. For fifty years past the system in Jersey had been condemned, and he contended that the Government ought to make this an Imperial question, and not leave it in the hands of a private Member.

MR. T. G. BARING, on the part of the Government, said, he could assure the hon. Gentleman that the attention of the Secretary of State would be seriously given to the subject.

MR. LOCKE said, that on that understanding he was willing not to press the Bill, but he hoped that the Government would do more than consider the subject, and that in the next Session they would be prepared to deal practically with it.

MR. SOTHERON ESTCOURT thought it was desirable that the States of Jersey should themselves take up the question, and he hoped that they would do so before next Session.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

POISONED FLESH PROHIBITION BILL &c. (*re-committed*)—[BILL 199.]

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

LORD E. HILL-TREVOR moved that the Speaker leave the Chair that day three months.

Amendment proposed,

> To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Lord Edwin Hill-Trevor,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR EDWARD GROGAN desired to assure the House that he was influenced by higher considerations than the mere desire to protect foxes, and he should therefore support the Amendment, because he believed that the Bill would prevent the owners of sheep in Ireland from protecting their flocks against the large number of dogs which committed so much havoc among their stock.

MR. PAULL said, he would support the Bill, which he regarded as supplementing a measure of his own which he had been fortunate enough to pass, and which he was satisfied had been attended with the happiest effects.

MR. DAWSON said, he should support the Amendment on the score of humanity, as he regarded the Bill as being most objectionable.

SIR LAWRENCE PALK believed the Bill would be found as pernicious in England as in Ireland. The only advantage that would attend the passing of such a measure would accrue to the informer, who would thus have an object in going into woods, and, even if he thought proper, might be induced to place poisoned flesh there and charge the keeper with being the culprit.

MR. H. BERKELEY denied that he had brought in the Bill merely for the protection of the foxes, though he believed that if the fine and manly sport of fox-hunting were once dropped the character of the English and Irish gentleman would deteriorate. The reason why he had brought it forward was because he had received numerous statements, from which he learnt that dogs and even pigs had been killed, owing to the practice of using poisoned food. Many shepherds' dogs and valuable pointers had fallen victims to the practice, and human life even had been endangered. He was not disposed to deny the right of any one to get rid of vermin, or even foxes if they so pleased, but such riddance should be effected by means of traps, and not of poison. He believed that the House, too, had a perfect right to prevent gentlemen from preserving game at the expense of the community.

MR. HUNT said, he thoroughly approved the object of the Bill, but thought it was framed in a manner which needed considerable alteration. He believed that it ought to have been sent to a Select Committee. He could not resist the statement which had been made with reference to the destruction of sheep in Ireland by dogs, but he thought at the same time that poisoned meat ought only to be resorted to with certain restrictions. He believed, moreover, that the Bill was very little calculated to preserve foxes, because by the third clause of the Bill a man was at liberty to place any poison in a dwelling-house, building, rick, or stack, for the destruction of vermin. Now, as a fox-hunter, he certainly did not look upon foxes as vermin, but, as a farmer, he viewed them in an entirely different light.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided* :—Ayes 60; Noes 38: Majority 22.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

FORTIFICATIONS AND WORKS.

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON moved a Vote for £150,000, on which to found a Bill. He would give an explanation of the Bill upon its second reading.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, towards providing a further sum for defraying the expenses of the construction of works for the defence of the Royal Dockyards and Arsenals, and of the Ports of Dover and Portland, and for the creation of a Central Arsenal, a sum not exceeding £650,000 be charged upon the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, and that the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorized and empowered to raise the said sum by Annuities, for a term not exceeding thirty years; and that such Annuities shall be charged upon and be payable out of the said Consolidated Fund."

MR. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD asked, if the money was required towards the construction of a central arsenal?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, it was not.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE asked, if it was intended to take a Vote for that purpose this year?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, there was no such intention.

House *resumed*.

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow*.

ARMAGH ARCHIEPISCOPAL REVENUES BILL.

On Motion of Sir HUGH CAIRNS, Bill for adjustment of Charges on the Revenues of the Archbishopric of Armagh, *ordered** to be brought in by Sir HUGH CAIRNS and Mr. WHITESIDE.

Bill *presented*, and read 1°. [Bill 202.]

JUSTICES PROCEEDINGS CONFIRMATION (SUSSEX) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. DODSON, Bill to confirm certain proceedings of the Justices for the county of Sussex, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. DODSON, Colonel BARTTELOT, and Mr. COBBETT.

Bill *presented*, and read 1°. [Bill 203.]

WESTMINSTER BRIDGE TRAFFIC BILL.

On Motion of Mr. COWPER, Bill for the better regulation of the Traffic on Westminster Bridge, and for the prevention of obstructions thereon, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. COWPER and Mr. BARING.

Bill *presented*, and read 1°. [Bill 205.]

DRAINAGE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LANDS (IRELAND) SUPPLEMENTAL BILL.

On Motion of Mr. PEEL, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863," *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. PEEL and Sir ROBERT PEEL.

Bill *presented*, and read 1°. [Bill 207.]

BANK NOTES, &C. SIGNATURE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. PEEL, Bill for impressing by machinery Signatures of Names on Bank Notes and certain Bills on the Bank of Ireland, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. PEEL and Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER.

Bill *presented*, and read 1°. [Bill 206.]

PUBLIC WORKS (MANUFACTURING DISTRICTS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. VILLIERS, Bill to extend the powers of the Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) Act, 1863, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. VILLIERS and Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER.

Bill *presented*, and read 1°. [Bill 204.]

And it being Six of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House till To-morrow, without putting the Question.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, July 14, 1864.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Trespass (Ireland)* (No. 202).

Second Reading—Railways (Ireland) Acts Amendment* (No. 178); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland)* (No. 189).

Committee—Factory Acts Extension (No. 176); Indemnity* (No. 197); India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment* (No. 195); Defence Act Amendment* (No. 193).

Report—Factory Acts Extension (No. 176); Indemnity* (No. 197); India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment* (No. 195); Defence Act Amendment* (No. 193).

Third Reading — Public and Refreshment Houses (No. 184); Civil Bill Courts (Ireland)* (No. 200); India Office* (No. 191).

Royal Assents— Union Assessment Committee Act Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 39];
Coventry Free Grammar School [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 41];
Superannuation (Union Officers) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 42];
Government Annuities, &c. [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 43];
Divorce and Matrimonial Causes (Amendment) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 44];
Greek Loan [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 40];
Settled Estates Act Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 45];
Life Annuities and Life Assurances [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 46].

OFFENCES IN RAILWAY CARRIAGES.

QUESTION.

Lord BROUGHAM had been asked by his noble Friend (Earl Russell) to postpone the Jamaica Petition which stood for to-day, he therefore fixed it for Monday with the Cuba Slave Trade, of which he had given notice. He would put a question to his noble Friend (Earl Granville). From accidental circumstances he was in communication with a great number of persons and societies all over the country, and he had received numberless applications from persons, much alarmed by the late numerous offences in railway carriages. For himself he did not profess to feel alarm, because at his time of life it would be folly to feel much about a risk of what little remained of life being cut short which was so very soon to terminate. But there were thousands of persons looking forward to very long years, and of these hundreds passed many days on railways, and their alarm was great. They said that as railway companies had a monopoly and transcendental powers under Acts of Parliament, they were bound to expect legislative interference for the protection of the public. Therefore the right of making laws to control them was incontestable. There might be various opinions on the best protection, but he thought it clear that there ought to be no power given to those in the compartments to communicate with the driver, but a power should be given to communicate with the guard; and it seemed manifest that every railway should be made with boards or other means by which the guard could pass along when called by any passenger. This was constantly provided on the foreign railways, and might by a small cost be afforded on ours also. He wished to know of his noble Friend if any steps were about to be taken, or had been taken to effect this, or any other means to quiet the alarm the country felt so generally and so strongly?

Earl GRANVILLE said, that as his noble and learned Friend had not given him notice of his Question, he had been unable to communicate with the Department more especially concerned. The subject, however, would be most carefully considered by Her Majesty's Government. Although on foreign railways there was generally a means by which the guard could communicate with the passengers, it was not always the case that the passengers could communicate with the guard.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL—(No. 136.)

COMMONS' AMENDMENTS CONSIDERED.

"Commons' Reasons for disagreeing to One of the Amendments made by the Lords, and Commons' Amendments to Lords' Amendment should be considered" (according to Order).

The Earl of SHAFTESBURY rose to move, That their Lordships should insist on their Amendments in Clause 4. The noble Earl said, that as the Bill originally came from the other House, the fourth clause provided that a convict holding a licence should within three days after his arrival in any place notify his arrival to the police authorities, and should thereafter report himself once in each month until his term had expired. Their Lordships had struck out the words requiring a monthly report, and had made some other Amendments in the clause; but the Commons had refused to agree to the omission of the words regarding the monthly report; and he now had to move that their Lordships should insist upon their Amendment. The Commons had sent up four or five Reasons for disagreeing to this Amendment, to which he would call their Lordships' attention. The first was simply the statement of the wish of the House of Commons—

> "That a monthly registration of the places of residence of all male licence holders should be systematic and regular."

Against this their Lordships might place their desire to the contrary. There was some ambiguity about the expression "places of residence." If it was intended to apply to the actual domicile of the licence holder, all the time of one of these persons might be occupied in reporting his changes of residence to the police. They generally lived in common lodging-houses, adapting their residence to the situation of their work, and often changed their place of sleeping three or four times in a week. Upon the second Reason he need not make any observation. The third Reason was—

> "Because, if the said Amendment were agreed to, there would be no security that any holder of a licence would ever be required to make a periodical report of himself to the police in any way."

But when their Lordships struck out the words "once in each month," they left in the regulation that within three days of his arrival in a police district the licence-holder should report to the chief constable, and that if he went from one district to another he should give notice both of his departure and arrival. For the fourth Reason—

> "Because, if any licence were issued containing such conditions as are referred to in the said Amendment, such licence must be in a form different to that set forth in schedule A, and consequently no holder of such licence would be amenable to the penalties mentioned in the 5th and 8th clauses of the Bill."

There was something more to be said, because he admitted that this Amendment was somewhat inconsistent with other parts of the Bill; but he entertained so strong an objection to this provision, which would most seriously interfere with the working of the present system of granting licences, that he should be prepared to meet almost any difficulty rather than allow it to become the law of the land. The fifth Reason—

> "Because the adoption of the said Amendment would seriously interfere with the working of the present system of registration and supervision of licence holders in Ireland"—

inclined him to think that the House of Commons had been induced to vote for the restitution of those words under the impression that the Irish system had been incorporated in the Bill, and that by their Amendment their Lordships intended to prevent its forming part of the measure. Nothing, however, could be more distinct than the system which was to be established under this Bill and that which now existed in Ireland. As a proof of the difference, he would refer to the circumstance that he had that morning received the first report of "the Inspector of Released Convicts in Dublin." The existence of such an officer itself constituted a most important difference between the two systems, which became still more apparent when regard was had to his duties, among the most important of which was to provide employment for men when they were discharged from intermediate prisons—thus relieving them from the great difficulty of finding work, which pressed so hardly upon them in this country—and to keep up a frequent correspondence with discharged prisoners. The Irish system provided for the man most minutely and carefully all those things which under this Bill he was to be called upon to provide for himself. The Bill did not make any provision for finding a man occupation, or rendering him any assistance in contending with the difficulties to which he would be exposed directly he came out of prison. All that it did was to require him to report himself to the police once a month, and thus to impose upon him the necessity of disclosing his condition, not only to the master who employed him, but also to the men among whom he worked. Since the debate on the subject had taken place in that House, he had instituted very minute and extensive inquiries on the point, and the conclusion at which he had arrived was that employers of labour were most unwilling to engage ticket-of-leave men, while they would, he believed, be still more unwilling to employ men who were forced to report themselves every month to the police. He had also ascertained that the working classes themselves objected to having those men incorporated in their body, and that the police were by no means the persons who were most adverse to them. It should, he might add, be borne in mind that the holding of a ticket-of-leave was an incentive to deception—such a man found it most difficult to obtain employment unless he concealed the fact of his condition — and that the evil of the system in that respect would be very much aggravated if a man were compelled month by month to deceive everybody except the police-constable to whom he made his report. The action of the police with regard to those men must not, he would further observe, be judged too harshly. A policeman saw a man employed in a confidential situation whom he knew to be a convicted thief; and if he took no notice of the circumstance, and the man committed a robbery, he was held responsible for having concealed the real state of things from his master; while if he were to act otherwise he would, no doubt, be frequently the cause of having a man driven from employment who was disposed to earn an honest livelihood. So long as a ticket-of-leave man was able to tax his friends for his support he went on all right; but when he began to seek the means of earning a livelihood himself, then his difficulties commenced, and it was necessary that some consideration should be shown by the Legislature for the position in which he was placed. Those men as a class were naturally very excitable, and were disposed to look upon the whole world as opposed to them, and in despair to throw themselves back on their old associates. Their Lordships would see that there was a very considerable difference between a man who had been convicted for the first time and one who had been convicted ten or a dozen times; and it was a very serious thing that a man who had offended once, and who was desirous of returning to the paths of honest industry, should be driven back by legislation to his evil courses, and perhaps made a hopeless criminal. Another objection to the provision to which he was referring was that the requiring this periodical report tended very much to bind the man to the place he went to immediately after liberation, and thus to keep them to their old haunts, which was most undesirable, inasmuch as they were thereby exposed to temptations which they found it impossible to overcome. Of those who came out of prison a large proportion, he might observe, were anxious to reform—a statement which was corroborated by the testimony of Mr. Organ among others, as well as by his own personal experience of the men, several of whom had told him that it was impossible to exaggerate the horrors of their life. A few years ago, for instance, he had received an application from a great number of thieves in London, who requested that he would meet them at a particular place. In compliance with that request, he went to the appointed spot, and there met 250 of those men, with whom he had a long conversation, and who begged of him to give them some advice as to the best means of getting out of their wretched position. He never should forget the energy and force with which they stated their case, and he was happy to say that employment was found for about eighty of them (and he believed many of the others succeeded in obtaining employment), and that, so far as he could ascertain on the most minute inquiry, not twenty-five of the number had ever returned to the course of life from which they had been rescued. That furnished strong evidence that, if they were not driven back to crime by such a disclosure of their position as was involved in the necessity of reporting themselves once a month to the police, many convicts might be restored to society. He might mention another very remarkable case in illustration of what he had just been stating. A boy eighteen years of age, who had passed six years of that time in prison, and who was pronounced by the police to be an incorrigible offender, had presented himself at the door of a reformatory of which he (the Earl of Shaftesbury) was president, and begged to be admitted. Admission was at first refused, on the ground that the boy was beyond the prescribed age; but in compliance with his repeated entreaties his request was at last complied with, and nothing could exceed the propriety of his conduct during the year and a half after his entrance. It was then determined to submit him to a severe experiment, and they said to him, "Here, Daniel"—for that was his name—"here are five pounds for you to go and pay a bill in Whitechapel and bring back the receipt." Now, Whitechapel was the neighbourhood in which this young man had always lived; but he returned in an incredibly short space of time, his eyes sparkling with delight, and when asked, "What makes you so cheerful?" he replied, "Why should I not be cheerful—I have been entrusted with £5." They then asked him how it was he got back so soon, and he said that Whitechapel was his old haunt, and he ran the whole way because he knew the moment he got there his former companions would come round him, and if he stayed with them one half hour he should be a lost man. This showed to his mind that a desire existed amongst this class of people to abandon the vicious course of life they had been leading. But he was sure that if their Lordships insisted upon the proposed regulations the thieves would infinitely prefer remaining in prison and fulfilling their whole sentence, than submit to them. Their Lordships must admit that the whole thing was an experiment; but he thought it would be far better to be a little less stringent in their enactments, although it might allow a few men to slip through the meshes of the law, than by any arbitrary legislation force hundreds of them back to their old courses of fraud and violence.

Moved, "To insist on the Amendments to which the Commons have disagreed."

THE EARL OF CARNARVON hoped that the Government would state what course they intended to take in this matter. Much as he was disposed ordinarily to rely on the authority of the noble Earl who had just sat down (the Earl of Shaftesbury) on these subjects, he could not consider his arguments applicable to this particular question, and if his proposition were carried out, the Bill would become practically unworkable. The point had been very fully discussed already, and on a review of all the arguments he recommended their Lordships not to insist on their Amendment, but to acquiesce in the decision of the other House. He hoped the Government would not allow the matter to fall back into chaos, which would be the case if the Bill were prevented from passing.

EARL GRANVILLE said, the noble Earl who had just spoken had precisely explained the course which Her Majesty's Government intended to pursue. From what he (Earl Granville) had said on the previous stage of the Bill, his noble Friend (the Earl of Shaftesbury) must be aware that he could not concur in the course his noble Friend now proposed, and he thought there would be great danger of losing this important Bill if their Lordships should insist on their Amendment. He hoped, therefore, his noble Friend would withdraw his Motion. He thought, also, that in a great degree the alarm felt with respect to the effect of the Bill, if it passed in its present state, had been greatly exaggerated.

LORD HOUGHTON regretted that the House of Commons had struck out the words "if required so to do." The condition of the monthly report was now made absolute. There would be no power in the police or any other authority to remit the supervision, and he would much rather the Bill were lost altogether, than that the words should remain as they now stood in the clause. He and those who thought with him in the matter were not open to the charge of disregarding the interests of society, for it was because they believed that the convict by the monthly supervision would be placed in such a condition as would make it impossible for him to regain the paths of honest labour, that their Amendment was proposed. He should not divide the House, but he felt certain the time would come when their Lordships would regret allowing the clause to stand in its present form.

THE EARL OF LICHFIELD objected very much to the indiscriminate application of the clause to all persons coming out of convict prisons. He thought there could be no doubt that it would put fresh obstacles in the way of ticket-of-leave men getting employment, while it would not secure the supervision which was exercised over that class in Ireland. Their Lordships ought to pause before introducing a system which could not be proved to have been successful in Ireland, and which had been entirely unsuccessful in France. He would rather see the Bill lost than introduce in it so clumsy a piece of legislation, under the name of police supervision.

On Question, Whether to insist? their Lordships *divided* :—Contents 25; Not-Contents 62: Majority 37.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

Commons' Amendment to Lords' Amendments *agreed to.*

CONTENTS.

Westminster, M.

Airlie, E.
Chichester, E.
Effingham, E.
Fortescue, E.
Harrowby, E.
Lichfield E. [*Teller.*]
Shaftesbury, E. [*Teller.*]
Verulam, E.

De Vesci, V.
Eversley, V.

Calthorpe, L.
Churchill, L.

Congleton, L.
Cranworth, L.
Dartrey, L. (*L. Cremorne*).
Ebury, L.
Houghton, L.
Leigh, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough*).
Portman, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford*).
Stratheden, L.
Taunton, L.
Vivian, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Westbury, L. (*L. Chancellor*).

Armagh, Achbp.

Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Manchester, D.
Somerset, D.

Bath, M.
Salisbury, M.

Caithness, E.
Carnarvon, E. [*Teller.*]
Clarendon, E.
De Grey, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry*).
Ducie, E.
Granville, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Lucan, E.
Manvers, E.
Morley, E.
Nelson, E.
Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Saint Germans, E.

Hawarden, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore*).
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster*).
Melville, V.
Sydney, V.

Cork, &c., Bp.

Oxford, Bp.

Abercromby, L.
Abinger, L.
Annaly, L.
Brougham and Vaux, L.
Camoys, L.
Chelmsford, L.
Clinton, L.
Colchester, L.
De Tabley, L.
Dinevor, L.
Dunsany, L.
Egerton, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Hamilton, L. (*L. Belhaven and Stenton*).
Harris, L.
Lismore, L. (*V. Lismore*).
Monson, L.
Mostyn, L.
Polwarth, L.
Redesdale, L.
Rivers, L.
Seaton, L.
Seymour, L. (*E. St. Maur*).
Sherborne, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll*).
Templemore, L.
Thurlow, L.
Tredegar, L.
Tyrone, L. (*M. Waterford*).
Wensleydale, L.
Wodehouse, L.
Wynford, L.

LORD BROUGHAM said, he had voted with the majority because he agreed entirely with the Commons, and wholly disapproved of the clauses as added by their Lordships after a previous decision against that clause; but that even had his opinion been different he should have voted with the majority, because a difference with the Commons must have lost the Bill.

PUBLIC AND REFRESHMENT HOUSES BILL—(No. 184.)

THIRD READING.

Bill read 3^a (according to Order).

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE objected to the principle of allowing the local bodies of the different towns to adopt the Act if they so pleased, and moved an Amendment rendering the Act compulsory upon all places to which the Act could extend.

Clause 2 (Limits of Act).

Moved to leave out "such" and insert "within the limits of."

Earl GRANVILLE said, that the principle of granting to municipal and governing bodies such an optional power as that contemplated by the Act was not new. In this case he believed such a provision to be necessary, because the circumstances of the metropolis were so different from those of most other places.

On Question, That the word proposed to be left out, stand part of the Bill? their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 44; Not-Contents 33: Majority 11.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

Bill *passed,* and sent to the Commons.

CONTENTS.

Westbury, L. (*L. Chancellor*).

Armagh, Archbp.

Somerset, D.

Airlie, E.
Caithness, E.
Chichester, E.
De Grey, E.
Effingham, E.
Fortescue, E.
Granville, E.
Lichfield, E.
Morley, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Shaftesbury, E.

Eversley, V.
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster*).
Sydney, V.

Cork, &c., Bp.
Down, &c., Bp.

Abercromby, L.
Camoys, L.

Churchill, L.
Cranworth, L.
Dartrey, L. (*L. Cremorne*).
De Tabley, L.
Ebury, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Hamilton, L. (*L. Belhaven and Stenton*).
Harris, L.
Houghton, L.
Leigh, L.
Lismore, L. (*V. Lismore*).
Monson, L.
Mostyn, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough*). [*Teller.*]
Rivers, L.
Seaton, L.
Seymour, L. (*E. St. Maur*).
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stratheden, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll*).
Taunton, L.
Vivian, L.
Wodehouse, L.

Lord Brougham

NOT-CONTENTS.

Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Rutland, D.

Bath, M.
Salisbury, M.

Carnarvon, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry*).
Hardwicke, E.
Harrowby, E.
Nelson, E.
Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Verulam, E.

De Vesci, V.
Hawarden, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore*). [*Teller.*]

Melville, V.

Oxford, Bp.

Abinger, L.
Chelmsford, L.
Colchester, L.
Dinevor, L.
Dunsany, L.
Egerton, L. [*Teller.*]
Polwarth, L.
Portman, L.
Redesdale, L.
Sherborne, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford*).
Thurlow, L.
Tredegar, L.
Tyrone, L. (*M. Waterford*).
Wensleydale, L.
Wynford, L

FACTORY ACTS EXTENSION BILL.

(No. 176.) COMMITTEE.

Moved, "That the House be put into a Committee on the said Bill."—(*The Lord President.*)

The Earl of SHAFTESBURY hoped the Bill was only the precursor of a series of measures the effect of which would be to confer the greatest possible benefits upon the country. The feeling upon the question of the restriction of labour had of late years undergone a remarkable change, and those most affected by the passing of such measures had at length come to perceive the great advantages which would arise from the extension of the half-time system. The result of the present measure would be to relieve 100,000 children and young people, to whom the law had hitherto brought no protection, from the excessive demand which was made upon them for their labour. He would remind their Lordships that the workpeople of the country were well deserving of any protection which Parliament might be the means of affording them. During the late cotton famine in Lancashire there had not been heard a word of sedition or Jacobinism. They felt that they were suffering from a visitation of Providence, and many of them had lately reminded him of their prophecies, that if the Factory Bill passed there would be no more sedition in the manufacturing districts. It had not been necessary to increase the military by a single man in the distressed districts. The people were their own police, and this tranquillity was owing, to a great extent, to the action of

Parliament in removing the grievances under which they had formerly laboured. Mr. Baker, the intelligent Inspector of Factories, stated, in 1859, the advantages which the change had brought about. Mr. Baker said—

> "I have thus given you not only the result of my own experience but the local testimony of gentlemen who weekly visit mills, which employ in the aggregate upwards of 70,000 persons, of whom upwards of 40,000 are females and 4,500 are children, and who all testify to the same fact, namely, the almost entire disappearance of deformity and the non-appearance of any other disease specific to factory labour. And it is exceedingly gratifying to find that an experiment, which had many opponents when it was about to be tried, has been productive of such great benefit to the working classes, without I believe an atom of either personal, commercial, or national wrong. I venture to make this latter statement on three grounds :—1. Because, although the hours of work have been very much diminished, wages have increased in some cases as much as 40 per cent, and generally about 12 per cent, and therefore the means of providing home comforts by the people have been multiplied. 2. Because it has not diminished any kind of textile production, and therefore it has not injured our national prosperity. Our exports of manufactures in 1844 and 1858 show this in a remarkable manner :
>
> | Value of exports in | 1844 | 1858 |
> |---|---|---|
> | Total cotton manufactures ... ... | £18,814,869 | £33,421,843 |
> | Total ... ... | 37,767,890 | 51,998,927 |
> | Increase ... | £14,231,037 | |
>
> 3. Because the people are neither less moral nor less intellectual by the leisure which it has afforded them. In support of this view I appeal to the living and flourishing institutes for intellectual improvement, to the lectures, to the musical meetings, to the allotment gardens, and to all the other sources of pleasure and profit which are now to be found, not only in the towns, but almost in every hamlet of these factory districts; sources of refinement and civilization which only take their date from the possession of the privileges which restricted labour conferred upon the people : I mean the Saturday afternoon, of itself one of the greatest blessings ever conferred upon them, and the certainty of knowing when the master's time ends and their own time begins."

He trusted their Lordships would pass the Bill through Committee.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY was understood to suggest that the trades of lucifer match makers and percussion cap makers be struck out of the schedule of the Bill.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY said, these were two of the most horrible trades in the schedule. The operatives employed in making lucifer matches were liable to some hideous forms of jaw disease, and the manufacture of percussion caps was carried on in the majority of cases by women and children of tender age. It made all the difference to those employed in these trades whether they left work at six or eight o'clock in the evening. The latter was an addition of two hours' toil at the end of the day, and carried on moreover in rooms heated by gas and filled with bad air. He wished the noble Earl would go to these factories and hear from the persons employed the effect of these two hours additional work upon their health and morals. Half the evils to which these young persons were exposed arose from their being detained from home until a late hour in the evening. The only domestic life which persons employed in factory labour could enjoy was in the evening. In the morning they had to hurry over their work, and it was only in the evening that their social enjoyments were obtained, when they met together over the family tea and passed the evening together. There was no one boon obtained by the Factory Act which had produced a more joyous effect upon the hearts of the operatives than the fact of their labours terminating at six o'clock.

House in Committee.

Bill *reported*, without Amendment ; and to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*

NEW GOVERNMENT OFFICES.

QUESTION.

LORD REDESDALE rose to draw attention to the line of frontage of the new Government Offices in Downing Street and King Street, and to ask whether it is the intention to purchase property in that neighbourhood for other offices, and for the improvement of the approach to the Houses of Parliament? For many years he had endeavoured to enforce upon the Government the importance of purchasing the property between Great George Street, Parliament Street, and the new Foreign Office, because it was utterly impossible to carry out all the necessary improvements without possessing more space than the Government at present had. More than that—no person, he was sure, could be satisfied with the present approach to the Houses of Parliament. Parliament Street was utterly inadequate to the traffic which passed through it, and King Street was a wretched narrow thoroughfare. Another circumstance was that the improvements which were being effected by Government in that locality produced this consequence, that every day the surrounding property became more valuable. The purchase of the property would not have caused any great expenditure if it had taken place some years ago, or even if it took place now, because there was no necessity for immediate occupation by the Government; and if the freehold interest were acquired the tradesmen and others might remain in possession until the property was actually wanted. Another circumstance to which he wished to draw attention was this—if any one of their Lordships walked down Whitehall he would see that the new building was not upon the same line of frontage as the building in which the Privy Council Office was; and how any good architectural effect could be produced by having the two buildings upon different lines of frontage he could not conceive. He desired to ask whether King Street was to be widened, or were the new buildings to be placed in the existing narrow street? It would be monstrous to have such buildings in so narrow a street, where it would be impossible to allow a carriage to stop at the door for fear of blocking the thoroughfare. If, on the other hand, they widened King Street, they would by so doing improve the value of the property on the other side of it, and this they must eventually purchase if they wished to widen Parliament Street. In Charles Street they had pulled down the houses on one side, and were building there a very fine elevation against one of the nastiest and shabbiest streets in Westminster, and were of course improving the value of the houses opposite. Every house, also, of which the lease fell in, or which wanted repair, was so improved as to render it much more expensive to buy. Since he had first brought the matter before their Lordships as many as from twenty to thirty houses in the locality had been rebuilt. In the new building the line of Charles Street had been taken; and the consequence is that the two sides of Downing Street will not be parallel, but run into each other like a wedge, and on the parade the new building would not be at right angles with the Horse Guards. He thought that it was most unfortunate that this should be so.

Earl GRANVILLE was understood to say that he agreed to a great extent with the noble Lord. The Department of the Government which had the matter in hand were of opinion that it would be necessary to purchase all the houses in Charles Street, in order to provide anything like a decent approach to the Houses of Parliament and the other handsome buildings which there would be in the neighbourhood. The cost of this purchase was estimated at £300,000. With regard to the new building not being rectangular with the existing buildings, the same thing existed in regard to some of the finest structures in Europe, and he believed that the architectural arrangement would be such that no defect would be observed.

House adjourned at a quarter past
Seven o'clock, till To-morrow,
half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, July 14, 1864.

MINUTES.] — New Member Sworn — Sir Michael Edward Hicks Beach, Bart., *for* Gloucester County (Eastern Division).

Select Committee—Standing Orders Revision *appointed* (*List of the Committee*).

Report—Sewage (Metropolis)* [No. 487].

Supply — *considered in Committee*—Civil Service Estimates.

Ways and Means—*considered in Committee*.

Public Bills — *Resolutions in Committee*—Improvement of Land Act (1864) [Stamps].*

Ordered—Bank Post Bills (Ireland).*

First Reading—Facilities for Divine Service in Collegiate Schools * [Bill 208] (*Lords*); Clerks of the Peace Removal * [Bill 209] (*Lords*); Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment* [Bill 210] (*Lords*).

Second Reading—New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan) [Bill 150]; Bank Notes, &c., Signatures * [Bill 206]; Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex)* [Bill 203].

Committee—Bleaching and Dyeing Works Act Extension * [Bill 181]; Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* [Bill 194]; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements * [Bill 196]; Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal * [Bill 197]; Militia Pay *; Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands) (*re-committed*)* [Bill 200]; Harwich Harbour Act Amendment * [Bill 171]; Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland) * [Bill 164]; Mortgage Debentures * [Bill 169] (*Lords*) (Debate *further adjourned*); Registration of Deeds (Ireland) * [Bill 176]; Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. (*re-committed*)* [Bill 199].

Report — Bleaching and Dyeing Works Act Extension * [Bill 181]; Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* [Bill 194]; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements * [Bill 196]; Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal * [Bill 197]; Militia Pay *; Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* [Bill 200]; Harwich Harbour Act Amendment * [Bill 171]; Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* [Bill 164]; Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* [Bill 176]; Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. (*re-committed*)* [Bill 199].

Third Reading—Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans)* [Bill 191]; Highways Act Amendment * [Bill 177]; Expiring Laws Continuance * [Bill 193]; Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment * [Bill 185]; Militia Ballots Suspension *; Naval and Victualling Stores * [Bill 178] (*Lords*).

Withdrawn — Courts of Justice Money * [Bill 188]; Gaols (*re-committed*) * [Bill 180].

STANDING ORDERS REVISION.

COMMITTEE MOVED FOR.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN, in moving the appointment of a Select Committee to revise the Standing Orders, said, that what he desired was the appointment of a Committee of experienced Members to consider certain alterations in the Standing Orders, which he believed would tend to the better conduct of the private business of the House, diminish expense, and shorten the time which was to be devoted by Members to attendance on Private Bill Committees. If it should succeed in the latter object only, it would confer an immense boon on the Members of the House. The private business of the House had been continuously increasing of late years, until a difficulty was experienced in finding a sufficiency of Members to attend to it. During the present Session they had had to consider and decide on no less than 505 Private Bills. All these were not opposed; but in consequence of their mere number it was impossible to go through them properly, so as to enable the other House of Parliament to consider them equally with the House of Commons. Arrangements had been adopted by which the vast number of Railway Bills introduced into the House every Session were classified into groups, and the Committees were appointed by the Committee of Selection, and were presided over by an experienced Member taken from the "Chairmen's Panel." Few duties were more creditable to Members of that House than those which were discharged by those Gentlemen who devoted themselves to the business of presiding over Railway Committees; but the disadvantage attending the present system was that it was necessary to place a great number of Bills before the same tribunal, and thus many parties promoting Private Bills had to wait from an early period of the Session until the time came for their case to be considered; and then to find that they could not be passed through this House until it was so late as to preclude the possibility of their going before the House of Lords. Two cases which occurred during the present Session afforded a strong illustration of the inconvenience which might sometimes result from this arrangement, for two Railway Bills (the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway Company Bill, and the Cannock Chase and Wolverhampton Railway Company Bill), which were ready to be proceeded with on the 1st of April, could not be taken into consideration until other Bills preceding them in the list were disposed of, and their turn did not come on until the Standing Orders of the House of Lords came into play, and prevented the second reading of the Bills in that House. Thus the whole time and expense of the parties were thrown away. This was no fault of theirs, nor did he throw any blame on the Standing Order of the House of Lords, for the other House had a right to claim due time for the consideration of Bills brought before it; but it was a hardship which the House of Commons should prevent if possible. Some time ago the noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Lord Robert Cecil) proposed a Resolution to the effect that it was desirable in Private Bill legislation to disentangle the facts of the case from the merits, and to submit the investigation of the facts to a tribunal exterior to that House. The noble Lord, however, withdrew the Resolution, as the House appeared unwilling to part with the jurisdiction. Nevertheless, many Members were convinced that it was desirable to disentangle the facts from the merits of a Bill, provided the investigation was not conducted by a body beyond the walls of that House; and, since that time, several Members had met together and considered whether it would not be possible to accomplish the object to a certain extent. After considerable consultation, though they were not able to effect the object to a great extent, they thought they might propose a plan which to a slight extent would disentangle the facts from the merits. What they proposed was—

> "1. The Chairman of Ways and Means and three persons to be appointed by the Speaker, and to hold office during his pleasure, of whom one shall be an engineer officer, to be Referees on Private Bills; two of the Referees to be a quorum. The salaries of the three appointed Referees to be fixed by the Fee Fund Commissioners of the House. 2. The Referees to hold sittings in some Committee-room of the House; all their proceedings and practice to be regulated and subject to be altered by the Chairman of Ways and Means; such regulations to be laid on the table of the House. 3. The Referees to inquire into, take evidence, and hear counsel and agents upon such matters of fact requiring investigation as are from time to time referred to them. When inquiry completed, the Referees to make a Report to the House, such Report to stand referred to the Select Committee on the Bill; and no further evidence to be taken upon the facts reported on, unless the House shall otherwise order."

Then came the question, what were the facts which might be submitted to these Referees; and it was thought that the following facts might very well be separated from the consideration of the merits and referred to the Referees:—

> "First, in Bills authorizing the construction of works, the engineering character of the undertaking, the efficiency and fitness of the works for the proposed objects, and the sufficiency of the estimate; second, in Bills for authorizing new lines of railway, the nature and amount of the traffic proposed to be accommodated; third, in Waterworks Bills, the nature of the proposed source of supply, the quality of the water, the sufficiency of the supply for the wants of the district, and the provisions as to reservoirs; fourth, in Gas Bills, the quality of the gas, the cost of production, and the tests of purity and illuminating power, &c.
>
> 4. In addition to the matters regularly referred to the Referees upon each class of Bills, according to Standing Order, the Committee on any Bill to be empowered, with the approval of the Chairman of Ways and Means, to refer any question of fact arising in the course of their inquiry, which they may think suitable, to the Referees for their opinion, in the shape of a case stated in writing, and signed by the Chairman of the Committee. The Referees, after inquiry, to certify their conclusion to the Committee.
>
> 5. All questions of *locus standi* of petitioners to be referred to and decided by the Referees previously to the sitting of the Committee on the Bill."

With regard to the second suggestion, the case was thought to be more difficult, and it would possibly require some little consideration before its adoption; and he proposed that the Committee to which the consideration of his suggestions should be referred should not adopt it unless it were clearly made out that those facts could be ascertained without interfering with the consideration of the merits. With regard to the fourth suggestion, the matters there referred to were facts and not merits, and private interests could not be injured by those facts being ascertained out of the Committee on the Bill. With regard to the question of *locus standi*, that was a matter which had sometimes occupied Private Committees for several days, and it was believed that if some rules were laid down to regulate and decide the practice with respect to *locus standi*, a very great benefit would be done to all parties. The only objection to that part of his proposals was, that some persons connected with Railway Companies said they would prefer that all questions of *locus standi* should be referred to the Chairman of Ways and Means on all occasions. In a Committee appointed last Session his noble Friend the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley) proposed that Committees on Private Bills should for the future consist of only three Members. There was a great deal to be said on behalf of that suggestion, which he believed found favour with many Members; but on consideration they had come to the conclusion that it would not be advisable. That did not arise from any want of confidence in that number of Members; but everybody who was acquainted with the practical working of Committees knew that illness, applications for leave of absence, and a number of other things occurred to take Members away in the middle of an investigation. Committees reduced to three each would be too small to deal satisfactorily with the vast interests which would come before them, and such a change might possibly diminish the confidence of the public in these tribunals. It appeared, however, to those who had considered the matter with him, that they might reduce the number from five to four, which would give the Chairman a casting vote. At present Chairmen were all selected because they were believed to be the most competent Members of the House for conducting such investigations; and it would not, therefore, be too much on questions of difficulty and doubt to give them a double vote. These proposals were submitted to the House with the greatest possible diffidence, with the object of saving the time of Members, which was taxed too severely by the increasing amount of business which came before them. He might claim, at least, one merit for the scheme—that it was very simple; and if it failed they had nothing to do but, to use a common phrase, "smash it up," and nobody would be injured. If it led to increased expenses, as some apprehended, or if it did not work well in any other respect, Mr. Speaker could draw his pen through the Standing Orders on the subject, and promoters of Private Bills would still have the old tribunal to which they could submit their projects. When the Resolution to appoint a Committee was agreed to, he would move the next Resolution, which stated simply that it was desirable to do so and so. If any Member had any suggestions to make, he and those who were acting with him would be ready to consider it, with every desire to meet the wishes and suit the convenience of the House.

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to revise the Standing Orders." —(*Colonel Wilson Patten.*)

SIR JOHN SHELLEY said, the House

must feel much indebted to the hon. and gallant Member and those who had considered the matter with him for the trouble they had taken. They were all anxious to shorten the labours of Private Bill Committees as much as they could, not merely from selfish and personal motives, but in order to spare suitors the heavy expenses which were involved in a protracted investigation. With all deference to his hon. and gallant Friend opposite, he thought the proposals he had made were of too important a character to be affirmed at once, and that it would be desirable to allow further time for their consideration. He had not a word to say against any of the Gentlemen who were nominated for the Committee, but he was of opinion that it would be advisable to add to it some others who paid a great deal of attention to the matter, and perhaps held different views from the hon. and gallant Member. He therefore gave notice that to-morrow he would move that the hon. Baronet the Member for Evesham (Sir Henry Willoughby) and the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) should be added to the Committee. There were other questions connected with the Standing Orders besides those which had been referred to, which it would be well that the Committee should consider. For example, there was great perplexity as to what was a Public, what a Private, and what a "hybrid" Bill, and a great deal of confusion had been caused thereby.

SIR LAWRENCE PALK said, he desired to call attention to an evil which had very greatly increased of late years —the number of witnesses who were called by counsel before the Committees to speak to the same facts. There seemed to be no limit to this practice. It was in vain that the Chairman told counsel that the Committee had had sufficent evidence on the point before them. The regular reply was, "Oh! you must not take the conduct of our case out of our hands. We do not know what objections the other side may make, and it is necessary for you to listen to all the evidence we deem it necessary to adduce." The consequence was that the proceedings of Committees were spun out to a great length by superfluous testimony, in order to suit the convenience of counsel, or perhaps of the parties in the case, who desired to have the opportunity of making private arrangements outside the Committee-room. He suggested that at the commencement of the inquiry a list of witnesses should be furnished to the Chairman, with a note of the points on which they were going to give evidence, so that a selection might, if necessary, be made.

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON said, he had had an opportunity of hearing the opinions of gentlemen connected with some of the great Railway Companies, who furnished, perhaps, the largest amount of work for Private Bill Committees, and could state that the proposals of the hon. and gallant Member were received by them with every desire to give them a fair trial. They felt many of the evils which had been pointed out, and had great confidence in the hon. and gallant Gentleman and those who acted with him. He believed there was among experienced persons some doubt as to whether the Referees could possibly overtake the amount of work that would be imposed on them. When they considered the various branches of inquiry in each case, and the discussions of counsel, they would see that the labours of the Referees would be very heavy and comprehensive. It was to be hoped, however, that by their uniformity of practice, and by the authority which would belong to them, they might shorten the form of procedure which would be a great benefit not only to the House but to all concerned.

MR. AYRTON said, the hon. and gallant Member for North Lancashire proposed that three persons, in addition to the Chairman of Ways and Means, should be appointed Referees, one of whom was to be an engineer officer; he wished to ask whether the other Referees were to be Members of the House, and to have the power of out-voting the Chairman of Ways and Means? He also suggested that the House should not affirm the proposals absolutely, but should adopt them as an Instruction to the Select Committee to consider these points.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, he had moved the Resolutions only with the view which the hon. and learned Member had expressed. The appointment of the Referees would be in the hands of the Speaker, and the tribunal would, no doubt, consist of the Chairman of Ways and Means, who would preside, assisted by the Speaker's Counsel, an engineer, and two other individuals.

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, he thought

the suggestion of the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets worthy of consideration. It would be better to move the Resolutions as an Instruction to the Committee, and not to pledge the House to the plan proposed in them. He believed they were all prepared to give a fair trial to the new proposal as an experiment. He was quite prepared to see this experiment carried out; but he thought it ought to be understood, that if the Board of Referees should fail, Parliament should be at liberty to put an end to their labours, so that they might not become a vested interest and entail a permanent charge upon the public. There ought to be a clear understanding upon that point. With regard to the duties of the Board, he was not sanguine, unless they had some final authority, that they would save the House or the promoters of private legislation either labour or expense; because if, when the Parliamentary Board of Referees found certain facts, those facts were afterwards to be contested, and if persons were to be at liberty to come to the House and move that such facts should be investigated by the Select Committee upon the Bill, the House would have done nothing more by this Resolution than was attempted years ago under the Preliminary Inquiry Act, and would only be adding one stage more to the inquiry upon Private Bills. He thought the Board would have a great deal of work to do. If three Gentlemen, assisted by the Chairman of Ways and Means, were to investigate any considerable portion of the material facts which were now considered by Select Committees on Private Bills, in order to enable them to pass the preamble, he thought they would have very great labour thrown upon them, and he doubted whether one such Committee would be able to get through the work. His hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Wilson Patten) submitted his plan to the Committee on Private Bill legislation last Session. The Committee did not condemn it, but took a favourable view of it, and in their Report they stated that if the facts could be found by any Board such as that with which the hon. and gallant Gentleman was connected, they would no doubt be useful to the Select Committees of the House. There would, however, be considerable difficulty in laying down what were the material facts to be found by a Board such as his hon. and gallant Friend proposed, and what were to be the guiding facts to enable Committees to come to a conclusion upon the preamble of a Private Bill. Counsel would have to be heard before the Board of Referees, and arguments would also be urged as to the bearing of the facts upon the preamble of a Bill. He had no wish to prejudge the case, but he had merely mentioned these circumstances as matters of difficulty which were likely to arise.

Mr. RICHARD HODGSON said, he understood that it would be the duty of the Committee to make a Report upon the various questions which were submitted to them, and in that respect the scheme would work well. There was, however, one point upon which he entertained considerable doubt—namely, whether counsel ought to be heard before the Referees. If counsel were to be heard before the Referees it would institute a kind of double inquiry, as counsel would almost in every case endeavour to resuscitate before the Committee the arguments which they had raised before the Referees. He also doubted the propriety of having four Referees instead of three. Some time ago certain Resolutions in reference to Railway Bills were passed by the House, and referred to the Committee of which the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley) was chairman. They related to traffic arrangements of a very important nature; some of them gave general powers for amalgamation, and others related to the power of Railway Companies to set up steamboats. Up to the present time those clauses had not been considered, and he hoped that the Committee about to be appointed would take them into consideration.

Mr. WHALLEY thought that no satisfactory result would be arrived at until competition ceased to be recognized as a ground of opposition to new schemes. If it were refused to be recognized, a very proper limit would be imposed on the power of the great companies. He thought that the appointment of four Referees instead of three would jeopardize the character of the Private Bill legislation, by placing more power than was necessary in the hands of the Chairman. He had no wish to accuse the Chairman of Private Bill Committees of partiality; but it was notorious that one Chairman took a view upon a particular question entirely opposed to that taken by another, and it was a matter of constant difficulty for the promoters of Railway Bills to know upon what rule or principle they were to be treated. The question of competition, as a ground of opposition, ought to be settled at once, and if it was to be disallowed hereafter all this machinery would become unnecessary, and railway business would be conducted with much greater facility.

LORD STANLEY said, he rose chiefly in consequence of the appeal which had been made to him by his hon. Friend (Mr. R. Hodgson) in reference to certain clauses which his hon. Friend had obtained the consent of the House to refer to the Committee on Railway Bills. Unfortunately, up to the present time, that Committee had been unable to take those clauses into their consideration. Their excuse must be that every Member of it had been occupied in presiding over some one of the Committees sitting on Private Bills. He thought the more convenient course would be that that matter, as well as the other subjects for consideration, should be referred to the Committee on Standing Orders about to meet. With regard to the plan of his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Wilson Patten), in one part of it he cordially concurred —namely, the proposed reduction in the number of Members on Private Bill Committees from five to four. He had himself last year proposed a still further reduction, feeling sure that three Members in such cases would act under a greater sense of responsibility than a larger number. As to the possibility of one of the Members being taken ill and additional power being thereby thrown into the hands of the Chairman, it would be recollected that when he made his proposition he coupled it with a proviso that no Member should be required to serve more than ten days on a Private Bill Committee, except to finish the hearing of a case that had been actually begun. Under such an arrangement he believed that little or no practical inconvenience would result from smaller Committees. As to the adoption of some rule to prevent a multiplicity of witnesses being called to establish the same point, he thought the Committee had ample power now, and, if a Chairman knew his duties, it was not necessary that there should be any such rule of the House, for it was easy to intimate to counsel when sufficient proof had been adduced on a particular point. There was not, as a rule, according to his experience, any intentional waste of time by counsel. The leading counsel of the Parliamentary Bar were men of high position and reputation. They had little or nothing to gain personally by lengthening out these inquiries; and whenever there had been a waste of time in one of these Committees he had noticed that it generally arose from the over-zeal of some junior, who, in the absence of his leader, feared to pass over a single point. The real remedy for the length of time over which these inquiries occasionally dragged would be this:—He should like to see the Members serving for a shorter period than they did at the present, but, at the same time, for a greater number of hours at each sitting. The real waste of time lay in the fact that they did not get more than three-and-a-half hours of absolute work from each sitting; and every one, he thought, would agree that in two days of six hours each they would get through a great deal more than in three days with four hours each. If the number of sittings were reduced as he suggested, there would be no great hardship in lengthening the number of hours. With respect to the plan for instituting Referees, the House ought to look upon it as an experiment to which they should, indeed, give fair play, but to the success of which they were in no way committed. He thought there would be a difficulty in defining the exact duties of the Referees, and if there were to be an appeal from their decision, they would be introducing additional delay and expense. On the other hand, if the Referees had an independent jurisdiction to decide a certain class of questions, he foresaw that there would be a good many complicated questions arising as to what points should be sent before the Referees and what points should be decided by the Committees. These difficulties, however, need not prevent their giving the proposal a fair trial. One of the questions which the Select Committee might consider with great advantage was the awkward and perplexing question as to *locus standi.* This question ought to be subjected to some more definite and stricter rule than at present, and in that respect his hon. and gallant Friend's plan might work well. If adopted, it should, he thought, be adopted only for a limited period, and should expire of itself unless renewed by the House. The House should insist on seeing in some detail what was to be the definition of the duties of these Referees, the class of questions which were to be submitted to them, and the extent of their power to deal with them. Subject to those reservations, he believed that the plan of his hon. and gallant Friend deserved the sanction of the House.

LORD EDWARD HOWARD desired to point out the great hardship to which private individuals were often exposed by being dragged to London at great expense in order to appear sometimes year after year before the Committees of that House on Private Bills. It was believed that railway schemes were sometimes got up as mere speculations by one or two persons, who would themselves be very sorry to see their Bills become law. These proceedings, however, entailed on private individuals, often of very small means, the necessity of defending their rights in Parliament; and he would, therefore, suggest that the Committee should be empowered to take into consideration the propriety of giving compensation to owners of property who were put to the expense and trouble of opposing these projects.

Lord ROBERT CECIL thought the suggestion of the noble Lord well deserving the serious consideration of the House. The hardship inflicted on private individuals by railway projectors compelling them to go before that House at a gigantic expense ought not to be suffered to continue. The remedy for that was very easy. There was no other tribunal in the kingdom which was not armed with the power of mulcting in costs those who inflicted, for frivolous and vexatious reasons, heavy expense on their opponents; yet all attempts to arm Parliament with that power had hitherto been made in vain. So intense was the contempt which the House entertained for the tribunals which it persisted in maintaining that it would not arm it with one of the most rudimentary functions of a tribunal. The House placed in its hands the power to dispose of enormous sums of money, and gave it a jurisdiction over gigantic interests; but when it came to the question of inflicting costs, either on those who promoted foolish schemes or who set up a frivolous defence, it was said, "Oh, the constitution of this tribunal is so peculiar that you can't invest it with authority to do that!" Their reluctance to give that authority to these Committees was, to his mind, the most damaging condemnation of the whole system which it would be possible to pronounce. Among the other useful reforms which the hon. and gallant Gentleman had undertaken in that system, he trusted that he would turn his mind to this, which was, on the whole, the greatest grievance of all. He therefore concurred with all the hon. and gallant Gentleman's proposals, and he hoped they would be effectually carried out, for he was sure the good they would do would be great.

Sir FRANCIS GOLDSMID pointed out the difficulty that would arise from having to divide subjects into two parts—one, that of matters of fact for the decision of the Referees; the other, the points which were to be left for the decision of the Committee. If the report of the Referees were final, how was it to be supposed that it would be better than that of the Committee itself? But if, on the other hand, the report was not final, he thought the evil would be increased instead of diminished. If the Referees did not possess an independent and final jurisdiction, the scheme would only lead to a prolongation of the inquiries and additional expense.

Mr. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD wished to remind the House, that while they considered the rights of one class of persons they ought not to overlook the injustice to which the other class was exposed. No doubt these Railway Companies very often inflicted great hardship and injustice on individuals; but, on the other hand, individuals frequently inflicted great hardships and injustice on Railway Companies, because it was within the experience of all who served on Railway Committees, that very often a line was desired by a whole district, the great bulk of the landowners were favourable to the scheme proposed, but there might be some one landowner, perhaps occupying only two or three acres, who insisted on going into the whole question, and canvassing every fact connected with the engineering of the line forty or fifty miles distant. Now, if it was fair to give costs in one case, it would be but fair on the other hand that Railway Companies should be protected against such an abuse as that. A case had occurred not long ago, where arrangements being made with every landowner on the line except one small proprietor, he demanded nearly £100,000 for his piece of land, and the Committee having come to a decision adverse to his claim he offered to take £6,000, instead of £100,000, and ultimately the company were obliged to pay him a considerable sum of money in order to save the expense of his threatened renewal of a similar question in another place.

Mr. MASSEY said, that Committees being practically intrusted with interests of great magnitude, it seemed almost absurd that they should not have the power of deciding questions of subordinate importance. He thought it practicable to frame Resolutions which would render it perfectly safe and just to empower Committees to award costs. The Act conferred the power of awarding costs on Election Committees where the opposition to an hon. Member appeared to be frivolous and vexatious, and he had never heard that the exercise of that power had been complained of. He could not, therefore, see why they should withhold from Committees on Private Bills a similar discretion. They must all feel that the present mode of transacting the private business was not satisfactory to the parties, and not creditable to the House. As a great number of the plans propounded for its improvement had not found favour, he did trust that the scheme which had been sketched by his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for North Lancashire, who had so much experience in these matters, and which had been pronounced by those who had been consulted as feasible, would be considered with indulgence and tried as an experiment. He quite agreed that no vested interests would be created in favour of those who received appointments under this scheme. It was entirely an experiment. There were obvious difficulties connected with it, but these, he thought, were not insuperable. It was quite practicable to separate questions of fact from questions of opinion. Questions of fact and of Parliamentary inquiry not involving matters of policy, being settled as proposed by this scheme, would furnish the Committee with materials for deciding questions of policy. The difficulty was to draw the line without trenching on the final decision of the Committee on the merits. He hoped the House would have sufficient confidence in the Committee on Standing Orders to expect from it some matured scheme which, when laid on the table, would be ripe for the decision of the House, and that it would be received with at least that limited degree of confidence that the plan would be adopted as an experiment next Session.

MR. SCOURFIELD said, that a distinct recommendation with reference to the power of awarding costs had been adopted by the Committee which reported last week. It would be necessary, however, that an Act of Parliament should be passed on the subject if possible during the present Session.

MR. WALTER said, it appeared to him that the power of awarding costs ought to be adopted, if at all, with very great caution. It had been stated, indeed, that Election Committees possessed the power of awarding costs; but there appeared to be an essential distinction between an Election Committee and a Committee on a Private Bill. An Election Committee was more analogous to a court of law, in which a man had to maintain an existing right; but in a Private Bill Committee it was not an existing right that was to be maintained, but parties claimed a right to be given to them. There was a clear distinction between the two cases. Besides, he thought it would be a very invidious and difficult discretion to exercise for Committees to award costs in matters of that kind, where there was a trial of strength between two parties, and where both claimed the same right.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH hoped that during the recess some further progress would be made by the right hon. Gentleman, the President of the Board of Trade, in bringing about a satisfactory solution of the vexed question relative to the fees of Parliamentary counsel.

MR. PAULL wished to know whether the Referees would be Members of that House, and whether, in addition to the Chairman of Ways and Means, they would be paid?

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, no Members of the House would be paid. The Referees would not be Members of the House, and should be paid some salary; but it was quite understood that the scheme would be tried merely as an experiment, and if it failed no party could have any claim to compensation.

Motion *agreed to.*

Select Committee *appointed,* "to revise the Standing Orders:" — Mr. MASSEY, Lord STANLEY, Mr. EDWARD PLEYDELL BOUVERIE, and Mr. MILNER GIBSON, nominated Members of the said Committee.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Sotheron Estcourt be one other Member of the said Committee.

MR. SOTHERON ESTCOURT rose to request that he might not be placed upon the Committee. It appeared to him most desirable that all opinions upon the subject should be represented upon the Committee, and as he, having acted for some years with the hon. and gallant Chairman of the Standing Orders Committee (Colonel Wilson Patten), could not, perhaps, avoid looking at the matter in a somewhat routine light, he hoped the House would allow his name to be withdrawn. Notice had been given of a Motion to enlarge the Committee beyond the number of fifteen, and if that were agreed to, he trusted that the additional names would be chosen from among those Members who had not yet had an opportunity of serving upon the Standing Orders Committee. He thought that such a course would tend to strengthen any opinion which might be arrived at concerning an experiment which was well deserving a trial. It was quite time some steps were taken to relieve Members from a burden which greatly interfered with their power of giving due attention to public business. A striking instance of the severe pressure of the present system was afforded by the labours of the noble Lord near him (Lord Stanley), who, with an hon. Gentleman opposite, had been engaged every sitting day since the 12th of April.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Ingham, Mr. Edward Egerton, Mr. Scourfield, Mr. Hassard, Mr. Adair, Mr. Lowe, Colonel French, and Colonel Wilson Patten, nominated other Members of the said Committee:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Five to be the quorum.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN then moved that it be an Instruction to the Committee to consider whether

> "It is expedient that Referees should be constituted under the authority of this House for the more speedy and economical decision of certain questions of fact commonly arising in the proceedings upon Private Bills."

Motion *agreed to.*

Ordered,

That it be an Instruction to the Committee to consider the expediency of constituting Referees under the authority of this House for the more speedy and economical decision of certain questions of fact commonly arising in the proceedings upon Private Bills.—(*Colonel Wilson Patten.*)

CASE OF CAPTAIN DE BURGH.

QUESTION.

Mr. HANBURY said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether Captain De Burgh should be allowed to command the Uxbridge Yeomanry Cavalry when charges which are preferred against him are still unsettled; and whether the Order for the annual assembling of the Yeomanry can be countermanded until the matters pending be cleared up?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON, in reply, said, the form of the Question appeared to be calculated to give a somewhat erroneous impression of the facts of the case. It was quite true that some two or three years ago certain individuals did make complaints about Captain De Burgh. Those complaints were investigated by the Marquess of Salisbury the Lord Lieutenant of the county, and explanations were given which were satisfactory to the Lord Lieutenant and the late Sir George Lewis. It was also true that, within the last few months, further complaints were made by the same individuals, and these further complaints had been examined, and an explanation had been given, which was considered to be satisfactory by the Marquess of Salisbury, and Earl De Grey concurred in that opinion. It was, therefore, quite incorrect to say that the charges against Captain De Burgh were still unsettled. For that reason it was out of the question to postpone the annual assembly of the Yeomanry, and it did not appear to the Secretary of State that it would be necessary to take any further steps in the matter.

NAVY—CHAPLAIN GENERALSHIP OF THE NAVY.—QUESTION.

Mr. HANBURY TRACEY said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether, considering the great want felt amongst Naval Chaplains for a head of that department, it is the intention of the Admiralty to revive that part of the Order in Council of 4th March, 1812, which provided for the appointment of a Chaplain General to preside over the Chaplains of the Royal Navy in the same manner as is now practised in regard to Chaplains in the Army?

Lord CLARENCE PAGET said, in reply, that the question of appointing a Chaplain General of the Navy had been brought before the Committee upon Naval Promotion and Retirement, and evidence had been taken upon it. It was, however, felt, that although certain advantages might result from such an appointment, it would interfere with the discipline of the navy if the chaplains on board ships had to look to any other authority than the captains of their vessels.

COMMUNICATION WITH RAILWAY GUARDS.—QUESTION.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, as he understood that he had rather taken the President of the Board of Trade by surprise on a former evening, he would now beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman, Whether he will not reconsider the determination he then expressed; and whether, on the part of the Government, he will not give a promise that he would introduce next Session a Bill to make it compulsory upon Railway Companies to adopt some improved mode of communication between guards and passengers on their lines?

Mr. MILNER GIBSON said, in reply, that it appeared, in replying to the Question of his hon. Friend on a former evening, he had been understood as refusing to entertain the suggestion. He certainly had not intended to convey that impression. If the hon. Member wished him to promise that next Session he would introduce a Bill to compel Railway Companies to adopt some means of communication between guards and passengers, he must say that he could not at present see his way sufficiently clear to enable him to give such a promise. He admitted that it was not a pleasant thing to be shut up in a railway carriage without the means of summoning aid if it were needed. The recent outrages and murder clearly showed that the obtaining of this communication was much to be desired, but the difficulties of the question were so considerable that, although he was quite willing to consider any proposal which might be made, he must decline to give any promise to introduce a Bill on the subject.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, he wished to ask, Whether the right hon. Gentleman was not aware that all through the Continent, and in other places, there were means of communication which did not exist in this country between the passengers and the guards?

Mr. MILNER GIBSON said, he believed in some parts of the Continent there were such means of communication, but he was not at all sure that the construction of our railways or of the carriages running upon them would admit of the same arrangements.

THE NEW ZEALAND WAR.
QUESTION.

Sir MINTO FARQUHAR said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether any Despatches have been received by him that day relative to the late unfortunate battle in New Zealand?

Mr. CARDWELL: Sir, some despatches have been received to-day, and it was my intention on moving the first Order of the Day, the second reading of the New Zealand Loan Bill, to have stated to the House that they had been received, and that I should lose no time in placing them in the hands of Members. The principal despatch relates to the action at a place called Tauranga, in the northern Island, the telegram respecting which has already created so much anxiety and sorrow in this House and the country. As the whole of the despatches will shortly be in the hands of Members, perhaps it may be better that I should leave them to gather the story from the despatches themselves. I may, however, state that the repulse is attributed by that distinguished officer, General Cameron, to the intricate construction of the interior defences and to the confusion consequent upon the loss of so many officers at the moment of the assault. General Cameron uses these words—

> "Lieutenant Colonel Booth and Commander Hay, who led into the work, fell mortally wounded. Captain Hamilton was shot dead on the top of the parapet while in the act of encouraging his men to advance, and in a few minutes almost every officer of the column was either killed or wounded. Up to this moment the men, so nobly led by their officers, fought gallantly, and appeared to have carried the position, when they suddenly gave way and fell back from the work to the nearest cover. This repulse I am at a loss to explain otherwise than by attributing it to the confusion created among the men by the intricate nature of the interior defences and the sudden fall of so many of their officers. . . . The Natives, availing themselves of the darkness of the night, abandoned the work, leaving some of their killed and wounded behind. On taking possession of the work in the morning Lieutenant Colonel Booth and some men were found still living, and, to the credit of the Natives, had not been maltreated; nor had any of the bodies of the killed been mutilated. I enclose a list of our own casualties. I deeply deplore the loss of the many brave and valuable officers who fell in the noble discharge of their duty on this occasion. The 43rd Regiment and the service have sustained a serious loss in the death of Lieutenant Colonel Booth, which took place on the night after the attack. I have already mentioned the brilliant example shown by this officer in the assault; and when I met him on the following morning, as he was being carried out of the work, his first words were an expression of regret that he found it impossible to carry out my orders. The heroism and devotion of Captain Hamilton and Commander Hay reflect the highest honour on the naval service."

I am happy to say that the same papers contain an account of two other engagements in which the result was very different—the one on the same day in the immediate neighbourhood, and the other a most gallant exploit at Taranaki. I will lose no time, however, in placing the papers in the hands of hon. Members.

NEW ZEALAND (GUARANTEE OF LOAN) BILL—[Bill 150.]—SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Cardwell.*)

Mr. ARTHUR MILLS rose, pursuant to notice, to move that the Bill be read a second time that day three months. He had refrained from offering any opposition to the earlier stages of the measure, because he thought it fairer that the House should be in possession of all the papers on the subject; but now that the House was called upon to express an opinion upon the principle of the Bill, he was determined to give it all the resistance in his power. It would be admitted on all hands that the general principle of an Imperial guarantee for a colonial loan was objectionable. That was laid down by high authorities. It so happened that this was not the first time that a similar demand was made. In 1857 an Imperial guarantee was asked for a loan to New Zealand, and the House would forgive him if he read a few words which fell on that occasion from the late Sir James Graham. On the 6th of August, 1857, when it was proposed that the Imperial Parliament should guarantee a loan, Sir James Graham said—

> "I think the relations between the mother country and the colonies cannot be placed on a more insecure basis than that of creditor and debtor. Whatever aid is afforded to the colonies should, in my opinion, be in the nature of a grant, the reasons for which may be assigned, sifted, and debated in this House. I regard these dormant securities as dangerous, and I think the motto on the entablature of the Colonial Minister's official residence in Downing Street should be—
>
> "No lender be;
> "For loan oft loses both itself and friend."
>
> —[3 *Hansard*, cxlvii. 1135.]

He would ask whether the position of New Zealand in reference to the Imperial Government was materially altered now, in 1864, from what it was in 1857? It appeared to him that when the Imperial Parliament was asked to incur a fresh guarantee of £1,000,000 to the colony, it would be well that the House should be placed in possession of the liabilities it had already incurred; and fortunately the means of estimating the amount of liability which the Imperial Government was under during the current year were at hand. In 1859, which was a year of peace, we had 1,279 men of all arms in New Zealand, the cost of which to the taxpayers of this country, according to Returns which had been laid upon the table, was £104,850. Now it was a very simple rule-of-three sum to calculate what 11,000 men would cost in 1864 if 1,279 cost the United Kingdom £104,850 in 1859. The sum total, he apprehended, even supposing the commissariat expenses to be at the same rate now as then, would not be less than £1,000,000. But it so happened that the commissariat expenses now were nearly double. He had good authority for saying that they were more than £1,000 a day; that fact he gathered from the papers which had been laid upon the table of the House that morning. He would take the liberty of referring presently to a letter which had arrived from New Zealand, and which bore the signature of the Deputy Commissary General. The House had heard over and over again during the last few months, and it was repeated in a parrot-like manner by the press, that the war in New Zealand was virtually at an end. The Under Secretary for War in Committee of Supply on the Army Estimates proposed a reduction of the sum which originally appeared on the Estimates, on the ground that the Government had good reason for believing that the New Zealand war would be at an end in five months. He (Mr. A. Mills) thought at the time that was rather a sanguine estimate; but now he held in his hand a letter dated the 1st of April—a very appropriate day—and written by the Deputy Commissary General to the Under Secretary for War, in which it was stated that the Commander-in-Chief in New Zealand had been pleased to approve the proposal to prepare the ground for sowing the seed which was to produce forage for the Commissariat transport horses six months after the Under Secretary for War had stated his belief that the war would be at an end in five months. On the 27th of June a letter was written from the office of the Secretary of State for War, in which it is stated that Lord De Grey thought it expedient that the Commander-in-Chief should be fully informed of the increasing expense, and also of the fact that the war was likely to be prolonged under circumstances which would involve a large and increased expenditure. Now, the question which he would ask was whether, when the House was invited to guarantee a loan of £1,000,000, it was not right to inquire first as to the liability of Parliament in respect of the colony for the current year? He was prepared to state on good authority, that the taxpayers of England had to pay not less than £1,500,000 for the war now going on in New Zealand, and that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would next Session have to ask Parliament for that sum. Perhaps he might be told that there were inducements for the Imperial Parliament to guarantee the loan, and he found by the papers before the House that the inducements were, first, that the colony of New Zealand, or its agent in this country, engaged to pay back the sum of £500,000, which had been formerly lent, and which was to be a first charge on the new loan of £1,000,000—second, that a bargain was made by which the colony was bound to pay £40 for every soldier of the line, and £55 for every artilleryman sent to serve there, or about one-third of the cost to the mother country; and that the colony also undertook to expend £50,000 for Native purposes. If these were *bonâ fide* engagements, they might be well worth looking at; but there was not a syllable in the Bill alluding to those undertakings, and Mr. Reader Wood, the agent of the colony, the negotiator of this business at the Colonial Office, declared plainly and honestly that he had no power to bind the Legislature of New Zealand. So that, in fact, we had no security whatever that these engagements would be carried out. The question, therefore, presented itself whether Parliament would, under these circumstances, guarantee the proposed loan? He might be told that Sir George Grey, the Governor of New Zealand, recommended the loan. He did not wish to say a word in disparagement of one who might be a very able Governor—no doubt Sir George Grey discharged his duties efficiently—but he might perhaps be permitted to observe, without risk of contradiction from the Treasury Bench, that among Sir George Grey's qualifications might be enumerated a noble disregard of all considerations of economy. The revenue of New Zealand was represented by the Colonial Treasurer to be in a flourishing condition. It was stated to amount to £700,000 a year, nine-tenths of which were derived from Customs, and that it afforded an ample margin for the repayment of the loan. Then, if that were the case—if the colony were so overflowing with prosperity—why did not the colony go into the market and obtain the loan for itself? The question now was, not whether the mother country should tax the colonies, but whether the colonies should tax the mother country? Here was a colony with a revenue of £700,000, nine-tenths of which were derived from Customs, or, in other words, by the imposition of high duties on British manufactures, which jealously resented as an outrage the slightest attempt at Imperial interference, which possessed the fullest power of self-government, and yet which came to the Imperial Legislature asking for the credit of the Imperial Parliament in order to obtain a loan to carry on a war, as to the righteousness of which the people of this country had serious misgivings. He would not now allude to the great and fearful calamity which had occurred there, and the bereavement consequently felt in many a home in England; but he maintained that the proposed Bill involved this country in pecuniary engagements which the British taxpayers might have to discharge. Under these circumstances, the colony applied for the guarantee of this loan, and desired that no questions should be asked as to whether the object of the loan was not to enable the colonists to acquire as much land as they could, and to profit as much as possible by the expenditure on account of the war which was now being carried on. He was not there to apologize for the conduct of the Maories, or to say that serious outrages had not been perpetrated by them; but he contended that their conduct, whatever it might have been, had been grievously aggravated by the system carried on in the colony of allowing the Colonial Parliament to make a puppet of the representative of the Crown, and that the measures passed by the Colonial Legislature could have no other effect than that of stimulating the hatred of the Natives against us. It might be said that the colony was placed in very difficult circumstances, and that the entire adult population of Auckland had made stupendous sacrifices in this war. No doubt they had made great personal sacrifices; but as to pecuniary sacrifices, they had made none, while the effect of the war was to charge £1,500,000 upon the taxpayers of England. But it was argued, as a ground for guaranteeing this loan, that a certain old debt due to us from New Zealand was to be a first charge upon the money when raised. What, then, were the items which constituted this bad debt. The bad debt of New Zealand to this country arose from the non-fulfilment of the engagement to pay £5 per man annually for the troops employed in New Zealand, but of which sum they had never paid a farthing, and from debts of a similar character, and advances made for the pay of the local militia. The colony now admitted its liability for this half-million, and proposed that it should be a first charge upon the million they proposed to borrow on the Imperial guarantee. In regard to the debt, he would rather that England should say to the colony, "You say you cannot pay this debt, you sue in *formâ pauperis*, and we will make you a present of the money at once, wipe the slate clean, and start afresh." Instead of doing that, however, the Government proposed an Imperial guarantee for a loan of £1,000,000 to enable the colony to pay back a debt of £500,000. It seemed to him that that was very like throwing good money after bad. The other parts of the bargain, as to defences and so on, were mere moonshine, for the colonial agent acknowledged he had no power to bind the Legislature of New Zealand. He trusted that the House would not, in the teeth of the opinions of the soundest and most experienced financiers, sanction this request for an Imperial guarantee, the effect of which would be to throw fresh obligations on the already overburdened taxpayers of the mother country, to incur the risk of embarrassing our own resources, and the still further risk—which was to his mind a still more important consideration—of retarding the advance in self-reliance and national vigour which colonies could realize only when they were brought to the conviction that those who claimed the privileges and enjoyments of freedom, must share also the burdens and responsibilities which the blessings of liberty involved.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Arthur Mills.*)

Question, That the word "now" stand part of the Question.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he would not interfere with that which was the proper duty of his two right hon. Friends who were connected with the Colonial Department, but would confine himself to that portion of his hon. Friend's speech which related to the financial part of the question. The matter had, of course, been considered by the Government in a financial point of view, for they undoubtedly incurred a very serious responsibility when they asked Parliament to lend an Imperial guarantee for any undertaking, whether at home or abroad. He confessed he agreed entirely in the principles which his hon. Friend had laid down, but he ventured to challenge his minor premiss; indeed, he might even claim his assent to the principle of the Bill on the very ground he had alleged against it in the closing part of his speech. His hon. Friend laid down the proposition, which was not only true but of vital importance, that the inhabitants and the Legislatures of free colonies must learn self-reliance, and that the question of the present day had come to be, not whether the mother country should tax the colonies, but whether the colonies should tax the mother country: indeed, he might say that that had ceased to be a question, for England had been taxed very largely for the colonies for some length of time. His hon. Friend said it was their business in all the steps they took to endeavour to effect the amendment of that vicious system, and to teach the colonies that having the conduct of their own affairs they must take the responsibility of the results. He entirely agreed with those propositions, both as to their truth and importance, and he asked his hon. Friend to give the Government credit for having proposed the present measure in furtherance of those objects.

What was the case of the colony of New Zealand with regard to the general reasonableness of the loan? In the first instance the colony asked for a guarantee to the amount of £3,000,000; and the Government had consented to a guarantee of only £1,000,000, which was only about two-thirds of the sum guaranteed some years back, in the case of Canada in regard to public works. He mentioned this fact for the purpose of showing that it was not to be supposed that the pauperism of a colony constituted a ground for receiving a guarantee. Pauperism might, but he did not say it would, raise the question whether aid should be directly extended to a colony; but, plainly, it would not raise the question of an Imperial guarantee. It was absolutely the duty of the Government to propose no Imperial guarantee to a colony, unless they were perfectly convinced of the ability and disposition of the colony to pay its debt; and his right hon. Friend the Secretary for the

Colonies would show that there was not the slightest question as to the solvency of the colony. The Bill involved only a question of economy—of saving so much money to the colony. His hon. Friend (Mr. A. Mills) seemed to think that as the revenue of the colony was large there was something unreasonable in raising a portion of their expenditure by loan. But the revenue of a colony that had grown so rapidly as New Zealand had considerable demands on it even in time of peace. It was, however, war which had driven the colony to the necessity of a loan. He did not see how England could with justice throw the whole responsibility of the war on the colony. The policy which had led to the war had not been exclusively that of the colony. The Home Government had approved it, and were so far responsible for it. And what was the state of the case? For the first time in modern history, for the first time since the dissolution of the connection between the mother country and the American colonies, England had a colony which was paying a moiety, or at any rate a very large proportion, of the expenses of a war in which it was engaged. That, of itself, betokened an advance. What colony before had done as much? What, for instance, did the Cape of Good Hope ever contribute to the cost of the wars which were waged there? The reasonableness of meeting by a loan the charge of a war which imposed on the colonial exchequer a burden of hundreds of thousands of pounds was not *primâ facie* very seriously to be questioned. That, however, had nothing to do with the Home Government taking part in it. There were two inducements to them to do so—first, the repayment of the large debt already owing by the colony, and second, a matter which he considered of great importance—the great improvement they proposed to establish by a virtual compact with the colony for the future regulation of its military charges. The repayment of the £500,000 might not be a very great object in a fiscal point of view; but it would be a great political advantage. Every unsettled account between a colony and the mother country was in the nature of a political evil, because it tended to complicate and embarrass the relations between them. It might be said that the advance should never have been made; but that was not now the question, although he believed that it was granted on the responsibility of the Governor, who was the representative of England, under the pressure of what he deemed an overruling political necessity, connected with the lives and safety of the people, admitting of no delay and of no reference home. Well, this £500,000 was to be repaid to the Imperial Exchequer. [Mr. W. WILLIAMS: Hear, hear!] His hon. Friend cheered sceptically, but there was no doubt on the subject. The £1,000,000 borrowed would not be handed over to the colony with a request for £500,000 back again. The £500,000 would never leave this country at all, and would as soon as raised be paid into the Treasury. The remaining part of the question was, perhaps, of more importance. His hon. Friend remarked truly that, although there had been a great deal said about requiring colonial contributions to military expenses, very little had been done in that direction. No doubt £5 per head towards the expenses of an army which could not be maintained in New Zealand for less than £100 a head—he was not speaking with departmental authority, but that must be about the figure —was a payment in the nature of a mere pepper-corn rent. Two things were to be done. One was, that instead of the nominal contribution of £5 a head for the military expenditure, we were to require the real contribution of £40 a head; and the contribution of £40 a head was such a charge upon the colony that no colony would have any legitimate inducement to seek the multiplication of British troops when that was to be the rate they were to pay for them. Therefore this arrangement would be a matter of economy to us, because in reality it would be a check upon the disposition of the colony to call for troops; it would be a lesson to them in self-reliance and self-government, and it would go a great way towards rectifying the present distorted relations between the colonies and the mother country on this essential matter of military expenditure. The hon. Gentleman would no doubt say, "This is all very good upon paper, but will you get the £40?" That was a question upon which the House was perfectly at liberty to take its own course. It was in the power of the House to insist that this should be a substantial contract. The £500,000 was a case beyond recall; but with respect to the £40 a head, it was in their power to press on the Colonial Government, through the Secretary of State, whatever conditions or modes of proceeding they thought fit in order to secure that the compact with the colony should be carried out. As he understood the matter, a colonial Act must be passed before any proceeding could be taken to give effect to this guarantee. It was, therefore, in their power to require from the colony any declaration or instrument they might think fit, involving an assent to the principle and plan of future military contributions. Of course the great security was this—that the announcement would be formally made to Parliament. A despatch was on its way to New Zealand at this moment, declaring that on these conditions alone, with the exception of one single regiment, would the mother country consent to continue to supply troops for the defence of the colony. It was really as a question of reform in our colonial policy that it was important the subject should be entertained. If the House felt disposed to say, "We will not give this guarantee," he did not see how they could make a single step in extricating themselves from a false position. They had so far made a step that the colony was at this moment considerably charged; but they wished to make a further step in reference to all military expenditure, even whether war was or was not raging. They proposed to do it by means of this arrangement. They did not seek to give a guarantee without consideration, but they wished to give it in reference to prospective measures of legislation which were in contemplation.. At the same time, they were willing to receive suggestions from the House as to the best mode of obtaining securities that the guarantee should be placed on such a footing that it would form a road to lead us out of the system by which Great Britain was taxed for the benefit of the colonies, into a sound and wholesome system, by which the colonies should be required to bear the expenses of their own freedom, and be charged with the legitimate burdens of their own defence. These were generally the grounds on which the measure before the House was based.

Mr. WHITESIDE said, he wished to put a question to the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary before he rose to continue the debate. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that we were placed in a thoroughly false position in New Zealand; and he (Mr. Whiteside) wished to know whether the present war was carried on as the noble Lord at the head of the Government had said in reference to the Ashantee war—to maintain the honour of the country, or whether it was to maintain a policy capable of being explained or justified? On the 9th of December, the Governor of the colony in his despatches from Auckland declared the neck of this unhappy rebellion was broken, and that there was no probability of its becoming more general; yet immediately afterwards we received the most horrible details of fresh conflicts, and the consummation of those conflicts was what appeared in the papers that morning. A great number of despatches had been received from the Governor, but those from this country were few and singularly unimportant. There was, however, one upon which he wished to make an observation—namely, the despatch which touched upon what was called the land question. He had read the despatch of the Duke of Newcastle upon that subject, and he should be glad to learn from the Colonial Secretary what was the exact theory of what was called the land question. In a despatch dated the 26th of November, 1863, the Duke of Newcastle discussed a proposal sent to him from the colony as to what was to be done with the land of the Natives, the proposal being to assign the land of the Maories to a large body of settlers on a species of military tenure. The noble Duke said that he did not disapprove the principle of the measure, as he thought that any body of Natives who had been in arms against Her Majesty on such grounds as those which had been alleged were properly punishable by the confiscation of a large part of their common property. There was, he said, no objection to their being used as sites for military settlements; and then he added—

> "Since it is probable that the Natives of those districts, unlike those in the Cape Colony and Kaffraria, will soon become an unimportant minority of the inhabitants."

The noble Duke probably meant by that, that in the process of time all the Native inhabitants would be killed off. The noble Duke went on to say that, while he acquiesced generally in the principles which had guided the colony, he thought the application of those principles was a matter of great danger and delicacy. The noble Duke then declared that for all that was done the Colonial Government must remain responsible—thus shifting the responsibility of confiscating the land to the Colonial Government abroad, which was a most convenient way of evading the question. The despatch proceeded to say that it would be very difficult to control within just limits that eagerness for the acquisition of land which the announcement of an extensive confiscation was likely to stimulate among the old and new settlers, and which, if uncontrolled, might lead to great oppression. Throughout the whole of the despatches the land dispute was repeatedly referred to, and he (Mr. Whiteside) was anxious to obtain from the Colonial Secretary an explanation of what the policy of the Colonial Office was in that respect—if, indeed, they had a policy. In a despatch given to the House that morning, and dated the 29th of February, 1864, the question was again referred to. The Governor said—

> "My responsible advisers have requested me to transmit for your Grace's information the enclosed copy of a memorandum which they have drawn up in relation to your despatch."

And the Memorandum said—

> "With respect to his Grace's apprehension that the Natives who still remain friendly may view confiscation not as a punishment for rebellion but as a flagrant proof of the determination of the colonists to possess themselves of land at all risks, Ministers have to state that every means have been taken to persuade the Maories in general that the property and persons of innocent tribes will be strictly respected, and that the measure of punishment will be apportioned to the degree of guilt."

He would ask the right hon. Gentleman, who was well acquainted with what occurred in regard to Lord Ellenborough's celebrated despatch relative to the Talookdars of Oude, what was the policy of the Government on this question? Had any instructions been issued in consequence of the last despatch from New Zealand? Where General Cameron now was he did not know, but the right hon. Gentleman opposite had made some startling statements to-night on that part of the subject. It appeared that these savages could reason, and that they held public meetings. He was informed that they expressed themselves with good sense and considerable moderation, and that they showed a disposition to obey the law. He wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the alarm which existed among them was owing to any impression that there existed the intention to exterminate the Natives and distribute their land among the settlers in the way mentioned in the despatch to which he had referred?

MR. ROEBUCK said, he wished to place the responsibility in respect to this matter upon the shoulders which he thought ought to bear it — namely, those of the people of England. Our countrymen some years ago went to New Zealand to colonize in spite of the Government of the day, and the mere fact of their going there was an invasion of the country. That was not the first time we had done that in our history. In America we did the same thing. There our colonists were left to themselves, drove out the Natives, and, to use their own phraseology, "smote the Heathen hip and thigh." In New Zealand the case was the same. Our colonists, in going there as they did, were marauders and plunderers. We acknowledged that. But, being there, it was an absolute necessity that the brown man should disappear; for it was a remarkable fact in natural history, that wherever the white man set his foot the brown man disappeared. The white man having put his foot in New Zealand it became an inexorable necessity that the brown man should vanish from the face of the land. That process was going on when the Government interfered and said to the colonists, "You shan't do that." A past Government wishing to act humanely towards the Natives had introduced a new policy of government by which to maintain in New Zealand a Maori as well as a white population which should live harmoniously together. At the time when this policy was announced, he recollected startling the House some years ago by saying that was impossible. When they went to New Zealand they took on themselves the necessity of seeing these people exterminated, and exterminated they must be. He was not speaking as though that was what he desired, he was merely stating a matter of fact; and he remembered telling the Government that they would find themselves in this difficulty—that, by endeavouring to reconcile the two races, they would excite feelings among the Maories which would render civilized government impossible, and that the bloodshed which would ensue would be laid on our heads. His words had come true. The attempt had been made to reconcile the two races, and it had been found impossible to render the Maori a quiet civilized subject of our Government. Insurrection had broken out, which we said we could not allow to continue, and so we went to war; and the consequence would be that the Maories would be exterminated. The fact of our settling New Zealand, and glorifying ourselves upon planting a new colony there, with English laws, all implied the utter destruction of the Natives. In America had not the brown man receded step by step before the march of civilization, as it advanced from the Atlantic towards the Pacific? The dominion of the Native tribes over their land was narrowing daily, and the North American Indians were rapidly disappearing under the sinister influence of the white man. The white man took to the savage spirits, tobacco, and the manners of civilized life, and under that hot-house influence the savage withered away and the white man possessed his land. That was exactly what was happening in New Zealand, and the moral he was about to draw from it was, that the Government and the people of England, who undertook the policy he had described, were bound to protect the colonists against the mischief into which they had brought them. The colonists said years ago, "Leave this matter to us, we will settle it," and they would have swept the Natives before them. But the English Government would not allow that, and they were now bound to guarantee this loan, and to guarantee it under the dire necessity laid upon them of putting an end to the Native people. They were about to make a long agony of what the colonists would have made a short and sharp misery.

Sir HENRY WILLOUGHBY said, he was very much disposed to agree with the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck) as to the perplexing position of this country with respect to this colony; and he felt convinced that the only chance of extrication was the establishment of something like a dictatorship in the colony. Unless something were done to provide a Government which could conciliate the feeling of the two races they could not establish peace and order, and in the result the aborigines would be destroyed. The guilt of breaking treaties must be shared, he believed, by both parties. But, turning to the immediate question before the House, he said that if they guaranteed loans like this they would be sure to have chronic wars. He hoped, therefore, that the House would look closely into this question. The speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that night had disclosed some curious views as to the obligation to guarantee this loan. The colony was said to be in our debt, and to owe us £500,000; but who contracted that debt, and was the Parliament of England any party to it? He desired to have some explanation on that point. The papers on the table showed that there had been disputed accounts with the colony, and if a Colonial Governor could involve us to the extent of £500,000, might he not involve us to the extent of £5,000,000? They ought carefully to guard against being brought into the position in which they were told that they must either lose their money or guarantee a loan. In 1859, Parliament was misled respecting the former loan of £500,000. Subsequent Correspondence showed that £200,000 would have satisfied the wants of that day, and yet the House was persuaded to guarantee £500,000. The colony was now asking a loan of £3,000,000, and they knew nothing of its debts and liabilities. They were told certainly that the Customs had wonderfully increased. The revenue on that score was £691,000; but what was the expenditure?—670,000. What was the margin. Only £21,000. Was that a fair ground for guaranteeing so large a sum? There could be no doubt that the increase in the Customs' revenue had arisen very much from the war expenditure. On the ground of revenue, therefore, there was not the slightest pretence for guaranteeing this loan. But was it wise, he asked, that we should mix up Imperial finance with a colony, governed as it now was by an independent Legislature, almost wholly free from the control of the Secretary for the Colonies? The Governor, himself an able man, seemed a mere cypher in the face of that Legislature. It was almost idle to talk of the power of the Secretary of State over such a colony. Was it not the fact that the very parties who came to this country in connection with this guarantee belonged to a Government which had since disappeared? ["No, no!"] The much more serious question remained, however. How were we to get the money if the colonists did not pay? The Colonial Secretary might write able despatches, but it appeared to him (Sir Henry Willoughby) that the right hon. Gentleman was entirely without the power to enforce the fulfilment of obligations on the part of the Colonial Government. He agreed with the hon. Member for Taunton, that it would be better to take upon ourselves a temporary outlay of expenditure than guarantee this loan.

Mr. AYTOUN said, he should certainly support the Amendment. There were only two grounds on which a loan, or, indeed, any other species of aid, to a colony could be justified. One was that the mother country had injured it, or had retarded its prosperity by interference, and that was the plea upon which the former guarantee was asked for. The other ground was where the colony was in desperate circumstances. Now, he did not see how either argument could be advanced in the present case. By the former loan we had discharged every liability; and a colony which could advertise for a loan of £2,000,000 on its own security, as the New Zealanders were now doing, for the purposes of emigration and settlement, were not in a position to ask for a guarantee on an additional million. The history of the loan of 1857 should make the House exceedingly cautious in granting a guarantee for a still larger sum now. We ought to be extremely cautious how we granted another guarantee when we found how little care the Colonial Office had taken to ascertain the condition of the New Zealand finances at the time of the former loan. The truth was, it was the anxiety of the colonists to obtain additional land which led to our wars with the Natives, and by putting additional means at their disposal we tended to perpetuate the policy by which these wars had been brought about. There was no doubt that many of the colonists benefited by these wars—in fact, it was said that many of our soldiers had been killed by weapons of British manufacture, sold to the Natives by the colonists. The true policy was, that the colonists should be content with as small a portion of land as they were able to defend, and should not come to us and throw the burden of supporting fortresses for the defence of the colony upon the taxpayers of this country. If we were to throw upon the colonists the burden of this war, we should, to a great extent, impose upon them the only check we could to prevent their engaging in other wars in future. He saw nothing in the arrangements which had been made to induce him to support this guarantee. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that an engagement had been made to the effect that one regiment should be kept there free of expense to the colony; but though it would be some time before such a small force would suffice for New Zealand, he saw no reason why such an engagement should be made. That a guarantee had already been given to Canada was no argument for giving a guarantee to New Zealand, and though half of the £1,000,000 to be guaranteed was to be devoted to repaying a debt owing to us, yet we should remain answerable for the other half, and if the colony repudiated it we should have to pay it. He should certainly support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Taunton.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he felt great difficulty in deciding how he should vote on this question, and rose rather to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies a few questions on points which hitherto had not been adequately explained, than to make a speech for or against the Bill. The arguments of the Chancellor of the Exchequer—which were not entirely satisfactory—seemed to divide themselves mainly under four heads. First, he told the House that it was desirable to offer this guarantee, because in that way we should secure the repayment of a debt which might otherwise turn out to be a bad one; secondly, that this was an engagement which it would not be dangerous to undertake, because the finances of the colony were in a prosperous condition; thirdly, that there was a claim on the part of the colony, because it was paying a considerable portion of the expenses of the war out of its own means; and fourthly, that a good arrangement would thus be secured for the future as to the principles on which assistance was to be given to the colony. Upon all these points he wanted some further information than had been afforded in the cursory observations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. First, as to the debt of £500,000, he would remind the House of the significant fact that, just twelve months ago, it was proposed on the part of the colony that the British Parliament should guarantee a loan of half a million. It was part of that contemplated arrangement that a compromise should be come to with respect to certain old debts, and some more recent claims on the part of the Imperial Government, and that those claims should be met out of the half million loan. Mr. Reader Wood, the representative of the New Zealand Government, did not consider himself at liberty to make the compromise that was suggested to him, and consequently no advance of money was made. Subsequently the colony, through its agent, agreed to enter into that compromise; but in the meantime circumstances had changed, the debt of the colony had run up from £200,000 to £500,000, and the loan for which a guarantee was asked had also grown from half a million to a million—the colony, indeed, being willing to accept a guarantee of three millions if it could be obtained. These were significant facts; and when the Chancellor of the Exchequer told the House that the guarantee might be a good bargain for this country because it would procure payment of an old debt, he should have remembered that it was not entirely an old debt, but that some portion of our claim was of very recent date. He was referring to the £300,000 of debt which had been incurred in the course of the last year. It appeared that a large portion of that amount had been taken from the Treasury chest upon requisitions from the Governor, notwithstanding the objections of the Deputy Commissary General. The Colonial Government finding themselves in difficulties for money, had recourse to that convenient bank, the Treasury chest, and drew upon it at the rate of £12,000 a month for three months, and then it was proposed that until the Assembly of New Zealand could be called together, it was desirable that the Commissariat should make a further temporary advance to the extent of £100,000. The Deputy Commissary General demurred to making that advance, thinking that it was undesirable to make large advances from the Treasury chest, unless some decided steps were taken by the Colonial Government towards providing supplies. That officer also asked how the advances were to be repaid. He was told that provision should be made for repayment out of a loan which the Assembly was about to authorize. It now appeared that the loan was to be guaranteed by the Imperial Government. Now he (Sir Stafford Northcote) wished to ask whether this system of advances from the Treasury chest was to be continued? If whenever the colonial authorities wanted money they were to apply to the Treasury chest—if when the Commissary General objected he was to be told that the Colonial Government was going to provide for the money by a loan, and it turned out that they meant a loan to be guaranteed by the Imperial Government, that was getting into a vicious circle from which they would find it difficult to escape. Upon this occasion, as upon many others, it might be that the first loss would be the least, and that it would be better to abandon a debt of £200,000 or £300,000 than to enter upon a system of advances and repayments by means of guaranteed loans. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer recommended the House to give the guarantee asked for, because it would be the means of obtaining payment of advances, the right hon. Gentleman ought also to tell them what security there was that the system of advances would not be continued. He also desired information upon another point. In a despatch dated December 26, 1863, the Duke of Newcastle put to Sir George Grey certain questions which the Lords of the Treasury wished to have answered—

> "The desire to know whether, when the necessity of providing further funds became apparent, the Assembly was summoned for the earliest practicable day; whether, when the previous Assembly was prorogued, there was reason to believe that an emergency of this kind to a greater or smaller extent would arise; and if this was the case, whether provision was made to meet it such as to reasonable persons would at the time have appeared sufficient; and if it was not made, what means were taken by you to impress on the Assembly the necessity of making it?"

Various other questions equally pertinent were put, and he wished to know whether any answers had been returned to those questions, and, if so, what was the purport of those answers? The Chancellor of the Exchequer's next reason for giving the guarantee was that the colonists were making very great exertions on their own behalf. The House would like to have some details of the nature of those exertions, and as to how far they had raised money among themselves by taxation or in other ways. They must not be led into the mistake of supposing that money borrowed upon the ultimate security of the Home Government, or money obtained from the Treasury chest, formed any evidence of exertion. He would like to know how far the militia had been paid out of local funds. Then came the question of the solvency of the colony. They were told that the advances ought to be made because the colony was in a very prosperous condition. Upon that the obvious remark was, that if the colony was so prosperous it did not need a guarantee from this country—the only effect of the guarantee being to reduce the rate of interest on the loan by 1 or 2 per cent. But there were circumstances which should lead them to examine rather critically the flourishing condition of the colony. This loan had been spoken of as being a very heavy one in proportion to the resources of the country, and it was very striking to find that Mr. Reader Wood, in writing to the Under Secretary of State in July, 1863, said—

> "The cost to New Zealand of the war already reaches a round sum of £500,000. This sum

includes only extra expenses entailed upon the colony directly by the war, and might be largely swollen by a number of expenses which spring indirectly from the same cause. The charge of £500,000 in the shape of a debt upon the resources of a population of 100,000 persons, paying taxes to the State at the rate of about £4 per head per year, will appear of its proper magnitude if it be compared, after making all due allowances, with the expenditure of the United Kingdom for similar purposes. Thus compared, it represents an amount of above £100,000,000 sterling. In addition to this enormous burden, the colony is prepared to pay to Her Majesty's Government the sum of £150,000, and the offer to do so is declined as insufficient."

Some explanation of that statement was necessary. If such was to be the burden cast upon New Zealand by a debt of £500,000, what would be the effect of a debt of £3,000,000? He also wanted information upon another point — how the surplus of revenue over expenditure could be applied to the payment of the debt? It had been said that the revenue of the colony had largely increased between 1863 and 1864, and from the statement in the papers it appeared that the revenue had increased 25 or 26 per cent. But then, on the other hand, the expenditure had enormously increased under four main heads during the same period, by no less than 64 per cent. He wanted to know whether the expenditure included the war expenditure, why it had risen so much in amount this year, and whether it was likely the increase would continue? The last point to which he had to refer was the payment of the troops. Speaking literally, it was always theoretically possible for the Home Government to secure the payment of a proper sum from the colony, because they could say, "If you do not pay your proportion we shall not send you troops;" but practically the matter was not so easy. There was a great difficulty in saying that when British honour was concerned. He, therefore, thought there ought to be a distinct understanding with the colony that a guarantee should be given for its proportion, either by an Act of the Colonial Legislature or in some other forms. He felt that this was a very grave question, and he had not yet made up his mind on it. The bearing of his mind was to look with jealousy on such a proceeding as that proposed by the Government, and he, therefore, hoped that the Secretary for the Colonies would give the House some explanation on the points which he had ventured to bring under his notice.

MR. CARDWELL said, he was opposed to the system of calling on the mother country to pay the expenses of the colonies. He entirely recognized the principle that the credit of the mother country was her property, and that in lending to a colony the credit of the mother country you did bring the property of the mother country to the aid of the colony. But, notwithstanding these admissions, he thought he should be able to satisfy the House that the demand made by the Government in this instance was on every ground of generosity towards the colony, and of sound policy as regarded the mother country, a reasonable one, and one which ought to prevail. And he might say in general terms that he agreed with the principles which had been laid down by the hon. Member for Taunton (Mr. Arthur Mills). Some hon. Gentlemen had referred in strong terms to the origin and circumstances of the war now going on in New Zealand. His hon. and learned Friend the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck) was not one of them—he took the side of the colonists; but, in answer to the appeal which his hon. and learned Friend made to him, he could not say he entirely coincided in his theory with respect to colonization. On the contrary, from the moment he first obtained a seat in Parliament, he had always taken a great interest in the position of the Maories of New Zealand, and had been anxious to see a solution of the problem of recognizing the necessary and inevitable predominance of the British race in that colony, and at the same time acting with justice and generosity towards the Natives. He did not agree with his hon. and learned Friend that it was an inevitable necessity of colonization that the brown man must disappear before the white man. On the contrary, he thought that the superior races of Asiatic origin might grow side by side with the European races, and acquire a status which should enable them to take a part in all the social relations of life. At all events, the circumstances of the present war were perfectly clear. Four or five years ago New Zealand was governed by one of the most humane men that ever served the Crown—Governor Browne. He had left this country with the most friendly feeling towards the Maori race, and, having that feeling, he expressed in his despatches the greatest jealousy of the disposition of the colonists to acquire land. Notwithstanding those sentiments, Governor Browne found himself engaged in a war. That war came to a close rather by dying out than being concluded in the ordinary way; and, as a security, Governor Browne had prescribed certain terms of peace which were to be imposed on the Natives. He was succeeded by Sir George Grey, who was selected, not in the ordinary course of promotion from one colony to another, but because, from his great knowledge of New Zealand, and his experience of the relations between the colonists and the Maories, and from the great regard he had always shown for the interests of the Natives, he was of all men supposed to be the one best fitted to govern that colony in a conciliatory manner, and prevent a renewal of hostilities. And on his return to New Zealand in 1861, did Sir George Grey take any measures calculated to bring about a recurrence of the war? Quite the reverse. The first thing he did was to abandon the terms imposed on the Natives by Governor Browne; the second, to make a personal visit to the disaffected Natives, of which visit there was a most interesting narrative in the papers presented to Parliament. He received a very warm welcome, being addressed in such language as this, "You return to us our parent and friend. If you had remained, war would never have taken place." He gave out also that the King movement should not be a cause of war with him, and that the proceeding which had excited so much suspicion and alarm should not be again revived. In fact, he inaugurated that policy which was now sometimes called Sir George Grey's policy, and sometimes the conciliatory policy of 1861. These facts showed that the origin of the present war could not be imputed to Sir George Grey and the Government of New Zealand. What, then, had been the cause of the war? Every one would remember how a small detachment of British troops had been barbarously murdered while they were moving from one place to another. Two officers and nine soldiers were shockingly assassinated on that occasion by a party which some of the chiefs had in waiting for the detachment; and Sir George Grey stated that plots had been formed for an attack on the settlement of Auckland, and that the Natives were well armed, and had been long preparing themselves for the enterprize. At that time the colonists had made no military preparations. He, therefore, thought it impossible to hold the colonists of New Zealand responsible for the present war, however much one might regret the circumstances of the former conflict and the connection which, undoubtedly, more or less existed between it and the hostilities which were going on at present. The war very soon acquired large proportions, until at last it became necessary to maintain in the field a force of 20,000 men, one-half of whom were Queen's troops, and one-half forces supplied by the colonists. This involved a large expenditure, both to the mother country and the colony, for the whole population of Auckland able to bear arms were suddenly called upon to give up the profitable pursuits of industry. This was the position of the colony through the autumn of last year, when these advances were made from the Treasury chest. In October the General Assembly of New Zealand met and adopted a plan for a military settlement, which Sir George Grey described as based upon a plan adopted by him in British Caffraria, with such differences as the circumstances rendered necessary. In a despatch of August 29, 1863, Sir George Grey said—

> "I feel certain that the chiefs of Waikato having in so unprovoked a manner caused Europeans to be murdered, and having planned a wholesale destruction of some of the European settlements, it will be necessary now to take efficient steps for the permanent security of the country, and to inflict upon those chiefs a punishment of such a nature as would deter other tribes from hereafter forming and attempting to carry out designs of a similar nature, which must in their results be so disastrous to the welfare of the Native race, as well as to Her Majesty's European subjects."

This plan contemplated the ultimate settlement of 5,000 military colonists, and at this moment 5,000 persons were engaged under that plan in the defence of Auckland against the tribes in war against us. The plan was adopted in October by the Assembly, who agreed to a loan of £3,000,000, for the purpose, in some respect, of giving effect to it. The measures came home in due course for sanction, and arrived just when he (Mr. Cardwell) had succeeded to his present office. The hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Whiteside), in referring to this subject, surely could not have been aware that a discussion had taken place in this House in April last, and that the papers sent to New Zealand in answer to the proposal had been laid upon the table for a considerable period, for the hon. and learned Gentleman had asked him to state distinctly what were the views of the Government upon the land question in New Zealand. Now, these views had been so distinctly stated both in the House on the occasion to which he referred and in the despatches that he would not occupy time unnecessarily by repeating them. It was enough to say that they appeared then to be acceptable to the House, as consistent with the Treaty of Waitangi and with justice towards the Native race, and as dictated by a desire to distinguish between the guilty and the innocent, and whilst punishing the guilty calculated to impress the innocent with a belief in the justice as well as in the power of the European Government, and with a conviction that their property and their rights would be respected. The Colonial Assembly having agreed to apply for a loan of £3,000,000, requested the guarantee of this country, and that guarantee came strongly recommended by the Governor, on the ground that the colonists had made great exertions, and had done all that it was possible to expect from them in their own defence. The proposal was brought home by the Colonial Treasurer, the Financial Minister of New Zealand. He (Mr. Cardwell) at once said that the proposal was one which he could not possibly submit to the House of Commons; that the guarantee of so large a sum as £3,000,000 could not be entertained; and that all that part of the loan connected with the settlement of a large number of persons was a matter with which the colony must deal on its own responsibility. But other points were involved, and he undertook to submit a more limited plan to the just, kind, and generous consideration of the House of Commons. In the first place, he found that the promise had already been given to the colony, that a loan to the amount of £500,000 should be proposed to Parliament, as the subject of an Imperial guarantee; and a Bill for that purpose had been prepared by his right hon. Friend, and the preliminary Resolution adopted last Session. Owing to some difference of opinion between his right hon. Friend and the Colonial Minister, which was now satisfactorily explained by the desire of the colony to accept the terms offered to them, that Bill was not carried through last year. In the recess, however, the proposal was renewed, and there was an engagement to propose to Parliament a guarantee for £500,000. That engagement covered an old debt to the Treasury of £200,000, the particulars of which were to be found in the papers; and there was a proposal to advance £300,000 more for the service of the colony, and chiefly for the benefit of those unfortunate settlers who had suffered most severely during the former war. But in the meantime further liabilities had been incurred by the colony, amounting, so far as he knew, to close upon £300,000.

He had been asked a question to which there could be but one reply—Whether the system of obtaining advances without the sanction of Parliament from the military chest was not a vicious system? No doubt every advance of public money made without the direct sanction of Parliament was a vicious advance, and one to be avoided in every possible way; but he was afraid it was not possible to carry on a war anywhere without being exposed to the risk that such advances would have to be made under pressure. He believed that the advances made to New Zealand could not possibly be avoided at the outset of this war. These advances terminated in December last, since which time the colony had been spending money from its own credit, and had not, he believed, been drawing any from the military chest. The obligations which he had mentioned amounted to nearly the whole sum which, in fulfilment of the pledge given, would have been placed at the disposal of the colony. He had been asked to explain some observations made by Mr. Reader Wood, but must decline to be responsible for that gentleman's arguments. The present proposal was made up on its own merits, and if he could not sustain it upon its own merits he would not sustain it upon arguments drawn from the letter referred to. There having been a pledge to propose to Parliament a guarantee of £500,000, nearly the whole of that sum was exhausted by debts already incurred. In the meantime the colony was in great difficulties, being subjected to the extraordinary pressure caused by the war, for the origin of which the colony could not be held responsible. It was, therefore, proposed to raise the guarantee from £500,000 to £1,000,000, upon satisfactory and proper conditions. It was, in the first place, necessary that the security should be indisputable, and he believed that he should be able to show that such was the case in the present instance. Those who opposed the guarantee had met its advocates with two objections; they objected that if the security was sufficient the colony could raise the money in the open market without the guarantee of this country; and that if it were not sufficient this country ought not to be asked to guarantee it. He was not at all disposed to deny that the conclusion was a logical one; but the

House must at the same time be fully aware that the world, and especially the money world of London, was not exclusively influenced by logic. His hon. Friend the Member for Stamford (Sir Stafford Northcote) had asked him somewhat triumphantly, whether the colonists could not, with all their credit, obtain what they wanted in the market? In answer to the question he would say that, although the interest offered amounted to 5½ per cent, the tenders sent in were so few that the attempt was in reality a failure. He must naturally expect, after that statement, to be asked how the security could be good if the money-market failed to acknowledge its value? and in answer he would describe the steps which he had taken to arrive at a satisfactory solution of that question. When on a previous occasion the Government, in opposition to the advice of Sir James Graham, guaranteed a loan of £500,000, the revenue of New Zealand was, he believed, £185,000. The country had never been, and he believed never would be, called upon to contribute one shilling in consequence of that guarantee. The first fact he had endeavoured to ascertain was the actual income of the colony in the last financial year, which had expired on the 30th of June, 1863, and he found that it amounted to £549,000, and on comparing that sum with the expenditure he found that there was a clear surplus of £260,000? He had been asked by his hon. Friend the Member for Stamford in what position the provinces stood with respect to the surplus? and in answer to that question he would state that by the Constitution Act the General Assembly could dispose of the whole of the revenue, and that by their representatives in the General Assembly the provinces of New Zealand had agreed that the whole of the surplus should be applied to the purposes of the present loan. The whole amount of the interest on the loan would only be £60,000, and to meet that demand there was a sum of £260,000 at the disposal of the colony. That amount, however, did not constitute the sole security; because, in addition to the ordinary revenue, the land revenue—the revenue derived from the sale of lands and from mines, which nearly equalled the ordinary revenue—was by the terms of the Bill to which the House was now asked to give its consent pledged as security for the repayment of the loan. He then further demanded an estimate for the current year, which terminated on the 30th of June last. That estimate showed a still larger income; but as his hon. Friend the Member for Stamford had said, it also exhibited a larger expenditure. Apparently, the balance at the disposal of the colony was smaller than in the previous year, and he had been very justly asked for an explanation of the circumstance. Previous to giving one he might say that, although the year had terminated, news of the decisive financial result had not yet reached this country. They were, however, in possession of sufficient information to warrant the statement that the receipts had rather exceeded than fallen short of the estimate. A glance at the Estimates would show that the permanent charges, which in the former year had amounted to £79,000, would have increased to £130,000, but that increase would have chiefly arisen from the fact that £40,000 had been set aside to meet the interest of the very loan which the House had under consideration. The actual expenditure was, therefore, little more than it was last year. There was an item of £15,000 for the Militia, and £40,000 for the postal service for steamers; but the surplus would be pretty much the same as in the former year—or £250,000 to guarantee a loan, the interest of which was £60,000. He believed that he had shown conclusively that although the credit of the New Zealand Government might not be sufficiently well known in London to enable the colony to raise the requisite sum of money at an interest of 5½ per cent, the House was nevertheless incurring no risk in agreeing to the guarantee which was asked of them. If the addition of the ordinary revenue to the revenue derivable from the sales of lands and the produce of mines would not satisfy the House as to the credit of the New Zealand Government he believed that conviction was utterly impossible.

Mr. ARTHUR MILLS asked whether the territorial revenue as well as the revenue derived from the Customs could be applied to the purposes of the loan?

Mr. CARDWELL said, that the territorial revenue, like the ordinary revenue, was at the disposition of the General Assembly, and in order that there might be no mistake upon the point he had been careful to insert words in the Bill involving both of those sources of revenue as security for the loan. An hon. Friend of his had said that the taxes were raised upon articles of trade, and were, therefore, derivable in reality from our own revenue. All he could say was that no complaint had ever been made of the mode in which taxes were levied in New Zealand.

His hon. Friend the Member for Stamford had put several questions to him. One was, whether the system of advancing money from the Treasury chest was to continue? His answer was that he believed such advances to have terminated in December last.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE asked whether there was any security against the renewal of such a course?

MR. CARDWELL could only say that there was not the least desire on the part of either the Government or the Treasury to renew these advances. Such advances were only justifiable in cases of extreme emergency, and the course he now proposed would, he believed, obviate any such necessity for the future, because it would, if accepted, enable the New Zealand Government to meet all their engagements to the Treasury, and to liquidate those advances which had already been made. As a matter of principle, no one could reprobate more than he (Mr. Cardwell) did any system by which advances of the public money were made without the sanction of Parliament. His hon. Friend (Sir Stafford Northcote) had asked him what was the annual charge with which the colony had burdened itself in consequence of the war? That was a question which he (Mr. Cardwell) was unable to answer, as the amount had not been made up. How the colonists would meet those expenses would be a matter for their own consideration. The House should, however, bear in mind the fact to which he had already alluded, that in the province of Auckland every person capable of bearing arms had left his industrial pursuits to fight against the Natives. The other provinces would naturally desire that, instead of the whole expenses of a war local in its character being paid from the annual income, those expenses should be met by some other means less likely to press so heavily upon their resources. What perhaps was of more consequence was this — that if the war came soon to a close, as they hoped it would, a very large expenditure would be thrown upon the colony, not only for the war, but also for roads and other material improvements. At all events the loan which the House had to do with was inferior in amount to the sum which the colonists would have expended upon the war, and was limited to the actual urgency of the case. He spoke from information furnished by the Financial Minister of the colony when he said that the annual expenditure of the colony, at the rate it was now going on, was equal to £1,000,000. His hon. Friend next asked him an important question—namely, whether there would be any binding compact between this country and the colony? He (Mr. Cardwell) had already said that of the conditions upon which it was proposed to guarantee the loan, the first and most important was that the Treasury should have ample security. Now, he submitted that he had shown two things which his logical opponents had deemed almost impossible — namely, that the colony might be unable to raise money by its own unaided credit, and yet that its revenue was such that there was no fear of risk to this country in giving a guarantee. He would now proceed to the other conditions. The first was the immediate repayment of all the money due to the Treasury. He had been asked whether there would be any security that, after the House had guaranteed the loan, and the New Zealand Government had got the money, they would repay the Treasury at home? Perhaps in his position he might be permitted to express, on the part of the Colonial Government, some little surprise, nay, in a modified degree, some indignation at such a question as that. It was not a condition on the part of the New Zealand Government that they should pay the money advanced to them, provided that Parliament should agree to guarantee this loan. They were bound to pay, and he was sure they meant to pay their debt as soon as they could, whether Parliament guaranteed this loan or not. It was true that Mr. Wood had no power to bind the colony, but he (Mr. Cardwell) could assure his hon. Friend that there was no risk in this case, because they would have the very best security in the possession of the money itself. The money was to be raised in London, with the consent of the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury; it would be under their superintendence and direction; and, therefore, it would be the duty, as it would be in the power of the Treasury to do what the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said would be done — namely, as the money was received to carry it to the public exchequer, and thereby to repay the debt and extinguish that painful relation of an unliquidated and unsettled debt between the colony and the mother country.

The next condition was, that the arrangement which now existed with respect to the payment for the troops that might be furnished to the colony by this country, should terminate at the close of the present year. The Government of New Zealand agreed to pay £5 a head for the troops of this country who might be in the colony. He had said "agreed to pay" because it did not pay, for the greatest part of the money went back into the Colonial Treasury for colonial purposes. One condition in the new proposal was that this arrangement should be put an end to at the close of the current year, and that an actual payment of a substantial amount should be made. This payment would not only yield a considerable sum to the Imperial Treasury, but it would have a value far beyond its pecuniary amount, because it would place the colony, as it were, under bail that it would for the future so regulate its policy that there should be no further occasion to send for British troops to protect the lives and property of the colonists. The Government had, therefore, stipulated that the security should be ample, that the amount of the loan should not be excessive, that the whole of the debt to the Treasury should be repaid, that a substantial compact should be made with the colony, with regard to future military arrangements, and finally that the Colonial Government should undertake cordially to co-operate with the Home Government in that spirit of just and temperate policy towards the Native races which Parliament had so deliberately adopted and so clearly expressed. His hon. Friend Sir Stafford Northcote had asked what was to bind the Colonial Parliament to that contract? Was a gentleman to do so who admitted that he had not the power? He wished to state with respect to that gentleman, that all his transactions with him had been characterized by the greatest frankness and straightforwardness. But his hon. Friend had forgotten to read the next passage of the letter to which he had referred, and in which Mr. Wood said, "You have the security in your own hands. If we do not choose to carry out our engagements, you need not send out your troops, or you may recall them." But his hon. Friend said, "You cannot withdraw the troops in the moment of danger." No; but his hon. Friend must admit that the solemn engagement of a colony solemnly given was a matter which it was neither just nor wise to treat as of no value at all. Now, he was not acting on the engagements given by a gentleman who said that he had no power from the General Assembly definitely to conclude any arrangement. The compact should be written in the clearest and plainest terms before the name of England was put to this guarantee, or before a shilling of this loan was raised. It was not easy to write it in the form of an Act of the New Zealand Assembly for the reason that the number of troops would vary, and it was to be hoped it would soon be small. But this he would engage, that before the guarantee should come into operation the sanction of the New Zealand Legislature should be given to the arrangement, in what form he would not undertake to say—that should be a matter for consideration hereafter. But as the Bill was framed, it could have no validity until the sanction of the New Zealand Legislature was given to the arrangement, and he would undertake that without that sanction the loan should not be raised with an Imperial guarantee.

He believed he had answered every question which had been put to him; if not, he was prepared to do so, if hon. Gentlemen would be so kind as to remind him of any which he had forgotten. Well, then, he had shown that the war had not arisen through any act of the Government of New Zealand, that it was forced upon them by the outrages to which he had referred, and by the conspiracy among the Waikato tribes. He had shown that, as the necessity of the colonists was urgent, so their expenditure had been immense, considering the size and population of the colony. He had shown that they sought to meet that expenditure by a loan in the open market, and that they had not been successful; that their revenue was ample for the security which England was asked to give; and, therefore, that this country would by guaranteeing the loan render them a great assistance without incurring any risk. He had shown that the arrangement was one which would terminate an unliquidated debt to the mother country; that it should be ratified by the New Zealand Government before the Imperial Government was committed to any engagement; and that with regard to the military protection of the colony, a practical contribution was secured, and the concurrence of the New Zealand Government in the policy of this country was one of the conditions of the compact. He, therefore, confidently submitted the proposal to the favourable consideration of the House. He did not for one moment believe that under these circumstances, having regard to the struggle in which that colony was engaged, to the great sacrifices which the colonists were compelled to make, and to the financial difficulties in which they were placed, the House of Commons would be disposed to refuse them that assistance, coupled with wise and satisfactory conditions, which could be given without any injury to ourselves. The loan was a prior claim upon the whole revenue of New Zealand, and was little more than the whole annual revenue of the colony. The House might be quite secure that they would incur no expense and no risk; and he trusted, therefore, they would confer a great and enduring benefit upon one of the finest and most prosperous colonies of this country in circumstances of great and unparalleled difficulty.

MR. ADDERLEY said, that on the whole he was prepared, after the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, to give his support to the second reading of the Bill. It was very true that the colony could raise the money for itself; but the guarantee of the Imperial Treasury would enable it to raise as much money as was guaranteed on terms so much more favourable that it might be described as an assistance from England to New Zealand to the amount, perhaps, of £20,000 or £30,000 a year. The question then arose whether there was any risk to ourselves in giving that assistance, and a sufficient reason for affording it? He was as strongly against guarantees for colonial loans as any Member of the House, not so much for fear of risk to the Imperial Treasury, but because he entirely agreed with what had fallen from the hon. Member for Taunton on that point; he entirely concurred with the statement of Sir James Graham, which the hon. Member had cited, that there could hardly be anything more disastrous to the connection between the mother country and the colony than that there should spring up between them the relation of creditor and debtor. But while he entertained that general opinion against the system, he believed there were good reasons for making the present case an exception to the rule. The expenses incurred in these wars with Natives had arisen from a policy originated by the mother country for the protection of the rights of the Natives. It was not till 1852 that the colony of New Zealand had the management of its own affairs, and the responsibility for what happened before and the origin of those wars rested to a great extent with the Home Government, and it would hardly be fair upon our parts wholly to ignore that fact. He was not prepared to say, as the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield seemed to say, that the policy of this country was either in theory or practice a policy of extermination. He denied that statement, and maintained that it would be nearer the truth to say that the policy was quite the reverse, that in New Zealand the wars occurred from the scrupulous endeavour of the Home Government to maintain the rights of the Natives, and from attempting to guard them in too artificial a manner by treaties, which were incomprehensible to the Native mind. The policy which had been pursued was to prevent extermination, but it had resulted in war; and as far as England had without the free voice of the colony originated or maintained that policy we were implicated in its consequences. There was, therefore, something exceptional in the claims of New Zealand for liabilities dating before 1852. Yet, although we were to a certain extent responsible for the origin of these wars, it must not be supposed that we had incurred any permanent responsibility; because the colony had since received complete powers of self-government and complete control over the Natives as well as over their own affairs in those Islands. It would be absolutely impossible, even if it could be deemed right, that we should take upon ourselves an ultimate and enduring responsibility for the results for ever of a policy which was now placed in the hands of the colonists. Nothing could be more extravagant—nothing could be more disastrous—than that one country should be at liberty to consult its own interests and carry out its own designs, while another country had to bear the expense which those proceedings might incur in blood and treasure. The world would cry out against so outrageous and reckless a system. The question was, how they could give the assistance now due to the colony in such a manner as to lead it to more self-reliance for the future, and to lessen its disposition to lean again upon the mother country. As far as the proposition before them had any tendency, it was to increase the sense of responsibility in the colony, to throw upon it the results of its own policy, and to impose that check upon its engaging in hostilities which consisted in the liability of those who made war to pay the cost. It would thus break off the dependence on the mother country in regard to future wars. They had here, he thought, a case for assistance. He did not put it on grounds of generosity, because he did not wish this country to treat New Zealand as a *protegé;* nor would he endorse the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, that the House, by passing the Bill, would become entitled to the gratitude of the colony. England was bound, in justice, to give some help to New Zealand under existing circumstances, but so that New Zealand should be stimulated in the very process to help itself. That was the full extent of the aid which the Bill proposed, or he would not support it. The hon. Member for Taunton, in opposing the Bill, said, that the revenue of New Zealand was little more than half a million, and that the yearly increase was trifling compared with the increase in the expenditure, which had increased to a million and a half. [Mr. ARTHUR MILLS: I did not say year by year; I spoke of the current year only.] That might be true of a year of war; but what they had to consider was how to limit the incurring of such obligations for the future. His hon. Friend the Member for Taunton said they had better wipe the slate clean, and start afresh. He (Mr. Adderley) said the better plan would be to wipe the slate and not start afresh. He was not prepared to forgive the debt, because that was the way to encourage the colony to get into our debt again; but he would consider if they could not find some method of repayment which should act as a check against the desire to get into debt again, and at the same time be a real *quid pro quo* for what was given by this country. It was proposed that the mother country should give a guarantee for a million, in return for certain considerations. They were to receive, in the first place, payment of a debt of half a million; and, after the explanations of the Government, there could be no doubt that the money would really be paid to the Imperial Exchequer, for the first £500,000 of the loan raised would be *ipso facto* applied in that way. The second consideration was much more valuable, and would establish a new system of relations between us and the colony in case of future wars, and would become a precedent for other colonies. It was that the colony should undertake to pay for all troops, beyond one regiment, whom they might hereafter require, at the rate of £40 per head per annum. That was so important a consideration that he should have been quite ready to give the guarantee for that return alone. It was in itself a sufficient *quid pro quo*, because it would break down the vicious system of relieving the British colonies of their proper service in self-defence. The only question was whether this consideration was secured, and that appeared to him to be the weak point of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's speech. They should consider whether they could not insert in the Bill some better security. [Mr. CARDWELL: We have tried to get the best that New Zealand can give.] There was an old arrangement that the colony should pay £5 per man; but to that day it had never been paid.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE: It was remitted by the Imperial Government on the recommendation of Sir George Grey.

MR. ADDERLEY said, the result was much the same. The question was, had we better security for £40 than for £5 being paid or not remitted? If New Zealand could not pay £5 could she pay £40? And if she could would she? Of course when £5 per man could not be obtained, the chances seemed much less that £40 would be paid. Perhaps no provision on this point could be introduced into the Bill, because the liability was fluctuating and not fixed, and therefore no fixed stipulated payment on it could be enacted. Ten thousand men might be wanted one year, and perhaps more the next. He understood the right hon. Gentleman, however, to say that he was willing to introduce into the Bill in Committee such terms as would render it impossible that the Imperial Treasury should be liable for the guarantee until the colonial Parliament had passed some sort of a Resolution, pledging them to fulfil that part of the bargain. Even such a Resolution would be imperfect, for it would not be binding except on one Parliament, and, indeed, in one Session. At the same time, there was nothing in the annals of New Zealand to justify the supposition that the colony would repudiate a solemn Resolution passed by its Legislature. A solemn Resolution connected with benefits actually received, would constitute such an amount of equitable and honourable obligation that he had no fear that the colony would not consider itself bound by it. Of all colonies, New Zealand had been especially faithful in the discharge of its honourable as well as loyal obligations; and if once such a Resolution were adopted, he did not think it would be violated. There would then be a much more solemn obligation in regard to the new terms than in regard to the previous arrangement of £5 per head. There would be an absolute compact embodied in a Resolution referring to this Act, instead of a mere notification in a Colonial Office despatch; and such a compact could not be lightly broken. He believed, therefore, that, on the whole, the proposal was sound, and that it would be for the interests of the colony and of the mother country to adopt it — not so much on pecuniary grounds as on moral considerations, which were of infinitely more importance. The solvency of the colony was, he thought, sufficient to give full security for the repayment of the loan. The increase in the expenditure was of a temporary kind, whereas the increase of the revenue of the colony was steady and permanent. Scarcely one of the colonies of this country exhibited a revenue so rapidly increasing as did New Zealand. The Government having taken securities for repayment, and the case being exceptional, the proposition was one that the House might fairly sanction without laying down a mischievous precedent in regard to other colonies.

SIR JOHN TRELAWNY said, he had felt much difficulty in catching the drift of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Adderley), and could not tell whether he thought that this country or the colony should bear the expenses of the war, till he came to the practical conclusion that he would support the Government project, and bore testimony to the solvency and good faith of the colony. He (Sir John Trelawny), however, held in his hand a document, being a Parliamentary Return setting forth a Correspondence between the Colonial Minister of the day (Sir E. Bulwer Lytton) and the Governor of the colony (Governor Gore Browne), with reference to certain evidence of Mr. H. Sewell, Colonial Treasurer, delivered before a Parliamentary Committee on a then proposed guarantee (£500,000) loan, about 1857, and proving that in an important particular the Committee of the British Parliament which sat thereon was misled. Sir John Trelawny quoted a letter, published with the same Returns, and relating to the same transaction, written by the Speaker of the Assembly and several other members of it, clearly demonstrating their opinion thereof. The Return was reprinted in the present Session, and it appeared that Mr. Sewell was rewarded by a vote of £1,000, in consideration of the ability with which he had served the colony in that matter. After this, it would be prudent not to rely too confidently on the mere security of the honour and integrity of the colony when a guarantee loan of £1,000,000 was asked for, about which Parliament might be misled again, however inadvertently. He (Sir John Trelawny) did not say but that as we had got into such a difficulty it might not be necessary to escape from it at once and for ever by some strong act of the Government. "But," he said, "let us do it with our eyes open. Do not let us get into a state of confusion as not to know how we stand in consequence of the manner in which the Government had mismanaged the colony; but let our actual liabilities be for once distinctly settled, so that we may prepare to meet them like men. Murderers, of course, must be punished; but it was beneath the dignity of Great Britain to wage a war like the present with savages, putting our soldiers in positions where they were peculiarly liable to humiliating defeats, and that in a war which was evidently founded in iniquity. Though the people with whom we were fighting might be savages, that was no reason why faith should not be kept with them. The colonists had been rebuked by two or three Colonial Ministers, for the spirit of rapacity some of the colonists had exhibited as regards the land of the Natives, and for a desire expressed to set aside a treaty—that of Waitangi—deliberately pledging the faith of the Crown of England to confirm to the Natives the rights of British citizens. The Government on their part had taken at times a course that could not be palliated or defended, having both endorsed the act of Governor Gore Browne in respect of the seizure of the Waitara Block, and the act of Sir George Grey in giving it up again as having been wrongfully seized. What was the practical solution of the question? He said, punish once for all those Natives against whom delinquency could be proved, but do not go to war with the whole of the Natives, some of whom had been friendly to us, because a few officers and men had been shot by members of a particular tribe who considered that they had been ill-treated, and made war in despair of otherwise obtaining justice. He thought those were to blame who had got us into these troubles. Unfortunately the Government had never acted on a consistent policy in reference to the affairs of New Zealand. If the credit and revenue of the colony were as good as had been described, why had not the colonists been left to obtain a loan in the general market? As they had come to the Government for a guarantee, he inferred that the credit of the colony was not quite so good as had been represented. He trusted that the Bill would not be pressed by the Government.

Mr. J. B. SMITH said, that if New Zealand had the securities to offer which the Secretary for the Colonies said she had, it was ridiculous to suppose that she would not be able to borrow two or three millions of money in this country. The real difficulty in the case was, that the colony was not prepared to pay a sufficiently high rate of interest. They sought to obtain a loan at 5½ per cent, when settled colonies like Canada were only able to borrow at 6 per cent. If they went into the market and offered 6 per cent they would readily obtain all they required. Their difficulty was not that they could not borrow the money, but it was simply a question of a half per cent. He should support the Amendment, because he regarded it as a false principle to guarantee loans of this description.

Colonel SYKES said, they were now treated to a Parliamentary representation of the drama of *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*. The colony owed us £500,000, and the way in which they offered to pay us was by borrowing £1,000,000 on our guarantee. The result would be precisely what it had been in regard to the £500,000. We should in the end lose a million, but in the meantime we should get back the £500,000. Ever since the year 1841 we had been annually granting sums to the colony of New Zealand, varying from £6,000 to £20,000. [An hon. Member: What for?] He was unable to say what for, but he held in his hand a list of the grants which had been made by the House, and a very formidable one it was. Where was this to stop, and what were we to look forward to? Whenever we came into contact with men with black skins we called them uncivilized barbarians, when the truth of the matter was that they had the misfortune to own lands which we coveted and which we insisted upon having *vi et armis*. He had no hesitation in saying that it would be most imprudent on the part of the Government to guarantee the loan, the more so considering the precarious tenure of office of the Ministries ruling the colony.

Mr. MONSELL said, he did not see why a guarantee should be given if, as was stated by the hon. Member for Stockport (Mr. J. B. Smith), colonies where the security was known to be good could readily borrow money at the rate of 6 per cent. To show the progress which New Zealand had made of late years, he might mention that the Customs revenue, which in 1860-1 was £205,000, had increased in 1861-2 to £339,000, and in 1862-3 to £489,000, being an increase of 44 per cent. The population and shipping had also increased in a remarkable manner. How, then, was it necessary for the Government to give such a guarantee as this? It was perfectly clear that the colony could get the money by paying a little higher rate of interest, and putting themselves to some inconvenience. He thought it ought not to be made too easy for the colonists to carry on a war against the Natives. The right hon. Member for Staffordshire (Mr. Adderley) had spoken in terms of laudation of the conduct of the colonists towards the Natives; but if the right hon. Gentleman would look at the Report of Sir William Martin, he would find that, in the opinion of those persons who were well informed upon the subject, there had been a constant exercise of acts of the grossest injustice on the part of colonists towards the Natives in regard to the possession of land. They were constantly endeavouring to evade the engagements they had entered into in reference to land.

Mr. ADDERLEY said, what he had stated was, that the policy of the Home Government was not a policy of extermination.

Mr. MONSELL said, he was unable to see what argument the right hon. Gentleman could found upon that. No one was inclined to believe that it was ever intended by the Home Government to massacre the Natives; but we had given to the Colonial Government for the first time entire jurisdiction over the Natives, and had facilitated arrangements for the future maintenance of troops in New Zealand. Instead of endeavouring to make it easy for the colonists to get money into their hands for the purpose of abusing these privileges, we ought to make it as difficult as possible; and we ought to have some further proof than that given by the Colonial Secretary, that at a fair rate of interest the money required by the colony could not be obtained in the public market. If the House of Commons were forward in making the raising of money easy, it would render the colonists less anxious than they would otherwise be to put an end to the difficulties in which they had plunged themselves. According to Sir George Grey the distrust which existed in the minds of the Natives had been entirely produced by the conduct of the colonists towards them.

MR. WHALLEY said, he had seen it stated in the New Zealand papers that Sir George Grey, when passing through the disturbed districts, had declared that wherever he had gone he had found continually increasing proofs that the revolt of the Maories had been instigated and had been generally sustained by the influence of the Roman Catholic priesthood. The Roman Catholic population in Canada and other colonies were exuberant in outward demonstrations of loyalty, but whenever a real opportunity presented itself they were the first to organize a system of revolt against our dominion. If it was difficult for him to make his feelings intelligible to the House, how much more beyond him was it to unravel that web of sophistry which had employed, and which still employed, the greatest intellects of the world in weaving around our Empire? He had sought to direct attention to this matter on three different occasions, but the right hon. Gentleman had told him that it was too late to enter into that discussion, treating him, of course, as a monomaniac. That Power, in consideration of its influence in the divisions of that House, received at the present moment not less than about a million sterling annually in support of its institutions. [*Cries of* "Question!"]

LORD STANLEY, interposing, wished to know whether the hon. Member for Peterborough was in order, whereupon the hon. Member resumed his seat without further remark.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE: I will not follow the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley) in his pursuit of the Jesuits, whom he finds in every part of the world, and thinks have been at work in the forests of New Zealand; but if we are to take the statement he has made with respect to the conduct of the Roman Catholic Church in Canada as the measure of his accuracy in respect to New Zealand, we cannot rate it very high. I must say that the Roman Catholic Church, during the rebellion in Canada, so far from fomenting that rebellion, was, on the contrary, a most earnest ally of the Imperial Government on the side of order and loyalty. There are two or three points that have been raised in the course of this debate which I desire to notice. It has been admitted by the Government, from the first word spoken by my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer down to this moment, that the practice of guaranteeing colonial loans is objectionable as a system. It is fully and candidly conceded that an exceptional case must be made out by the Government for every colonial guarantee which it proposes. But we submit that an exceptional case has been made out in the present instance for the colony of New Zealand; and, in support of that view, I would refer to the speech of my right hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Adderley). No Member of this House would be likely to look with more jealousy and suspicion on a proposal of this kind than my right hon. Friend opposite; yet it is evident from the valuable support which he gives to this Bill, that he clearly sees that in spite of the guarantee the proposal is one which would promote and forward, instead of retarding, those objects of colonial policy which he has long had at heart. He knows well that the proposal is justified by the great and unparalleled efforts which the colony of New Zealand has lately made for its own defence; and that it is further justified by those conditions as to the future military contributions of the colony that would form the *sine quâ non* upon which the guarantee would finally be made to rest. The hon. Baronet the Member for Tavistock (Sir John Trelawny) went back to those two favourite topics of his in connection with past transactions in New Zealand, on which I am afraid we shall never come to an agreement — I mean the conduct of the agent of the New Zealand Government, Mr. Sewell, when the loan formerly guaranteed was raised, and the long-contested question of the Waitara purchase. I defy anybody to examine all the transactions connected with the guarantee of that loan, which were submitted to a searching inquiry before a Committee of this House, and to carry away that strange impression from them which seems to have got hold of the hon. Baronet's mind. The matter concerns political parties in the New Zealand Chamber much more than it does us. Whatever blame may or may not be due to Mr. Sewell—and of his conduct I give no opinion whatever—there is no doubt that the whole question was one very much of a party character—that he was charged with a certain want of frankness in his dealings with this Government, by those who were his political opponents in New Zealand: but, in fact, this House and the Government were not misled in any material degree on the point. The sum of £500,000 was contained in the Resolution of the New Zealand Chamber, and the only question was whether the colony might have accepted a smaller amount, about which there appeared to be some difference of opinion. But there was nothing in the whole transaction which cast any slur upon the good faith of the New Zealand Government, which has punctually met the loan, which is in gradual course of extinction. I will not now return to the question of the Waitara purchase, except to say that I protest against the hon. Baronet's version of that matter, and that, in my conscientious conviction, not an acre of land has ever been taken by the New Zealand Government from the Natives except with the voluntary consent of those who were believed to be the owners of that land. I am aware of the vague suspicion, rather than the knowledge possessed by many on that subject; but I venture to say that in no colony in which Europeans have had to do with a Native race has more scrupulous treatment with respect to their land been shown to that Native race than has been shown, under the direction of the Imperial Government, to the Natives of New Zealand. I now come to the objections of the hon. Member for Stockport (Mr. J. B. Smith), who said, "Don't ask us to guarantee this loan, because the New Zealand Government have nothing to do but to go into the market and obtain money if they will pay the market price for it." No doubt that might be so, or that, if they paid enough, New Zealand, a small though rapidly rising colony, would obtain money in the London market upon some terms or other; but we say that it is safe for us under exceptional circumstances to give this assistance to a struggling Colonial Government, which is making great efforts to enable it to repay the advances made to it under circumstances of difficulty, and also to enable it in conjunction with the Imperial Government to bring the war to an early termination. The difference between the amount of interest which the colony would have to pay if it obtained the loan upon its own security and that which will be payable under this arrangement is a matter of some importance to New Zealand, and is at all events quite sufficient to justify the colony in asking, and the Imperial Government in giving, the assistance which is to be rendered under this Bill. My right hon. Friend the Member for Limerick (Mr. Monsell) is afraid that if Parliament passes this Bill, things will be made too easy for the Colonial Government, and that they will be induced to continue the war instead of concluding peace. If my right hon. Friend looked into the affairs of New Zealand as closely as it has been my duty to do, he would not be afraid that things will be made too easy for the colonists by anything which this House can do. He would have seen an industrious population leaving their industrial employments, and turning out to defend their lives and property, and would have witnessed the remarkable fact of a force of something like 10,000 men armed, trained, and drilled by the colony, and mainly by one province, so that in Auckland there is scarcely an ablebodied man who is not under arms. Under these circumstances, there is no danger of war being made too pleasant to the people of New Zealand. But the fact is that the continuance of war or the conclusion of peace depends not upon the New Zealand Government but upon the Governor, Sir George Grey, in consultation with the General, Sir Duncan Cameron. When the responsibility of the management of the Natives in time of peace was transferred to the local Government, certain inevitable exceptions were made by the Duke of Newcastle, who, at the conclusion of his despatch to Sir George Grey, said—

> "You would be bound to exercise the negative powers which you possess by preventing any step marked by injustice towards Her Majesty's subjects of the Native race. You would be bound to judge for yourself as to the justice and propriety of employing, and the best mode of employing, Her Majesty's forces."

These are the instructions under which Sir George Grey has been acting all along, and I should be sorry to do him the injustice of supposing that if, in his opinion, on consultation with the General, the moment had arrived when the war might be terminated, and a lasting peace made with the Natives, he would have hesitated to make it, even although in doing so he should have differed from his responsible advisers. If that was always probable, it is now absolutely certain; because the Governor has been supported in this matter in the strongest and most unequivocal manner by the despatches which two months ago were sent to him by my right hon. Friend the Secretary for the Colonies, which directed him, whatever may be the opinion of the Ministers—if, unfortunately (which we do not anticipate), they should differ from him—to make peace with the Natives, whenever, in consultation with the General, he thinks that the right and proper time has arrived. It is, therefore, not to be supposed that the Colonial Government have the issues of peace or war in their hands, or that by the assistance which we propose to give them we shall be making war too easy for them, or lessening their desire for peace. Under these circumstances, I trust that the House will accept the proposal made by the Government, which I am quite certain will be of most important assistance to the colony in bringing this unfortunate war to a close, and, more than that, will for all time to come improve the relations as to military matters between the colony and the mother country.

MR. COBDEN: Sir, I feel thankful to the hon. Member for Taunton (Mr. Arthur Mills) for having brought this matter under the consideration of the House. Peculiar difficulties always attend the discussion of any principle involving our relations with our colonies. If it is brought forward as an abstract Motion, the Mover, as in the case of the hon. Member for Tavistock (Sir John Trelawny), finds himself counted out. But if it is brought forward on a specific ground, as to-night, we are met with extraordinary unanimity of opinion on all sides of the House, that it is a most improper thing we are going to do. Every one agrees that in principle it is indefensible; but then everybody says this is an exceptional case. I shall express in two words what it is we are asked to do. We have a debtor owing us £500,000, and he says to his creditor, "My credit is not very good in the City; if you endorse my bill for £1,000,000 I will be able to discount it on your credit in the City, and I will pay you the £500,000." Now, I want to know what interest the English people, who are to give this national guarantee, have in the matter? There has not been a word said on that point since the hon. Member for Taunton opened the discussion—and he dwelt upon the interest the British taxpayer has in the question. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies invoked our generosity and kindness towards the New Zealanders. But if we have any generosity to spare it is wanted by our countrymen—the taxpayers of this country. You have 100,000 people living in this colony of New Zealand, who, in an economical sense, are raised immeasurably above the average condition of the population of England; and you are asking the English population to bear the expense of a war carried on in that colony—and for what object? The hon. and learned Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck) tells us in his own peculiar fashion what the object is. He says we are bound by an irresistible necessity to exterminate the Native population of New Zealand; he says also that he told us so twenty years ago, and he appears to feel rather grieved than otherwise, that we have been so slow in the process of extermination. He says that instead of a long lingering agony we should have given them a short pang and be done with them. I want to know how the hon. and learned Gentleman proposes to exterminate the Maori race. He did not give the receipt, or tell us whether it was by strychnine or by what other process. Really I think the hon. and learned Member rather presumes on a long career of eccentricity when he advances a doctrine which in a Christian assembly like this is out of place, and should have been delivered in a Parliament of Thugs. What interest have English taxpayers in fighting the battles of the population of New Zealand? What is the issue? Everybody knows what it means; it is to take possession of the land of the Maories. Wool is enormously high, sheep pasturage is very profitable, and the neighbours of the Maori proprietors would be very glad to elbow them out and take possession of their land. But what interest have the English people in that? The English nation has parted with all sovereignty and jurisdiction over the land in New Zealand. The British Legislature has not power to dispose of a single acre of that land. If Queen, Lords, and Commons together were to pass an Act to give a few acres to some pensioner—some invalid from the army—the New Zealand Legislature would be up in arms against us for having infringed their rights. Seeing, then, that we have no interest in the land, what interest have we in the proceedings of the New Zealanders in this matter? I think it can easily be shown that the little interest we might have had in New Zealand, apart from the ownership of the land, namely, an interest in their trade, is likely to be very seriously impaired by the policy which we are now pursuing. For, what are we doing? We are proposing to give facilities to the New Zealanders to get into debt. That is the whole object of our proceeding to-day. It is argued that if the New Zealand Government go into the City they cannot get their money for 5½ per cent. It would be very strange if they could when the Bank rate is 6 per cent. If the New Zealand Government, like other Governments and other people, had to pay the ordinary market rate, 6½ or 7 per cent, that would be a motive for borrowing as little as possible. But what we are doing with New Zealand, what has been done with Canada, either by Imperial aid, or by the credit given by bankers upon the faith of the Imperial connection — what we are doing in both cases is this: We are heaping up in these colonies an enormous debt, the interest of which is all paid out of the Customs' duties, and the augmentation of those duties prevents our extending our trade with those colonies. Therefore we are acting directly at variance with our own interests in the only way in which we could have any beneficial relations with these dependencies. When you talk of the revenue of New Zealand you must bear in mind that it is nearly all derived from the Customs' duties. I see by the last Budget that £600,000 out of a revenue of £690,000 is derived from that source. We are told that the colony is very prosperous. I have taken the trouble to refer to the statement of our exports to New Zealand for the last three years, and I find that they have increased from £800,000 in 1861 to £1,200,000 in 1862 and £1,900,000 in 1863. Now, although no doubt an impulse to the trade of New Zealand has been given by the gold discoveries, the Government expenditure by an army in New Zealand adds to our exports to that country. Therefore, to a certain extent, this is a factitious trade and may not continue to increase at that rate. With this increased amount of debt, and consequent charge for interest, it is very likely that in New Zealand, as in Canada, the Legislature may put an excessive duty upon imports so as materially to interfere with your trade. I told the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in speaking of our relations with Canada, that I could make out a better case for paying the expenses of the garrison of Strasburg or Lille for France, than for paying the expenses of the garrison of Quebec for the Canadians. Our tariff with France is much lower than the tariff with Canada, and we shall have a high tariff with New Zealand if you afford them facilities for borrowing money. A debt of £3,000,000 or £4,000,000 is no slight matter for a population of 100,000 persons. If our debt bore a similar proportion to the inhabitants of this country, fabulous as it appears now it would be much larger. I do not understand what the stipulation is that we are to get in return for this loan. The right hon. Gentleman does not seem to have the power that would authorize him to pledge the New Zealand Legislature to anything. You have no guarantee for anything in return for this proceeding. I do not like the terms he offers us. Suppose we receive from New Zealand £40 per head for each man, and the cost of each man is £120 per head, the stipulation is this, that if we agree to pay £800,000 for 10,000 men, then new Zealand bargains to pay £400,000 more. I do not like the bargain; there is no motive for entering into it, and I entirely disapprove of the whole proceeding. And I ask you, is not this the time to come forward and show that we are prepared to take another course in colonial matters? Did we not feel last week that having our forces scattered over the world weakens us in our relations with our neighbours? If the hon. Gentleman goes to a division I will vote with him, and I thank him for having brought forward this subject.

SIR JOHN HAY said, he did not wish to detain the House, but there was one point which had not been mentioned in the debate which weighed with him extremely in giving his vote for the Amendment. Up to 1852 New Zealand was a Crown colony. At that time an Order in Council was in force which prohibited the importation of arms and ammunition into the colony, because it was wisely foreseen that if permission were given to import arms we should be arming the Natives against ourselves. One of the very first acts of the Legislative Assembly the year after New Zealand became a free colony was to pass an Arms Bill, permitting the importation of arms for sale to the Natives, which was justified on two grounds—one that the traffic was most lucrative; the other was a flagrant crime against the Imperial Legislature—that it was just to arm the Natives, because if they were not armed it would be unnecessary to maintain a large military force from the mother country, whereas if they were armed, it would be necessary that the colony should be protected by a large military force, and a military chest would afford considerable means of lucrative emolument to the colonists. Had the Order in Council prohibiting the exportation of arms into New Zealand been allowed to remain in force, the Natives would probably have remained peaceable subjects of the Crown, and this war, which had arisen in consequence of bad legislation and gross injustice, might have been prevented. For this reason he would cordially vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Taunton.

Lord STANLEY: I confess, Sir, I have formed my opinion upon this subject after considerable hesitation and doubt, and I now ask permission to state very briefly the reasons which have influenced me. I object, Sir, to this guarantee mainly on the ground that it seems to me we are giving assistance to the colony in the worst form possible. There is nothing more tempting, but at the same time more fallacious, than the idea of helping your friend without injuring yourself by becoming his security. We all know what that practice comes to in private life. I say if we are to give assistance to the colony of this kind it is much better to give it in hard money paid down at once, for in that case you know the extent of your liability and are under no illusion. But it seems to me that in this case the responsibility you will incur is totally out of proportion to the amount of aid given. The sum guaranteed is £1,000,000, and no one disputes the fact that the colony would be able to raise that amount, say at 7 per cent, in the usual way, without resorting to any guarantee. But if the money be borrowed upon our security it could be raised at 4 per cent, making the difference in the interest £30,000. Now, if Her Majesty's Government have come to the conclusion that they ought to help the colony in a financial way, I think it will be far better and cheaper for them to pay down at once this £30,000 a year, even without any hope of ever getting it back again, rather than that the Imperial Parliament should become guarantee for the loan now asked for. In the one case there would be a mere temporary sacrifice — in the other you would incur a responsibility for the capital. I want to know what is the security for the repayment of this debt? Her Majesty's Government appear to be embarrassed in their arguments. First they say the colony is poor and cannot raise the money without our security, and then that the colony is in a very prosperous condition, and that there is no fear for the consequences. One or other of these assertions must be untenable. If the circumstances of the colony are such that there is no reasonable probability of our getting back the money, it is a reason why we should not run the risk; and if, on the other hand, the circumstances of the colony are such that they can raise the sum without difficulty, then the Government have cut from under their feet the ground upon which they rest for granting this loan. Then I want to know, in the event of some difficulty being raised about the payment of this debt hereafter, what means have you of enforcing it? So far as I can see, there are none whatever. We cannot go to war with the colonists to compel them to repay it, nor can we proceed to seize the waste lands which we once held, and very wisely have given up of our own free will. You can exercise nothing but a moral force in getting it back if they do not choose to pay. And with regard to that, when you recollect that the colony depends greatly upon the influx of fresh emigrants, and that the majority hereafter will consist of persons whose fathers were not even in the colony when the debt was contracted, you must allow that a future Colonial Legislature may not attach to this debt that sacred character which attaches to a liability of this kind in England. If we look through the whole civilized world, England is, perhaps, the only country that has not at some time or other compounded — I will not say repudiated— with her creditors, and compelled them to abandon some part of their legitimate claims. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies appears to me to have put forward an argument against his own proposal, when he says he cannot expect that the colonists will be wholly responsible for the expense of the war, because the management of Native affairs has been kept to a great extent in the hands of the Governor independent of the Legislature. No doubt in that he spoke right. The purport of the despatch written by the right hon. Gentleman, dated the 26th May last, was to advise the Governor that in this matter of war he was wholly independent of the local Legislature, and that he might stop the war at any moment. If, therefore, he has the power of stopping it, he has also the power to carry it on so long as he pleases, independent of the local Government; and if, therefore, the colony cannot bring any pressure to bear on its Government, I do not see how a war of this kind can be brought to an end. The only way in which I think that can be done is by the colonists feeling the whole burden of the war, and that it is to their interest to put an end to it. It may be said that this House has not done so on former occasions, and that it will be a hard case to apply a new rule in the present instance. But a Judge once said, with truth, that hard cases make bad law, because in trying to soften down a general rule to meet what appears to be the justice of a particular case, you run the risk of destroying what is most important to maintain, certainty and impartiality in the administration of the law. I think this is a case in which the House ought to protest against the general policy of guarantees; and I believe that when the balance is struck it will be shown that the colony has paid less towards her defences than the mother country. That being so, the whole question at issue is, whether New Zealand shall pay £30,000 more for the interest of this loan than she will have to pay if we guarantee it? Looking, therefore, at this question as setting a precedent for the future, I think the House may with a clear conscience dissent from the policy of Her Majesty's Government with respect to this Bill.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON said, the hon. Gentleman the Member for Rochdale (Mr. Cobden), and the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley), had put the question upon a different footing to that of the hon. Member for Taunton; and he was afraid that those who voted against the Bill, by the light of those speeches, would find themselves committed to a new policy, which, to a certain extent, would cut the connection between the mother country and her colonies. He should, therefore, much regret being thereby committed by such a principle to a policy to which he was not prepared to go. He, therefore, called upon her Majesty's Government to give an assurance to hon. Members who did not wish to carry out the principle to such a conclusion, that in the future stages of the Bill they would insert a clause that should bind the colonists to accept such terms as were proposed to them in the despatch which had been laid upon the table of the House—namely, that they should in future maintain the troops necessary for their defence. He was not prepared to go so far as to leave the colonists to themselves, or to leave the poor Natives, to whom we were bound by solemn obligations, at the mercy of the Colonial Government; but if this assurance were given, many hon. Members who, as things stood, might not like to support the proposed guarantee, might have no hesitation in doing so.

Viscount PALMERSTON: My right hon. Friend the Secretary for the Colonies has already stated that we would exact from the Government of New Zealand precisely those engagements which the hon. and gallant Gentleman intimates would be satisfactory to him and to others. I quite agree with him that many of the doctrines laid down in this debate by those who oppose the Bill go really to the extent of saying that we ought to cast our colonies adrift. I am not, however, prepared to concur in that conclusion. This colony of New Zealand was founded in the expectation that the emigrants who went there would receive that protection which the mother country affords to her colonies. It is a very thriving colony; it is increasing rapidly in wealth and in everything that constitutes a prosperous society. The argument which has been advanced to-night by the opponents of the Bill really is, that we ought to deprive that society of the assistance of the Crown in bringing this unhappy war to a conclusion. Now, I lament the existence of the war as much as any body; but it is not, I maintain, a war arising, as has been stated, from the seizure of the lands of the Native population. It has been explained by my right hon. Friend that it had its origin in the murder of an officer and men, which is a thing totally unconnected with the question of land, and that no land has been taken from the people of New Zealand except by purchase, on the authority and with the consent of those to whom it belonged. The argument of the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn goes beyond anything that has been advanced by any other hon. Member who has spoken in this debate. They said, "Do not assist the colonists," though the assistance we propose does not involve any charge on the taxpayers of this country; but the noble Lord, not content with exhorting the House to reject the Bill, seems to wish that we should compel the colonists to borrow at 7 per cent without a guarantee, when with a guarantee they could borrow at 4 per cent. Nay, more, he runs down their credit and does his best to prevent them from being able to borrow at all, because, he says, they may hereafter repudiate the debt and then the guarantee will fall upon us. It is clear, therefore, that when they go into the market, people will be apt to say, "The noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn says you are not to be trusted, and we will not lend you anything at all." The real question at issue, however, is, Do we wish that this unhappy war should be brought to a conclusion, or that the revolt should be successful, and that the authority of the Queen and the interests of our fellow subjects in New Zealand should be sacrificed? I cannot believe that this House desires the latter alternative. The sooner, then, the war is brought to an end the better for all the parties concerned. And let us not suppose that the British colonists in New Zealand do not take an active part in the contest. There are 10,000 of the civil population under arms, and that is a state of things attended with great expense to the colony. Now, as to the security which they can give in the case of this loan, I need only say that New Zealand has a revenue of £700,000 per annum from the Customs, and that there are waste lands which would yield something like £1,300,000. The security, therefore, is ample, and is it because such security exists that we should allow the colony to go into the market without a guarantee to pay 7 or 8 per cent upon a loan which, with our guarantee, they can get for 4 per cent? I am sure the House, having regard to the interests of the Empire at large, as well as to the requirements of the colony, will not insist upon our adopting any such course.

COLONEL W. STUART should like to hear from the Secretary for the Colonies whether he proposed to introduce into the Bill at a future stage a clause carrying out the terms of the despatch which had been laid on the table? Upon the answer to that question depended his vote and those of some hon. Friends of his who were anxious to vote with the Government if they could.

MR. CARDWELL said, he had already stated that care would be taken that the New Zealand Government should be pledged to all the engagements upon which the loan was given. He would undertake to consider whether he could frame a clause making the consent of the Commissioners of the Treasury dependent on the acceptance of the Assembly of New Zealand of the terms on which it was proposed that the loan should be advanced.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 92; Noes 55: Majority 37.

Main Question put, and *agreed to*.

Bill read 2°, and committed for *Monday* next.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

DENMARK AND GERMANY—THE ARMISTICE.—QUESTION.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he would beg to ask the noble Lord at the head of the Government, Whether he has any information as to the terms demanded by Prussia from Denmark as a condition of peace? A statement had appeared in the public journals to the effect that, among other things, Denmark was to pay £11,000,000 and also to give up the whole of her fleet. He wished to know whether this country had sunk to such a degree of pusillanimity as to look with apathy and indifference on the surrender of the Danish fleet to Germany? The noble Lord in his speech the other night on the slave trade seemed as strong on the doctrine of intervention as ever, and no doubt he would repeat his Eastern policy whenever he had an opportunity; but he wished to know whether he had abdicated his doctrine of interference nearer at home, so far as to look unmoved on such a demand as this?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: The only answer I can give is, that we have no information as to the point to which the hon. Gentleman has alluded. If negotiations are going on, I doubt whether such a monstrous demand can have been made.

Mr. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD: Has the Government no information that an armistice has been concluded?

Viscount PALMERSTON: We have reason to believe that a proposal has been made, but I have not heard of any conclusion.

Motion *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

Supply *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £8,876, to complete the sum for the National Gallery.

Mr. AUGUSTUS SMITH objected to the item of £2,000 for incidental expenses of the establishment—travelling, agencies, &c., which he thought was a large percentage on the £8,000 which had been expended in the purchase of pictures. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Board of Works would take this opportunity of giving some information as to the decisions of the Government with regard to the removal of the Royal Academy. If the Royal Academy were provided for elsewhere there would be ample room in Trafalgar Square for all the national pictures, because there was a lower suite of rooms which would be admirably suited for the exhibition of cabinet pictures. He hoped to get a distinct pledge from the right hon. Gentleman on this subject.

Mr. COWPER said, it was a mistake to suppose that the space now occupied by the Royal Academy would, if added to the existing accommodation, be sufficient to receive all the national pictures. It might provide for the Ancient Masters, but it would be insufficient for the exhibition of the British pictures, which were for the present at South Kensington. He was sure that the House would not wish to deal with this subject in a partial or incomplete manner: any proposal ought to be complete in itself, and worthy of the pictures and of the nation. If the House had accepted the proposal made by the Government to erect a National Gallery at the back of the Burlington site, they would have had at a moderate cost a building which would have been unrivalled for grandeur in internal arrangements. There was, no doubt, on the part of many hon. Members, a great objection to remove the national pictures from what was called the "finest site in Europe," and there was a disposition on the part of many hon. Members to construct an adequate National Gallery there for the architectural improvement of that part of London. That plan would involve the expenditure of a large amount of money; but if the feeling of the House was to disregard cost and the best arrangement of the Gallery, and to insist upon having in that part of London a large Palace of Art, there would be no difficulty in attaining that object.

Sir WILLIAM JOLLIFFE thought the speech of the right hon. Gentleman was unsatisfactory. No answer had been given to the question put, and the House was entitled to know how the Royal Academy were to be provided for. The building in Trafalgar Square had been appropriated to the national pictures, but it had never been applied entirely to that purpose. No sooner had the site for the National Gallery been fixed upon than the Royal Academy succeeded in getting removed there; so that one half the building intended for the national collection had been given up to other purposes. Now, the right hon. Gentleman would do nothing, and would not say anything, because the House would not agree to his grand scheme. But the right hon. Gentleman should have thought of the matter two years ago before he spent £17,000 upon a half of the building to make it fit for the reception of the national pictures. Now it appeared that that money had been entirely wasted.

Viscount PALMERSTON would remind the right hon. Baronet that the reason why the Royal Academy was lodged in the present building was because the apartments which they formerly occupied in Somerset House had been required for the public service, and a portion of the National Gallery was not required then for the national pictures. But he denied that the sum expended upon improving the building had been thrown away. On the contrary, it had afforded the means of displaying a larger number of pictures. When the right hon. Baronet told the Government that they should two years ago have been prepared with plans for enlarging the National Gallery, and for providing elsewhere for the Royal Academy, he must surely have forgotten that a few weeks since the House came to a decision adverse to the arrangement proposed by the Government. What they had thought best was to provide for the National Gallery at the back of Burlington House, and to leave the Royal Academy at Trafalgar Square. The House decided against that arrangement. He retained his own opinion; but the House of Commons had a right to assert its own. It was too much to expect that in the short interval which had elapsed the Government should have been able to mature a plan for the accommodation elsewhere of the Royal Academy and for the enlargement of the present building, so as to receive all the national pictures. The Government would, of course, give their attention to the subject, and he hoped that next Session they would be enabled to propose some plan which would meet the approval of the House.

Sir JOHN SHELLEY thought it was a most unfortunate circumstance that, let the House do what it would, it could not persuade the noble Lord nor the right hon. Gentleman that it was determined the National Gallery should remain at Trafalgar Square. Surely, it was the duty of the First Commissioner of Works to bow to the decision of the House. The right hon. Gentleman had a fancy scheme of his own, but he must give it up. A question had been asked to which no answer had been given. Was the right hon. Gentleman prepared to consider the best mode of getting rid of the Royal Academy, and of devoting the whole space at Trafalgar Square to the exhibition of the national pictures.

Mr. LOCKE thought we were in the unfortunate position of having a choice of too many sites. The First Commissioner of Works said rightly that there was not sufficient room at Trafalgar Square for the exhibition of all the national pictures. He agreed that the expenditure of £17,000 which took place two years ago was thrown away, because it had destroyed a decent entrance to what was the most miserable building that could be devised. There were, no doubt, difficulties in deciding what course to take; but the Government had been distinctly told by the House that they must not remove the National Gallery from Trafalgar Square. They had a large space which they had purchased at Kensington. Nobody wanted to go to a National Gallery every day—he must be a miserable wretch who would go to a National Gallery every day; but when one did go to a National Gallery one liked to see something worthy of the name. There was space enough at Kensington to build everything that was required. It was impossible to say whether in a few years Kensington might not be the centre of London, so rapidly was London extending in that direction. There was not room at Trafalgar Square for the national collection, and we ought to wait till we could have something on a grand scale. There were deep feelings on this question. He did not know why, for he had none whatever. He did not care in which part of the metropolis the National Gallery might be, provided it was accessible to the people; but he did wish to see the pictures of the nation properly housed.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he did not understand how it was that room enough could not be found for all the pictures at Trafalgar Square. He contended that if the Royal Academy were removed from Trafalgar Square there would be ample space there for the national collection of pictures. He did not now want to go into the question whether glass was not useful for preserving pictures; but it was a fact that the glass covering prevented some of the pictures in the national collection from being seen. The dark pictures when so covered could not be seen, and among them was that admittedly spurious work for which £630 had been paid last year.

Mr. AUGUSTUS SMITH submitted that he was entitled to an answer to his plain question—namely, whether the Government, after the recent Vote, were taking any steps for the removal of the Royal Academy from Trafalgar Square? When that removal was effected there would be quite sufficient accommodation in the National Gallery for all the pictures we now had and all which we were likely to get for some time. It should be borne in mind that there was nearly as large a space below the present Exhibition rooms as there was in those rooms themselves. There was no occasion for a grand scheme. Nobody wanted it but the hon. and learned Member for Southwark (Mr. Locke). It seemed to him that the First Commissioner, ignoring the recent Vote of the House, insisted only on the objections to keeping the collection in Trafalgar Square.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, the hon. Baronet the Member for Westminster (Sir John Shelley) distinctly asserted that the House had determined to do something; but the House had not determined to do anything. The House had rejected the plan of the Government, but they had not adopted any plan in its place. Hon. Gentlemen said the House had determined that the Royal Academy should be removed from Trafalgar Square; but he put it to them whether, before they compromised the site of Burlington House by removing to that place a body which would occupy a great portion of it, the Government ought not to know what was to be done with the building in Trafalgar Square? He wanted to know whether the House by their vote had given the Government any clear indication of what was to be done with the building at Trafalgar Square? What had happened immediately after the division? Why, he had been instantly shown that there was a hopeless difference of opinion in the ranks of the majority as to the course to be taken in consequence of the vote. The moment the numbers had been announced from the Chair, the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho) rose and said the House had determined that a magnificent edifice should be erected. [Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK: No.] He begged the hon. Member's pardon. [Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK: The noble Lord said so.] Then why did the hon. Member say "No?" No sooner had the noble Lord stated that a splendid edifice was to be erected in Trafalgar Square than an hon. Member—he thought the Member for Hampshire—rose on the opposite side of the House, and amid very lively marks of assent contested the principle laid down by the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire, observing that there was no intention of pulling down the National Gallery, as comparatively inexpensive modifications and an enlargement of the present building would give all that was required. With those two distinctly contradictory interpretations ["No, no!"] what were the Government to do? Why do hon. Gentlemen say "No, no?" Two distinctly contrary interpretations had been put upon the vote. It remained for the Government to reconcile those contradictions as well as other circumstances in the case; and therefore it was important that they should have time to consider the matter, or have some clear indication of the will of the House. He begged the House would not understand him as giving any opinion on the matter further than to say that, up to the presen ttime, there had been no clear indication given by the House as to their opinion of the course which the Government ought to pursue.

MR. AYRTON certainly must express his dissent from the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who appeared to him to have spoken under an erroneous impression. The noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho) had voted with the Government; and the right hon. Gentleman seemed to forget that on the occasion to which he had referred the noble Lord rose, in the interest of the minority, to throw doubt and discredit on the vote of the majority. The moment he had done so an hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Sclater-Booth) got up and said the noble Lord had not spoken the opinion of the House, and the statement of the hon. Gentleman was assented to by the majority, among whom there was no difference of opinion. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to forget, likewise, that the noble Lord (Lord John Manners) who had moved the rejection of the vote, stated distinctly the grounds on which the Royal Academy ought to be removed, and the National Gallery kept in its present position for the use of the nation. An opposition scheme had been put before the House by the Government, and on that the House voted. There had not been the smallest misapprehension or difference of opinion expressed by the majority during the whole of the debate, and he had no hesitation in pronouncing the observations of the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire to have been most unwarrantable. The Chief Commissioner of Works had taken his cue from the noble Lord, and had reiterated the same sort of trash. He admitted that the Government ought not to be asked so soon how they intended to accommodate the Royal Academy; but he hoped there would be a clear understanding that the Royal Academy was to leave the National Gallery, and that a building would be provided for it either at Burlington House or elsewhere.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY said, there need be no doubt what the decision of the House meant. It meant that the national pictures should remain in Trafalgar Square, and it was the duty of the Government to carry out this decision.

MR. DILLWYN understood the Chief Commissioner of Works to say that he thought the National Gallery might be sufficient for the pictures of the Ancient Masters, but that the modern pictures should remain at South Kensington. Now, he would urge upon the Government the propriety of keeping the modern as well as the ancient pictures in Trafalgar Square, excepting, of course, those which had been left to the nation with the stipulation that they should be kept at South Kensington. It was sometimes said that pictures in the National Gallery suffered deterioration from atmospheric influences to which pictures were not exposed at South Kensington. But he had noticed with regret that there was more decay of colour in the paintings at South Kensington than in those kept elsewhere. He could not tell whether this arose from the glare of light or fromthe gas used at the many night fêtes which were given there.

MR. COWPER said, the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Ayrton) had taken a very narrow view of the ground of the vote given on a previous occasion, but undoubtedly many of those who divided with the majority had a larger and more suitable view of the requirements of the National Gallery. For example, the hon. Member for Poole (Mr. H. Seymour) had found fault with the Government for not providing a large, handsome, and, of course, expensive building in the rear of the National Gallery; and many other hon. Gentlemen had at different times stated that what they objected to was the false economy of the Government in not erecting a gallery worthy of the nation. The hon. and learned Member, therefore, had no right to assume that he represented the opinion of the majority upon that vote. The truth was there were many opinions held by the majority, and this rendered it difficult for the Government to say what they would do. If the House was content with the building as it stood and with the crowding of the pictures, that was a decision easily enough understood; but if they desired a building large enough to contain all our pictures, and one really worthy of our grand collection, it was impossible to be satisfied with the present building. If the pictures were brought from South Kensington, the rooms now occupied by the Royal Academy would not be sufficient to hold them. The portion of the building occupied by the National Gallery comprised 9,641 superficial feet of floor space and 860 lineal feet in a horizontal line; that occupied by the Royal Academy contained 7,391 superficial and 650 lineal feet, making a total of 1,510 lineal feet which the whole building would provide. Now the Keeper of the National Gallery said that the whole of the pictures would require 700 feet more than the 1,500 which the building contained. The hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) had misunderstood him. What he had said was that if the pictures were to come to Trafalgar Square from South Kensington they would occupy all the available space which the Royal Academy would give up. The hon. Member for Truro (Mr. Augustus Smith) asked why these pictures were not put in the basement? The answer was, because they could not be seen or appreciated there. For a short time the Vernon Gallery was put there, and everybody complained of the absurdity and folly of doing so. The difficulty was that various parties would combine in this House to reject a proposal, but no one could be sure that they would combine to support another proposal. Endless opinions had been offered; five or six sites had been suggested, and his opinion was that everything proposed in this House on the subject would be rejected. He thought, therefore, that for the present the pictures had better remain where they were.

MR. BERNAL OSBORNE said, it appeared to him that this was nothing more than an adjourned debate upon a question which was settled four weeks ago; and with all his knowledge of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Cowper) and his Colleagues he really was surprised at the course which they had taken that night. It was vain to say that there were many different objects intended by those who formed the majority on the former occasion; for the simple fact was, that if there were any combination at all it was to retain the National Gallery in Trafalgar Square. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Cowper) was unable to answer a plain question, but kept "harping on my daughter"—that was to say, he went back to his favourite scheme—and the Chancellor of the Exchequer endeavoured to explain away the decisions of the House. Now, although this House had last Friday supported the Government, though he denied that they had passed a vote of confidence, this was no reason why the Government, with their heads a little turned by their success, should now explain away the decision come to by the House upon the National Gallery. He thought the House before it separated ought to come to some understanding on this point, and that the Government should state distinctly whether they meant to carry out the decision. They ought not to allow either the Chancellor of the Exchequer or the First Commissioner of Works by a long rigmarole to explain away the decision of the House. The Committee, on the contrary, ought to insist on carrying out their decision by retaining the National Gallery in Trafalgar Square.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: I think my hon. Friend is the last man in the House to interpret the vote of the other evening. If I am not mistaken my hon. Friend had no opinion on the subject whatever. His mind appeared to have been so shaken by the arguments employed on the two sides that he ran away from the division altogether, and I think that he is, therefore, not entitled to put any construction upon the nature of the votes recorded by other hon. Members. I can assure my hon. Friend that we accept the vote of the House the other evening as being against our proposal, which was to remove the National Gallery to Burlington House, and to allow the Royal Academy to remain in its present position. This discussion, however, arose in consequence of a question proposed by my hon. Friend the Member for Truro, who has called upon us this evening to state what arrangement we proposed to make for the removal of the Royal Academy from Trafalgar Square.

MR. AUGUSTUS SMITH: I asked whether the Government had taken any steps for the removal of the Royal Academy from Trafalgar Square?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Of course we could take no steps until we could procure some plan showing where the Royal Academy could go, and how they were to house themselves. [An hon. MEMBER: That is their business.] We did not at all presume to controvert the intentions of the House that the National Gallery should remain in Trafalgar Square; and when next Session we shall propose some plan which will effect that object, it will be our duty to see that the collection can be properly lodged in Trafalgar Square, and I have no doubt that the House will not begrudge the necessary expense. It is quite certain that increased accommodation will be required, and we shall endeavour to attain that result in as economical a manner possible consistent with the public advantage.

MR. LIDDELL thought it perfectly right that art should be encouraged, but protested against the principle that the Government were in any way bound to procure accommodation for the Royal Academy.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK wished to know whether facilities would be afforded to persons desirous of inspecting pictures protected by glass, and whether the glass might for that purpose be removed upon application.

MR. COWPER believed that the Trustees already gave the necessary facilities in cases where application was made.

Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) £1,500, Gallery of Portraits.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK wished to know whether it were ultimately the intention of the Government to bring all the collections together, and place the Portrait Gallery under the same roof as the other pictures when the building in Trafalgar Square should be enlarged? He thought that the purchase of pictures should be conducted upon the responsibility of one person, and that more attention should be paid to the authenticity of the specimens, even though their cost might be slightly enhanced.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he had admitted that the separation of the Portrait and National Galleries was only to be regarded as temporary, but no plan was at present before the Government on that point. He did not concur with the hon. Member that it was advisable to confine the responsibility of purchasing pictures to one person. It would be impossible to give any pledge that the whole of the pictures should be placed in one building until some definite plan should be settled.

Vote *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

FORTIFICATIONS AND WORKS.

COMMITTEE. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Question again proposed,

"That, towards providing a further sum for defraying the expenses of the construction of works for the defence of the Royal Dockyards and Arsenals, and of the Ports of Dover and Portland, and for the creation of a Central Arsenal, a sum not exceeding £650,000 be charged upon the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, and that the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorized and empowered to raise the said sum by Annuities, for a term not exceeding thirty years; and that such Annuities shall be charged upon and be payable out of the said Consolidated Fund."

Colonel SYKES objected to proceeding at so late an hour (twenty minutes past twelve) with a Resolution which would involve an expenditure of £650,000.

Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE hoped at this period of the Session the Government would meet with some indulgence, and be allowed to proceed with the business in hand.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON trusted the Committee would allow this stage of the measure to be taken. The object of the Resolution was to obtain leave to continue works the principle of which had been already sanctioned by the House. There would be several opportunities hereafter for discussing the nature of the works more fully. If the Committee would allow him, he would state what was the financial position of the fortification scheme. There had been expended up to the 1st of March of this year, £2,854,000, and up to the end of July there would be an additional outlay of some £300,000, making a total of £3,154,000. The total sum voted last year was £3,850,000, therefore they would have a balance in hand of nearly £700,000. That sum, however, would be available only for the particular works for which the money had been voted, and it was necessary, therefore, to ask for £650,000 more. He should be quite willing to answer any questions that might be asked, but he submitted that on the whole the more convenient course would be to defer particulars until they should have the Bill before them.

Colonel SYKES hoped the House would get further opportunities of discussing this matter.

Mr. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD inquired whether the money now asked for was to complete works already begun or for the commencement of new works?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, that no new works as to the principle of which the House had not already pronounced would be undertaken. The House had already had the schedule of the works three times before it. It would be competent for any hon. Member, when the schedule of the Bill was before the House, to move that a particular work should not be continued.

Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE trusted that some of the money would be applied to the completion of the Spithead forts. Recent experiments had proved how necessary such works were for the defence of the country.

Mr. ANGERSTEIN inquired what the intentions of the Government were with regard to the Central Arsenal?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON replied that the original scheme contemplated the purchase of a site for a Central Arsenal. The intentions of the Government on the subject were by no means given up, but it was not intended this year to ask for any money for the purpose. With regard to the Spithead forts, the question as to where the works ought to be placed had been referred to a Committee, and he believed their Report would be presented in a few days.

Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE said, the works to which he had referred were not at Stourbridge, but on the east side, and he trusted they would not be lost sight of.

Mr. HENNESSY said, he believed that fortifications in Cork harbour had been included in the schedule of the Bill of last year. He wanted to know when the Report of the Dockyard Committee on the subject would be laid upon the table?

Lord CLARENCE PAGET: It will be laid on the table to-night.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

(1.) *Resolved,*

That, towards providing a further sum for defraying the expenses of the construction of works for the defence of the Royal Dockyards and Arsenals, and of the Ports of Dover and Portland, and for the creation of a Central Arsenal, a sum not exceeding £650,000 be charged upon the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, and that the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorized and empowered to raise the said sum by Annuities, for a term not exceeding thirty years; and that such Annuities shall be charged upon and be payable out of the said Consolidated Fund.

(2.) *Resolved,*

That the said Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorized to direct the payment, to the Governor and Company of the Bank of England, out of the said Consolidated Fund, of the sum of £600, for the management of the contributions to be received by the said Governor and Company in respect of the said Annuities.

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

BANK POST BILLS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Bill to permit, for a limited period, compositions for Stamp Duty on Bank Post Bills of Five Pounds and upwards in Ireland, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer and Mr. Peel.

Notice taken that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at half after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, July 15, 1864.

MINUTES.] — Select Committee — *Report*— Railway Companies (Borrowing Powers* (No. 127).

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia)* (No. 204); Naval Discipline* (No. 205); Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans)* (No. 206); Highway Act Amendment* (No. 207); Expiring Laws Continuance* (No. 208); Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* (No. 209); Militia Ballots Suspension*.

Second Reading—Judgments, &c., Law Amendment* (No. 194), and *referred* to Select Committee; College of Physicians* (No. 114); Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties)* (No. 198); Inclosure (No. 2)* (No. 177); Trespass (Ireland)* (No. 202).

Committee—Accidents Compensation Act Amendment* (No. 158); Street Music (Metropolis)* (No. 196); Railways (Ireland) Act Amendment* (No. 178); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland)* (No. 189).

Report—Street Music (Metropolis)* (No. 196); Railways (Ireland) Act Amendment* (No. 178); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland)* (No. 189).

Third Reading—Factory Acts Extension* (No. 176); Indemnity* (No. 197); India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment* (No. 195); Defence Act Amendment* (No. 193), and *passed*.

POWERS OF CONVOCATION TO PASS SYNODICAL JUDGMENT ON BOOKS.—ESSAYS AND REVIEWS.—QUESTION.

Lord HOUGHTON, in rising to put the Question of which he had given notice, as to the powers of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury to pass a synodical judgment on books written by either clergymen or laymen, said: My Lords, I should hardly be acting with due respect to your Lordships, or to the Law Officers of the Crown, if I did not accompany the Question which I am about to ask with a few comments, for the purpose of showing, as well as I am able, that I am not calling your attention to a speculative or fanciful subject, but to a practical grievance and to an immediate danger. I think, also, that I am bound to show in a few words, that there is sufficient doubt and difficulty as to the interpretation of the law upon this subject to justify me in asking Her Majesty's Government to require the opinion of the Law Officers with respect to it. The subject which I now desire to bring before your Lordships is the synodical judgment lately pronounced in the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury on a certain book called *Essays and Reviews.* The censure or condemnation of books has from the earliest times been a prompt and available means which both the ecclesiastical and the civil powers have employed for the suppression of opinions of which they disapproved; and, therefore, the combination of an entire liberty of the press with good social order is justly regarded as the highest triumph of modern civilization. From the time when the Emperor Charles V. prohibited the use of certain books in the University of Louvaine, from the time when the Pope Alexander Borgia established the system of licences at Rome, that power has been freely exercised, both by Churches and by States. Therefore, there is nothing peculiar in the fact that Convocation has desired to exercise, or has attempted to exercise, this power. But, at the same time, I think your Lordships will regard it as worthy of consideration, whether that power can at the present time be legally, and, perhaps, afterwards you will consider whether it can be constitutionally, exercised. The synodical condemnation which has been pronounced by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury with respect to this book is in the following terms:—

> "That this Synod, having appointed Committees of the Upper and Lower House to examine and report upon the volume entitled *Essays and Reviews*, and the said Committees having severally reported thereon, doth hereby synodically condemn the said volume, as containing teaching contrary to the doctrine received by the United Church of England and Ireland, in common with the whole Catholic Church of Christ."

My Lords, I am not going to enter, nor do I wish your Lordships to enter, into any theological controversy; my sole interest, here at least, is for the freedom of opinion and the liberties of literature. The opinions expressed in this book, therefore, I will set aside as matters which it does not become me to discuss. The nature and structure of the work, however, are so peculiar as to make the case against the censure so much stronger, that your Lordships will permit me to state what it is. Some years ago a young and enterprising publisher formed a scheme for establishing a theological review, which should have a larger latitude of speculation and scope of criticism than is usual with publications of that character at the present day in this country. For that purpose he collected certain articles; but he afterwards abandoned the project, and published in one volume the essays which were collected for the purpose of forming that review. Thus, then, the volume of *Essays and Reviews* was collected together without any mutual arrangement on the part of the contributors, and without any connection of the subjects whatever; and it is, therefore, as varied a work as might be any number of the *Quarterly* or *Edinburgh Reviews*, to which I believe that some of your Lordships or of your relations occasionally contribute. Therefore, I wish your Lordships to understand that in the condemnation of this work the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury have committed an act which, if followed up, as of course it will be, will enable them to condemn *in toto*, in like manner and with the same authority, any work in which they find any one article which contains theological propositions with which they do not agree. Now, this seems to me to be a very perilous precedent, and one carrying with it very serious consequences: for your Lordships will see that this condemnation does not fall upon any propositions which have been selected by Convocation as objectionable in themselves, and which therefore it was their duty to produce, but that it falls upon all the authors of papers in this book, although one of them is a layman and another a clergyman, I believe, Mr. Pattison, in whose essays no one has ever pretended to find anything objectionable. I think that in itself it is a matter of regret that a book of this nature should have been selected by Convocation as the commencement of the *Index Expurgatorius* of which English literature may expect to be the subject in future, unless prompt objection is taken to this process; and I hope that your Lordships will see that this is a question of pressing and immediate difficulty. Now, as to the law of the subject, the law relating to Convocation is exceedingly doubtful and difficult. Your Lordships are aware how almost contemporaneous was the reformation of the English Church with the invention of printing, consequently there were very few opportunities for the condemnation of works by the Houses of Convocation before the Reformation. But it is worth your Lordships' consideration, and I think it conveys a moral which may be of some advantage to the right rev. Prelates, that in the year 1555, in the reign of Queen Mary, the first works which we find condemned by the Convocation of Canterbury are these—a work on *The Sacrament of the Altar* by Archbishop Cranmer; a Communion Book, which is, in fact, our present Book of Common Prayer; and a suspect version of the Bible, which is the foundation of our present translation. At that time Convocation interfered with matters with which at the present day it would hardly think it right to meddle. I have been told by my friend Mr. Froude, that he has found during his researches among the records an address from both Houses to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, requesting Her Majesty as soon as possible to put an end to the life of Mary Queen of Scots, "as being an idolator she was perfectly justified in doing." But this particular question of the suppression of books hardly appears in the history of the English Convocation until those times when secular and ecclesiastical motives were so mixed up with one another that it would be unfair to attribute to the Church of England those defects and errors which really belong to the State. In the times of King William and Queen Anne ecclesiastical politics ran so high, and had so much effect upon the general distribution of patronage and power in this country, that it is no wonder that Convocation took the part it did. Therefore, I would rather direct your Lordships' attention to one great peculiarity of these attempts to censure and suppress books, which is this—that when the Lower House of Convocation were led away by political violence or religious zeal, they were in almost every case restrained by the superior wisdom of the Prelates, which prevented any considerable evil from being done. Thus I find that in 1689, when a work upon St. Athanasius's Creed was presented by the Lower House of Convocation as a subject for condemnation, the Upper House took counsel with the lawyers of the time, and they reported that having consulted those learned in both laws they were of opinion that Convocation could not proceed judicially. In the year 1700 there was a still stronger case with regard to a work by Toland, called *Christianity not Mysterious*, a work which at that, as at all times, would be most offensive to devout persons, believers in the Christian religion. The work was presented by the Lower House to the Upper for condemnation. And what was the conduct of the Upper House? The Upper House took legal advice, and this is the answer they gave—

> "Upon our consulting with counsel learned in the law concerning heretical, impious, and immoral books, and particularly concerning a book of Toland's, sent up to us from the Lower House, we do not find how, without a licence from the King, which we have not yet received, we can have sufficient authority to censure judicially any such books; but, on the contrary, we are advised that by so doing both Houses of Convocation may incur the penalties of the statute of the 25 *Henry* VIII."

In the same year, the Lower House, unchecked it seems by this rebuke, presented for censure no less a book than *The Exposition of the Articles*, the work of one of the Bishops themselves — Bishop Burnet. This, no doubt, naturally excited some indignation on the part of the Upper House, who returned this reproof, which I will venture to recommend to the attention of the right rev. Prelates, because the case is similar to that which I am now bringing before you—not certain propositions, but the whole book being condemned—

> "That the Lower House of Convocation censuring the book of the Bishop of Sarum in general terms, without mentioning the particular passages on which the censure is grounded, is defamatory and scandalous."

I come next to a case, on which, I have no doubt, the right rev. Prelates have very much relied—namely, the celebrated case of Mr. Whiston, in 1710. In that case the works of Mr. Whiston were presented by the Lower to the Upper House for condemnation. The Upper House was at that time presided over by Archbishop Tillotson, and I wish that any of your Lordships who take an interest in the subject would read the letter which was written by the Archbishop—a letter characterized by such great moderation and such profound respect for the law of the land, that I cannot help thinking that it may have been the very document which inspired a right rev. Friend of mine with the strong dislike and distrust of that prelate which he lately expressed. In this letter, which is too long to read, Archbishop Tillotson sums up in the most masterly manner all the objections to the action of Convocation in questions of this kind. He cites all the legal objections to which I have already alluded, and points out that the Act of 17 *Charles* II., which repealed the Tithe Commission, enacted that no court for dealing with ecclesiastical matters should be set up without the authority of the Crown; and he concludes by saying that it was necessary that the result of the deliberations should be laid before her Majesty, with an humble request that She might be pleased to submit the case to her revered Judges for their opinion. That was accordingly done, and the Judges consulted arrived at a decision which would no doubt carry with it great weight on such matters. Twelve Judges out of sixteen—[Lord CHELMSFORD: There were only twelve Judges altogether]—I am much obliged to the noble and learned Lord for the correction; but eight Judges and the Attorney and Solicitor General reported that this jurisdiction might be exercised in Convocation. They, however, add a proviso at the conclusion of their judgment, which appears to me to deserve great consideration. They say that this being a matter on which an application for a prohibition on the part of the person prosecuted might come on for judgment before some of them, they desired to be understood as giving their opinion, reserving to themselves entire liberty of altering it in case any records or proceedings which they were at the time strangers to should be laid before them, or any new considerations suggested to them which might convince them that they had made a mistake. Now I think that qualification, referring, as it no doubt does, to the possibility of an attempt being made to prohibit such a censure, by *mandamus* or other legal process, considerably modifies the effect of the judgment. It is, nevertheless, I admit, a document of great importance, and carries with it very serious weight. After their judgment was delivered, the Queen gave to Convocation plenary powers. But a curious historic fact is, that, when acting upon the Judgment and the Queen's Letter giving to Convocation such plenary powers as they required, they proceeded to pronounce sentence on Mr. Whiston, and to submit the sentence to the approval of the Crown; the Crown would not give that approval, and they could never find the Queen under such circumstances as to enable them to procure her assent; so that Mr. Whiston escaped. The only other case to which I shall call attention was that of Dr. Clarke, in 1714, whose book on the Trinity was condemned by both Houses of Convocation. He made, however, a submission, which was considered sufficient by the Upper House, but not by the Lower. The result was that there was a most unseemly difference of opinion, and Convocation was dissolved without any condemnation of Dr. Clarke having been passed. There is, therefore, nothing to guide us in this instance, except, perhaps, the case of Mr. Whiston, and connected with that case there were, as your Lordships have seen, great doubts and difficulties. There has since that time been a great deal of legislation with respect to ecclesiastical matters, and I think it a question worthy of consideration, whether the Act 3 & 4 *Vict.* c. 86, s. 23, does not affect this case. By that Act it is declared that no criminal proceedings shall be instituted against any clergyman in holy orders for any offence against ecclesiastical law in any ecclesiastical court otherwise than was therein enacted and provided. That being so, I consider myself justified in putting my first Question to Her Majesty's Government, Whether they have taken or are willing to take the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown as to the powers of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury to pass a synodical judgment on books written either by clergymen or laymen? If it should be determined that Convocation has the power of passing these censures, it still appears to me that it is required not only that the Act should be legal, but that it should be privileged; because, unless it is privileged, in the same way as the Acts of your Lordships' House and the House of Commons, surely it is competent for any person who considers himself damaged in fortune or reputation by any one of those judgments to appeal to the Courts of the land for that protection which the laws of England afford to every British subject. This, it appears to me, is a very grave matter, and can be got rid of only by the argument that those censures are not of such a nature as to inflict any injury on a man's character or prospects. I, however, deny the justice of that argument. I say that those who inflict those censures mean that they should punish, and by punishing injure. It is intended when a censure is passed that it should be injurious to the person censured, and it is regarded as a punishment. Let me take the case of the first author whose name appears in this volume of *Essays and Reviews*—the Rev. Dr. Temple, a most distinguished man, the Master of Rugby School, of the excellence of which the late Royal Commission spoke in such high terms. It seems to me that it may be very well argued that Dr. Temple's interests in that school are seriously injured by the decision which has been pronounced by Convocation. It may be that it may have the effect of preventing parents from sending their boys to the school, or of inducing them to remove them from it, and thereby inflict an injury on Dr. Temple in his status and emoluments. Then there is the case of the last author whose name appears in this book—Mr. Jowett, a Professor of Oxford, who has been treated with such signal injustice as to excite even the strongly expressed feeling of your Lordships' House. Can any one say that Professor Jowett may not have suffered injury in his future career from the censure to which I am referring? Let me suppose the case of one of those eminent writers rising to the highest position in the Church, and occupying a seat on the right rev. Bench—might they not have this censure still hanging over them, diminishing their influence, and preventing them from occupying that position in the State to which by their talents they are entitled? And if Convocation has the power to inflict so serious an evil as that to which I have drawn your Lordships' attention, must they not for very consistency continue their course of condemnation and censure, condemning such works as that of Bishop Colenso, which has created so much excitement lately—or any other work which the earnest clergy of this country may be disposed to regard as heretical? I contend that Convocation has no right to pick out this one book for censure; they should direct their attention equally to all other books of a similar character, and then who can say how far they would have to go? But, supposing this power to be legal and privileged, still even then it ought, I contend, to be accompanied by some degree of form and procedure. It has been urged that it is an essential vice in the constitution of Convocation that it has no power to call for evidence or papers, and does not possess the other attributes of a court of justice. Convocation cannot proceed to make a new canon without the express license of the Crown, and I can see no true distinction between making a new canon and pronouncing a sentence of this sort. I wish, therefore, to know explicitly from the Government whether this censure ought not to have been preceded by a license from the Crown, and whether it has really any meaning without that license? The fact that Dr. Williams, after having made a strong application to Convocation to be heard in his defence, was refused permission, and condemned unheard, I am sure will be repulsive to your Lordships' sense of justice. In a letter he has written to me Dr. Williams complains of this act of injustice, and he says—

> "The nature of a suit in the Ecclesiastical Courts is to deal only with legal issues. The defendants in such a suit are excluded from all the moral bearings which depend upon literary, scientific, or other research. Convocation, by refusing to hear me, has declared I shall be heard nowhere."

My Lord, I feel deeply, not only this act of injustice, but also the mistake which Convocation has made in diverging from the path of useful and practical reform on which it has entered of late years to an attempt to limit freedom of expression and thought in this country. The newly appointed Dean of Lincoln, Dr. Jeremie, Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, spoke with excellent sense on this point in Convocation. He said—

> "If we once do so we shall be involved in endless difficulties. I believe that the whole tide of public sympathy, now in our favour, will turn against us, and we shall ultimately lose the means of usefulness we now possess, and which we cannot hope to retain unless we confine our attention to reforms of a particular nature."

If Convocation persists in proceeding in this path, I fear the result will be a reversion to the constitutional form which has been adopted before to check its eccentricities; whereas if they will employ argument to meet argument, knowledge to meet knowledge, and intellect to meet intellect, they will do all which will be the best for their Church and their country. I will, in conclusion, put to Her Majesty's Government the Question of which I have given notice—

> "Whether they have taken or are willing to take the Opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown as to the Powers of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury to pass a Synodical Judgment on Books written either by Clergymen or by Laymen; as to the immunity of the Members of that Body from Proceedings at Common Law consequent on such Judgments; and as to the Forms according to which such Judicial Power must be exercised if it belongs to that Body?"

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, the speech of my noble Friend (Lord Houghton) has been so able, that it relieves me in a great degree from any difficulty as to my answer. There are three modes of dealing with Convocation since it has been permitted, which I deeply regret, to come into action again and transact business. The first is, while they are harmlessly busy, to take no notice of their proceedings; the second is, when they seem likely to get into mischief, to prorogue them and put a stop to their proceedings; the third, when they have done something clearly beyond their powers, is to bring them to the bar of justice for punishment. Now, before what Court could they be brought, and what would be the punishment that could be inflicted on them? All the laws about which my noble Friend has addressed you were passed at the time of the Reformation, and were passed for a purpose which the Legislature had most at heart—to secure the supremacy of the Crown. The supremacy of the Crown is guarded by strict words, which carefully enunciate this truth—that the Crown is the fountain of all jurisdiction, ecclesiastical and spiritual as well as temporal, and that none shall presume to exercise that jurisdiction, either directly or indirectly, without the special warrant of the Crown and with an appeal to the Crown. But as if there were an expectation that the clergy would endeavour to usurp the rights and powers which history tells us they have at all times been anxious to obtain, the statutes have carefully provided that the express license of the Crown should be necessary to enable Convocation to act in any manner, and that if Convocation should attempt to pronounce any sentence, or execute any law or ordinance, without the previous license and authority of the Crown, they shall incur the penalties of a *præmunire.* The enactment of the 25 *Henry* VIII. c. 19 is, that the clergy shall not presume to attempt, allege, claim, or put in use, any constitutions or ordinances or canons in their Convocations without the King's license so to do. Words could not more precisely or accurately define that all jurisdiction to be exercised by Convocation is to be under the power and authority of the Sovereign, and that without an express authority they are prohibited from alleging or putting in use any ordinance or canon, that is, from passing any judgment, opinion or sentence. But the caution of the Legislature did not even stop there. Not only did it require that Convocation must be put in motion by the Crown, but it said that no ordinances or sentences—nothing which Convocation might choose to pronounce—should have any validity until it had received the sanction of the Crown, and that if any attempt were made to give any force to them without that sanction the parties so offending should incur the penalties of a *præmunire*. I am afraid my noble Friend has not considered what the pains and penalties of a *præmunire* are, or his gentle heart would have melted at the prospect. The most rev. Primate and the Bishops would have to appear at this bar, not in the solemn state in which we see them here, but as penitents in sackcloth and ashes. And what would be the sentence? I observe that the most rev. Primate gave two votes—his original vote and a casting vote. I will take the measure of his sentence from the sentence passed by a Bishop on one of these authors—a year's deprivation of his benefice. For two years, therefore, the most rev. Primate might be condemned to have all the revenues of his high position sequestrated. I have not ventured—I say it seriously—I have not ventured to present this question to Her Majesty's Government; for, my Lords, only imagine what a temptation it would be for my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer to spread his net and in one haul take in £30,000 from the highest dignitary, not to speak of the *oi polloi*—the bishops, deacons, archdeacons, canons, vicars—all included in one common crime, all subject to one common penalty! I cannot contemplate that possibility, and, therefore, your Lordships will not be surprised to hear that I have refrained from approaching the subject—that I have shrunk altogether from taking the first step of asking counsel of the Law Officers of the Crown in the matter. Had I taken that step I have no doubt I should have been advised, that if there was a synodical judgment it would be a violation of the law; I should then have been placed in the disagreeable position of having to advise a prosecution; and, entertaining as I do a sincere affection for the Episcopal Bench and a sincere personal regard and affection for many members of the Episcopate, I am happy to find myself relieved from such great difficulty and embarrassment. But the question is a most serious one for the right rev. Bench; and, in the hope that I might save my right rev. Friends from danger, I was extremely anxious to know from them what the thing was which they call a synodical judgment, but in which, as it seems, no person has been condemned. I thought it right, however, to remind the right rev. Prelates that they were under no necessity of producing the records of Convocation if they thought it more prudent not to do so. The most rev. Prelate has not favoured me with a copy of the judgment, and therefore I have been obliged to have recourse to the ordinary sources of information. But assuming that the report of the judgment which I have read is a correct one, I am happy to tell your Lordships that what is called a synodical judgment is a well-lubricated set of words—a sentence so oily and saponaceous that no one can grasp it. Like an eel, it slips through your fingers. It is simply nothing, and I am glad to tell my noble Friend (Lord Houghton) that it is literally no sentence at all. I have had recourse to a publication which seems to have some authority, and I find that the sentence was in terms to this effect—

> "That this Convocation having appointed Committees of the Upper and Lower Houses to examine and report on the book entitled *Essays and Reviews*, and the Committees having severally reported thereon, this Convocation does hereby synodically condemn such book, as containing teachings contrary to the doctrines received by the United Church of England and Ireland, in common with the whole Catholic Church."

If, my Lords, the book had been the work of one hand, this sentence might have had some effect; but seeing that the book is nothing but a pair of covers holding together seven separate essays, being the distinct works of so many authors, and seeing that this sentence does not attribute any offence to anything but the volume containing those separate writings, no one of the authors is condemned, and each one of them may say, "This thing that is condemned is not mine; it is no child of mine—it belongs to you." In this way the volume and the sentence which condemns it may be handed round from one to another, and the application of the sentence be repudiated by the authors in succession. Convocation could not have been more successful if they had synodically sat down to produce a sentence of no meaning, than they were when in their labour they produced this *ridiculus mus*. As a judgment, this sentence has no meaning whatever—this judgment is no judgment at all. And though, if I desired to be strict and severe

—as I have certainly no desire to be—I might bring the whole body that have sought to exercise this jurisdiction within the penalties of the statutes, for they have equally broken the law, although their sentence is abortive; yet I am happy to assure my noble Friend, as no one is hurt by this oily form of words—as no one can say that he is injured by them—that having regard to the impotency of the thing, Her Majesty's Government intend to take no action in the matter, *Solvuntur tabulæ risu.* But, my Lords, I would remind the right rev. Bench that the question raised by this proceeding is a very serious one, and in order, if possible, to prevent Convocation being misled hereafter, I wish to explain exactly how the case stands. The question does not depend, as I have seen it stated, upon the Act of *Henry* VIII alone. That was one out of a number of statutes. But the Legislature was anxious to repeat again and again the great principle of the law upon which the constitution of the country as regarded the union of Church and State depended—namely, the supremacy of the Crown in all matters civil and ecclesiastical. That principle is most clearly stated in the language of the 17th section of the 1st of *Elizabeth*, c. 21, which is as follows—

> "And that also it may likewise please your Highness that it may be established and enacted by the authority aforesaid, that such jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities, and pre-eminences, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any spiritual and ecclesiastical power or authority hath heretofore been or may lawfully be exercised or used for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order and correction of the same, and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, shall for ever by authority of this present Parliament be united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this realm."

Now, if there had been ten thousand times the jurisdiction attaching to Convocation, the whole of it would be taken away and annexed to the Crown. It could not remain in Convocation, and for this plain reason—because the statute of Henry VIII., confirmed by the statute of Elizabeth, has declared the final ownership of all this jurisdiction shall be vested in the Crown. But from Convocation no appeal is given. Now, it is impossible that any body can exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction without appeal to the Crown; from Convocation there is no appeal; it therefore can exercise no jurisdiction to condemn either books or authors even if it had a license so to do. In the introductory part of the statute of 37 *Henry* VIII. c. 17, the Crown is described as being Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England, having full power and authority to correct, punish, and repress all manner of heresies, &c., and to exercise all other manner of jurisdiction, commonly called ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Again, in the same preamble, it is stated—

> "Inasmuch as your Majesty is the only head of the Church of England and Ireland, to whom by Holy Scripture all authority and power is wholly given to hear and determine all manner of causes ecclesiastical, &c."

Again, by the antecedent statute of Henry—23 *Henry* VIII. c. 9—it is declared that no person is to be cited to appear before any spiritual jurisdiction out of the diocese "wherein he dwelleth," except by the Archbishop acting as a Court of Appeal. All those statutes taken together must bring us to this conclusion—that it was the intention of the Legislature to marshal ecclesiastical jurisdiction for trying all ecclesiastical offences in this order—first, the diocesan of the diocese in which the person cited lives; then the Archbishop in court of appeal; and lastly, the Crown, as the supreme head and the final administrator. But if you interpose your Convocation you interpose a body that is not exercising any accountable jurisdiction—that is, not controlled by any court of appeal. It would therefore be an anomalous body exercising an anomalous jurisdiction, not falling at all within the order of arrangement contemplated by the statutes, and not amenable to the final jurisdiction of the Crown if it should attempt to exercise anything in the nature of jurisdiction. It is impossible that Convocation can exercise anything like this jurisdiction. With regard to your meeting among yourselves as a debating club, expressing your opinion whether this or that book is a good or a bad one, even that is not a very small nor is it a very proper thing, because you may thereby involve yourselves in circumstances of great peril. You cannot declare that the book of a clergyman is heretical without involving the author in the charge of heresy. Let me bring before you the predicament in which any individual member of the Episcopal Bench may stand. You, the Upper House, come to a particular determination. But suppose the author of one of these essays is presented to a living or any other piece of ecclesiastical preferment, and suppose that one of the Bishops who has been a party to these proceedings is called upon to institute.

The Bishop will naturally say, "How can I institute a man whose work I have joined in condemning for heretical opinion?" But in declining to institute the Bishop might be involved in very serious consequences, and be subject to a proceeding denoted by another hard word, a *duplex querela.* I call upon the Bishops to pause before they again place themselves in such a position—to pause for their own sake, even if they have no regard to the injustice, to the anomaly, to the unreasonable spectacle of condemning a man whom they have no power to convene, whom they have no authority to hear, and whom, when he presents himself as a suppliant, their own timidity and fear of going beyond their tether compel them to dismiss. Those who do not concur in these proceedings may probably think that, by protesting against such a course, they may save themselves from consequences; but, if they will take my recommendation, whenever there is any attempt to carry Convocation beyond its proper limits, their best security after protesting will be to gather up their garments and flee, and, remembering the pillar of salt, not to cast a look behind. I am happy to say that in all these proceedings there is more smoke than fire. The words of condemnation are innocent and innocuous, though they do not, probably, proceed from a spirit that is equally harmless. As to the Question of the noble Lord, after what, I trust, may be an intelligible statement of the law, I have only to assure the noble Lord that it is not the intention of the Government to take any steps in the matter.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, I assure your Lordships that I feel the great disadvantage under which I must labour after the two speeches which have just been made, and especially after that of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. At the same time I must be allowed to express my sincere regret that in the concluding words of the noble and learned Lord's address he should have imputed motives. I can assure your Lordships that in the course which we took there was no touch of malice, and that our object was simply and solely to vindicate the Church of England from complicity with opinions which we considered most mistaken and dangerous. I cannot but lament that it was not thought right that the Law Officers of the Crown should give their opinion in this matter. It was not my fault that their opinion was not obtained. Before I took a single step on this subject in Convocation I said, "I will not move till I am satisfied that I am entering on a legal course." A case was accordingly drawn up and submitted to the Law Officers of the Crown, who hesitated, however, in pronouncing upon it; and the answer they at last returned was that they ought not to give their opinion. I regretted this extremely, because the question was one which touched the Royal supremacy, and I did think that it behoved the Government to procure the opinions of the Law Officers on such a question, and to shield Convocation from pursuing a wrong course. Being deprived, however, of this valuable assistance, the case was submitted to Sir Hugh Cairns and Mr. Rolt, who were unequivocally of opinion that we were proceeding in a legal course. This was the case submitted to them—

> "Is the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, when legally assembled under the Queen's writ, estopped by the statute of 25 *Henry* VIII. c. 19, or by any other statute, from proceeding to pronounce synodical condemnation upon a book, not intending to proceed against the author, without receiving the special Royal License for the purpose?"

The opinion of Sir Hugh Cairns and Mr. Rolt was as follows:—

> "We are of opinion that the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury is not estopped by the 25 *Henry* VIII. c. 19, or any other statute, from expressing by resolution or otherwise their condemnation or disapprobation of a book, although no special Royal License is given for the purpose. Exception was taken early in the last century to the proposal of Convocation to pass synodical censure on a sermon preached by Bishop Hoadley, but it was not alleged that they were disabled by statute from so doing."

My Lords, I know it is very presumptuous in me to venture to bring forward any legal argument; but I cannot help quoting a single passage from a pamphlet which I hold in my hand upon *Convocation and Provincial Synods.* I do so because I think the gist of this question has been entirely overlooked by both the noble Lords who have addressed your Lordships on the subject. They have spoken as though we were attempting to condemn a person; whereas the question is whether we may not condemn a book or condemn opinions. Now, speaking of the necessity of the Royal Assent before passing a canon, the pamphlet says—

> "Not only is the power of Convocation to make canons thus limited, but it is very doubtful, to say the least, whether the Upper House, as such, has any jurisdiction or power to try or condemn

a clergyman for the publication or preaching of heretical opinions. In the celebrated case of Mr. Whiston, in the reign of Queen Anne, the Queen, on the petition of the Upper House, took the opinions of the Judges on this question. They were divided in opinion; and, although the majority were of opinion that such a power did belong to the Upper House, they reserved to themselves the power to decide otherwise if the question were brought before them by prohibition."

Now, this is the material passage—

> "They were, however, of opinion that heretical opinions might be examined and condemned in Convocation without convening the authors or maintainers of them."

If that is the law, Convocation is now within it. I think, therefore, that all the dreadful penalties which the noble and learned Lord spoke of as being in store for us may be passed over without any great concern. There is a passage in the judgment of the Privy Council in the case which seems to me to invite the very thing which has been done by Convocation—

> "A few short extracts only are before us, and our judgment must by law be confined to the matter which is therein contained. If, therefore, the book, or these two essays, or either of them as a whole, be of a mischievous and baneful tendency, as weakening the foundations of Christian belief, and likely to cause many to offend, they will retain that character, and be liable to that condemnation notwithstanding this our judgment."

This passage surely shows that the book itself might be justly liable to condemnation, though the Court, having only "a few short extracts" before it, could not take cognizance of all the matters contained in it. Apprehensions are entertained lest Convocation should proceed continually in the same direction as it has lately taken, constantly condemning books as they are brought before them; but I ask your Lordships whether since the Reformation there has been any crisis in the English Church of so grave a character as that through which it is now passing; and whether there is ever likely to occur in the next 200 or 300 years so serious a case or one calling so urgently upon Convocation, the Synod of the Church, to pronounce its opinion. The very passage I have quoted from the judgment seems to me to intimate that the book does strike at the foundations of Christian belief. I will abstain from entering into theological questions; but, taking one sentence only from the book, "no testimony can reach the supernatural," I say that that strikes at the root of Christian belief, and that if such a doctrine is to prevail there is an end to the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

I ask again, was there ever a case which called so loudly for our interference? Here is an address which was forwarded to me from 500 or 600 of the clergy of one diocese only—the diocese of Rochester—who say—

> "Believing, as we do, that imminent danger will accrue to the truth, and to the Church of England and Ireland as a witness of the truth, and an instrument in the hands of God for the salvation of men's souls, if steps are not taken by which the said disastrous effects on the popular mind may be promptly met, and, if possible, prevented, we earnestly beseech your Grace to take counsel with the rest of the archbishops and bishops of the Church of England and Ireland with a view to the adoption of such measures as may clear the Church from any supposed acquiescence in an interpretation of its articles and formularies which we hold to be at variance with their plain meaning and with the true faith."

Now, with such appeals as these could we really sit with our hands folded and say, "We know we have the power of pronouncing condemnation, but we are afraid of the outcry which may be raised if we condemn the book, and so we will not condemn it?" I say we should have been unworthy of our position in the Church if we had adopted such a course.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that in his quotation as to the power of Convocation the most rev. Prelate had omitted a passage declaring that tenets and opinions might be examined and condemned under the authority of a Royal license.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: I hope, in conclusion, that three or four clergymen of the Church of England will never again be found to combine—for such, I must assert, is the proper term to use in this case — to publish opinions of such a dangerous tendency. I know that in the *Edinburgh Review* and elsewhere the charge of combination has been denied, but combination I must call it, and that there was concert between these clergymen I cannot but believe. I think it is hardly fair to say that the parties to this question have not been heard. If there should ever be a renewal of the agitation which has existed in the Church since this publication, I trust that Convocation will be found ready to act again; but I hope it will be long before any such crisis does occur in the history of the Church of England. I will only repeat that I regret very much that the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown was not obtained, and that their opinions had not been pronounced upon it before Convocation proceeded to take cognizance of the case. We took the best opinions we could get, and we believed that we were fully authorized to act upon those opinions.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON: My Lords, I think the most rev. Prelate has good ground of complaint that his desire to obtain the opinion of the highest legal authorities was not granted. There is no subject which may not be treated with ridicule, and perhaps there are matters which may be more easily disposed of by ridicule than by more serious treatment; but, still, we know that very grave consequences often arise from very small causes—and upon no subject are those consequences more likely to arise than on the intricate relations between the power ecclesiastical and the power temporal. The experience even of the last fifteen or twenty years has shown that these disputes between the civil power and the ecclesiastical power, unless attended to in the beginning with great care and caution, are likely to lead to very serious evils. A cloud no bigger than a man's hand may spread until it bursts into a hurricane. Within the last fifteen years experience has shown us that if the Government of Sir Robert Peel had been advised to treat with due respect the little and insignificant squabble which arose, I believe, in the Presbytery of Auchterarder, we should not have been reduced to the unfortunate predicament of seeing the Established Church of Scotland rent in twain, and one very large section of the religious feeling of that country become entirely separated from the Established Church. It does, therefore, seem to me that when such questions arise, however limited their sphere, and however unimportant, it is desirable that those who are at the head of affairs should take such steps as will, if possible, settle the disputed questions before they attain a gravity which may be dangerous. The noble and learned Lord has favoured us, who formed the minority in Convocation, with some advice; but if your Lordships had ever attended a meeting of Convocation you would know that the summonses are couched in most imposing language, and I know not what penalties are threatened to those who may be regardless of the commands of their superiors, and refuse to take any part in the proceedings. It is all very well to call this a debating society, but it is a debating society which must meet when the Queen summons it; and it would be hardly decorous in me without grave cause to refuse to obey the summons. If, therefore, there is the slightest chance that the law may be violated by such a body, it is undoubtedly necessary that the very highest legal authority should as soon as possible be consulted and should pronounce upon what is the law, and what is the course which each individual belonging to that assembly ought to take. This was done in the reign of Queen Anne in Whiston's case, when the matter was referred to the twelve Judges. I am not sure that that opinion has been correctly stated by the noble Lord who opened this discussion. Unless I am mistaken, the question referred to the twelve Judges was whether, under the circumstances in which Convocation then met, it could proceed to censure the book of Mr. Whiston? Those circumstances were somewhat peculiar, for the Queen had summoned Convocation to take into consideration the religious condition of the country; and although the Queen had not actually named the book of Mr. Whiston, yet she had given a general license to Convocation to deal with all similar books. Therefore, so far as I can judge, I am distinctly of opinion that Mr. Whiston's case did not in any way establish the rule that Convocation without the Royal Assent was entitled to enter upon a consideration of such matters. That was not a case of Convocation entering upon a matter without the Royal license so to do; but a case in which Convocation was called together by the Queen to enter upon such subjects generally, and then the opinion of the twelve Judges was taken whether that general license entitled them to consider a particular branch of the general subject. Now, undoubtedly, there is no such general license in the present instance, and therefore doubts may fairly arise, and did present themselves to the most rev. Prelate, as to whether he would be justified in proceeding to do that which the clergy, not of one diocese alone, but of many dioceses, called upon him to do. No one can know the most rev. Prelate without being convinced that he would not proceed in this or any other matter without being clear and distinct as to what was his duty. The natural course for him was to request that the highest legal authority should set him right if he were likely to go wrong, and that step he took upon this occasion. It would have been well if the noble and learned Lord had spoken at the proper time with that clearness and precision with which he usually speaks, and has spoken now, or if the Law Officers of the Crown had been permitted to deliver their opinions upon this matter. Instead of that course, however, the noble and learned Lord held his peace while Convocation was proceeding, and after they had concluded their deliberations he now comes forward to pronounce, with all the force of his great authority, against the legality of their judgment. Now, the most rev. Prelate had, it appears, taken privately the advice of two of the most eminent lawyers of the day. But it must be admitted that, even with the authority of two such eminent men in his favour, Convocation is not necessarily acting legally; for their Lordships knew how frequently men most eminent in the law proved to be mistaken in their opinions. I need only refer again to the northern portion of this kingdom an instance. One of the peculiarities of the difficulty which led to the Scottish disruption was that those who held ecclesiastical authority in Scotland at that time were advised by one of the most eminent lawyers of the day to take the steps which they did take. The name of the lawyer still survives in his son, the present Lord Advocate of Scotland, and he was regarded as a most able and acute lawyer. He gave a distinct opinion, which afterwards turned out to be wrong; but that he was mistaken was not found out until the dispute had become too serious to be settled quietly. It is well to be forearmed in such matters, not only with an able opinion, but with the opinions which have the highest authority. Let it not be supposed that there is anything like a desire on the part of the clergy to violate the law, or to stretch their ideas of ecclesiastical rights beyond what is legal and proper. No body of men are more anxious to obey the law than the clergy, but they must know what the law is before they can obey it, and you (the Government) do not tell them. You leave them to find it out for themselves, to go to the best counsel for advice; and when they act upon the opinion thus obtained you tell them—very properly tell them—that they have done wrong, only it would have been better by a timely opinion to have prevented their wrong doing. There was, indeed, good reason for the most rev. Prelate taking the opinion of counsel upon this matter. I hold in my hand a somewhat remarkable document, an address of the Bishop of Exeter to his clergy in the course of last summer. I do not know whether that rev. Prelate still retains the opinions which he then expressed, but upon that occasion, speaking of Convocation, which he understood had entered upon a similar examination of a book which has been alluded to already in this debate, he said—

> "They are sober, discreet, as well as learned and able men, and they would not have rushed into such a danger of violating an Act of Parliament—the Act which relates to the supremacy of the Crown in these matters—without great caution, and without being sure that they were right. Now, we know this is not the first occasion on which Convocation has dealt with heretical books, so called. But I see that on those occasions the wise men—our predecessors—who had to deal with them took special care not to proceed without the license of the Crown. I hold in my hand an answer of the archbishops and bishops in the year 1702, when the Lower House of Convocation called upon them to deal with the book of Toland, in which they said, 'We do not find how, without the license from the King, which we have not yet received, we can have sufficient authority. We know not how, without that license, we can have sufficient authority to censure judicially any such works'—not men, which is an important distinction—'but, on the contrary, we are advised that by so doing both Houses of Convocation may incur the penalties of the statute 25 *Henry* VIII.'"

The right rev. Prelate having expressed that opinion, it was not unnatural that doubts should have presented themselves to the most rev. Prelate, and that he sought to have those doubts dispelled by the highest authorities. In the course of the debates in Convocation on the matter now under discussion, further doubts on the legality of the proceedings were expressed. It was there stated—

> "In Burnet's case, 1700, the Lower House having made a general representation against his book on the Thirty-nine Articles (Bull and Sherlock protesting in the minority), the Upper House answered—'That the Lower House of Convocation censuring the book of the Bishop of Sarum in general terms, without mentioning the particular passages on which the censure is grounded, is defamatory and scandalous.'"

This was one of the points raised against the present judgment. Another was, that it is not according to the precedents of this Synod to censure any writings which have been previously judged in the Ecclesiastical Courts. It is obvious, therefore, that the present case was one requiring to be solved *in limine* by the highest legal authority. I do not myself think that it is possible to find any precedents for what has been done by Convocation in this case. The case of Bishop

Hoadley has been quoted. He was attacked twice—once before he was made a Bishop, and once after he became Bishop. When he preached a certain sermon before he became Bishop, it was brought under the censure of the House of Convocation, and the very question now argued was brought forward. It was said that the Bishops hesitated to proceed, because they could not believe that they possessed any power so to do, without the authority of the Crown. When Bishop Hoadley's case came on again ten years afterwards, the Court was dissolved—*solvuntur risu*—and although it was revived again for a short time, Convocation was soon afterwards dissolved, and did not meet again for 100 years, scarcely entering on any other such, except it were that of Dr. Clarke. The mention of Dr. Clarke's name reminds me that I am not so hopeful as the most rev. Prelate in believing that we may never have any more such books as those referred to in this debate. This is, no doubt, a grave crisis through which the Church of England is passing. I look with as much sorrow as any man on the dangerous opinions which are current in the present day; but I trust that the truth will ever prevail. There is one who watches over His Church with greater power than Convocation, and I, for one, do not doubt that by the help of sound argument, learning, and pious lives, the clergy will more successfully maintain the truths committed to them than by the intervention of such censures as those of which we have heard. Thus the Church has been preserved in former trials. I doubt whether the present trial through which the Church is passing is as great as when the Rector of St. James's (Dr. Clarke) suggested an amended edition of the Prayer Book, from which all mention of the Trinity was omitted. There was at that time a large and recognized Arian party in the Church, and this may remind us that the Church has had other and more severe periods of trial from which she has happily passed uninjured. Men always exaggerate the importance of the questions of their own time, and if the only way of meeting errors of this kind is by the censure of Convocation, we may expect a long catalogue of such conflicts as the present. I trust that this will not be the case, and that the peace and harmony of the Church may be preserved by the good sense and good feeling of the clergy. Convocation is not a large body, and comparatively few of its members attend. At the meeting now in question perhaps not more than forty to fifty members were present. [The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: Sixty.] At any rate I think it probable that the Church, having its attention called to the subject, will think it desirable to treat these matters in another way. We shall, however, be greatly assisted by knowing whether the course which has now been taken, and which many of us deem unwise, be legal or not. We may be called upon by ecclesiastical authority, though I hope not, to take a similar course again. I desire to know the law for my own protection, and I do not know how I am authoritatively to ascertain the law unless I can have the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown. With regard to Convocation and the position it holds in this country, no one will deny that there is a growing disposition to revert to the action and authority of Convocation. If that is the case, it is the more imperative on the part of that body to see that it maintains its dignity in the sight of this Empire, and to perceive that, if it seeks immunity from criminal proceedings by saying that its resolutions, however high sounding, have no validity, it then, indeed, occupies a humiliating position. In former times, when I filled a lower position in the Church, I never felt so strongly as some of my brethren the necessity for resuscitating this body from its slumbers. Since I have been called to my present office in the Church, finding Convocation resuscitated, I have always endeavoured to perform my duty as a member of Convocation. I do think, however, that our position will be intolerable if we are told, on the one hand, that we are violating the law, and if, on the other, we cannot obtain an authoritative opinion as to what the law really is.

LORD WENSLEYDALE (who was most indistinctly heard) said, that his most rev. Friend the Archbishop ought to take the best possible advice whether Convocation had a right to act judicially, and condemn a work as heretical, or merely to express their opinion upon the qualities of the work as injurious to the Church. In the one case, it had the qualities of a judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction. They might publish it with impunity, whether libellous or not; they could not be punished or rendered liable to an action, however unjust it might be. But if they were not invested with judicial powers, the publishers of the document would be liable to action, and only have the common protection of every individual in commenting honestly on every published document; and if they were found to have exceeded that universal privilege, they were liable to punishment or to make the injured partў compensation. His most rev. Friend ought not to rely on any barrister's opinion, even that of the Attorney and the Solicitor General. This House had unquestionably the power of taking the best possible opinion — that of the Judges; a power which had in his own time been exercised on a Motion by the right rev. Bishop of Exeter as to the Canadian Reserves, and he strongly advised the most rev. Archbishop to move the House to obtain that opinion.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: My Lords, it was a matter for the discretion of my noble Friend (Lord Houghton) whether he should or should not bring forward this Question; but having determined to bring this matter before your Lordships, I for one—and I believe my right rev. Brethren agree with me—have nothing whatever to complain of in the tone or manner in which my noble Friend has discharged the duty he has imposed upon himself. My noble Friend, however, fell not unnaturally, for one unacquainted with ecclesiastical matters, into a few palpable mistakes, which detracted somewhat from the weight of his remarks. There was, for instance, considerable confusion in his account of what the twelve Judges agreed upon, and upon what they differed, when their judgment was asked by Queen Anne. The whole Bench, including the Attorney and Solicitor General, agreed in declaring that the Convocation had a jurisdiction which it was free to exercise as to books. They said they conceived that a jurisdiction existed in matters of heresy and the condemnation of heretics. Four of the Judges differed on the second clause of the jurisdiction over the man, but they united with their brethren in asserting the jurisdiction of Convocation over books. They said, "We conceive that heretical tenets and opinions may be condemned, if authorized by Royal license." The authority of the Royal license is the license which calls Convocation together. I say so for this reason—that there is no instance of any license other than this being received for the exercise of this jurisdiction by Convocation. The Queen's Letter was no license; and here was the second error into which my noble Friend fell. He spoke of the Queen's Letter accompanying the answer of the Judges, informing Convocation of their powers, as if that was a Royal license. But a Royal license is drawn in certain peculiar words, it gives certain peculiar powers. It is framed upon the Act of Submission of Henry VIII., and does not agree in any one point with the Letter of the Queen accompanying the opinion of the Judges. It is, therefore, simply a mistake to suppose that that was a license under the broad seal as is required by the Act of Submission, to enable Convocation to do this thing. It had no relation whatever to it, but was simply a letter accompanying the answer of the Judges, giving an opinion with respect to the legal question asked by Convocation. That is a most important point in the argument, and therefore it is that I have noticed it, and not from any pleasure which I take in showing that my noble Friend has fallen into error. He also fell into another error of the same class when he said that at all events the Clergy Discipline Act, which required that in every suit against a clerk a certain line should be followed, had taken away from Convocation all power to deal with clerks. But how does that touch the condemnation of the book? That was the power the Judges maintained that Convocation possessed; that was the power which was exercised in Convocation upon the authority of the twelve Judges of England, never yet contradicted by any authoritative sentence. But if I have no ground to complain of the tone of the speech of my noble Friend, I think that—I do not say in common with my right rev. Friends, but in common with this House—I have good ground to complain of the tone of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. If a man has no respect for himself, he ought, at all events, to respect the tribunal before which he speaks; and when the highest representative of the law of England in your Lordships' House upon a matter involving the liberties of the subject and the religion of the realm, and all those high truths concerning which this discussion is, can think it fitting to descend to a ribaldry in which he knows that he can safely indulge, because those to whom he addresses it will have too much respect for their character to answer him in like sort—I say that this House has ground to complain of having its high character unnecessarily injured in the sight of the people of this land by one occupying so high a position within it. But, my Lords, this is not all. I venture to say that in such a discussion as this there is one duty which more than another it is imperative upon one holding the high place of the noble and learned Lord to be careful to discharge: it is that he does not by any license of speech, or by any carelessness of assertion, mislead your Lordships as to one single fact or one single point of law. Such carefulness, I venture to say boldly in your presence, my Lords, has not been exercised to-night. I will take but one instance. The noble and learned Lord stated that he had applied to my most rev. Friend and myself to give him a copy of the judgment pronounced in the Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury; that he had accompanied the request with a caution that no man was bound to criminate himself; and that my most rev. Friend and I had acted with a wise prudence in not venturing to produce the document. My Lords, what are the facts? After I came into the House this evening the noble and learned Lord asked me to speak to him on the Woolsack. He said, "Have you with you in the House a copy of your judgment?" I replied, "I have not." He said, "I should have liked, if you had, to have seen it." I replied, "I wish that you had told me so before, for nothing would have given me greater pleasure than to have produced it to you." The noble and learned Lord asked the same question of my most rev. Friend the other night, and received an answer exactly similar to that which I gave him to night—that we were most ready to put into his hands the document for which he asked. I ask your Lordships is it the way in which this House should be treated that such a request so answered should be transfigured into the charge which the noble and learned Lord has thought fit to bring against the most rev. Prelate and myself to-night. I must say that I think throughout the whole time he was dealing with the great question of law, the same misleading tendency pervaded the speech of the noble and learned Lord. Throughout he endeavoured to suggest to your Lordships that the question which we were raising was this — whether jurisdiction resided in us spiritual persons as separate from the Crown in virtue of our spiritual character; or whether, as he maintained, jurisdiction in this land comes all of it, ecclesiastical as well as civil, from the Crown? That was a suggestion that we were in this case attempting to claim a jurisdiction independent of the Crown. My Lords, it is scarcely conceivable that one having the knowledge of the law possessed by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack could really have thought that what we claimed, sitting under the Queen's Writ, acting because we are called together under the Queen's Writ according to Act of Parliament, was to act by a power opposed to the Royal supremacy—when we meet together at the call of the Queen, because we acknowledge that she has such supremacy, and do our duty as the Queen's subjects in a Court which she has called together. The attempt was to suggest that here was one of those reaches of power of which he said the clergy were always guilty, by attempting to set up something against the jurisdiction of the Crown. There was an attempt to make your Lordships believe that which was not only not the fact, but which the very fact of our so sitting contradicted in the act of our sitting. I complain of this; and I complain also of the way in which the noble and learned Lord quoted the 37 *Henry* VIII. c. 17, to make out his case, when he said that our laws gave to the Queen the title of "the Head of the Church." Are your Lordships aware that though that title was so given in that Act Queen Elizabeth refused to receive or bear it, and that in the revival of the old Acts providing for the Royal jurisdiction, the part which declared the Sovereign to be the Head of the Church, was by Her own special command excluded from the revival? In these cases, I think that this House has a right to have all these matters stated by this high authority in the way in which your Lordships can be most religiously preserved from taking any wrong view of the matter upon which you are addressed. And, my Lords, when at last we are told that it was timidity only which had prevented the Upper House of Convocation from proceeding against the man in this case, here was an imputation of motives, unworthy, I will not say, of those who sit in that House, but unworthy of those who dared to throw out such an imputation. But I leave this to the good taste of your Lordships' House. I have not a doubt how in this House, and how throughout the country, all that I have ventured thus lightly to touch upon will be received. I know enough of this House, and of the people of England, to know that it is not by trying, in words which shall blister those upon whom they fall, to produce a momentary pain on those who cannot properly reply to them, that great questions will be solved; but that it is by dealing with them with calmness, with abstinence from the imputation of motives, and above all with the most scrupulous regard to stating upon every point that which shall prevent any man in this House being led to a conclusion other than that which the facts warrant. But, my Lords, I must say, with the most rev. Prelate, that I consider this to be one of those peculiar cases in the history of the Church which call for unusual remedies to redress the evil. What was it that was before us? My noble Friend (Lord Houghton) has said that there was an attempt to repress the liberty of thought. For one, I utterly disavow any such desire. I do not believe that people can be kept to a right belief by any such means. No one can go further than I do in saying, "Let argument be met by argument, learning confronted by learning, and the right shall prevail." But was that our question? Our question was this—men bound by the most solemn obligations that man can possibly take to teach according to the particular line of doctrine laid down by the Church, as the condition of their holding the ministry—these men, in the judgment of this Bench, taught publicly, and in virtue of that sacred office, the opposite to that which they had undertaken to teach. Our action was for the maintenance of truth, and to hold to engagements, and it was not to put down opinion. We had to deal with this question—"Shall the Church of England see these false doctrines stated by those who hold her ministry; and shall we, her highest ministers, having under our Queen the opportunity of, for the ministry of that Church, disavowing these errors—shall we timorously hold our tongues; because if we speak we may be subject to ribald reproach; or shall we, in the name of the Church of England, clear that ministry from being supposed to be at liberty to declare one thing as the condition of taking it, and then to speak another as the habit of its exercise?" It was not, my Lords, to put down opinion, it was to prevent men breaking their solemn obligations, that this step was taken. Nor let it be thought that you have heard the whole facts of the case when you have been told, as you have been told to-night, that the censure was a mere general one, and that no propositions were abstracted. There were propositions carefully extracted from the book, and cited as the grounds of the judgment, and this course has been always followed on the part of Convocation. In the case of Mr. Whiston the propositions were stated separately from the judgment, but the judgment was founded on the propositions. That was the course which we pursued. We took out of the book the specific propositions which we deemed it most essential to condemn, and we then spoke the condemnation. It was said that in doing this we resorted to the un-English unfairness of condemning men who were not allowed to answer the charges which were brought against them. But I pray your Lordships to mark how the matter stood. We, in the first place, did not condemn the men, while we censured much that was in the book. But is it true that the individuals concerned had no opportunity of answering the charges which were made? Why, edition after edition of the work was published after the passages which were objected to were known, and if the writers wished to explain they had ample opportunity to do so. It is, I would add, one thing to condemn a man, and another to censure a book. The man might not have intended any harm, and if you proceed to censure him you must give him an opportunity of stating what it was he did mean, so that he might be enabled to retract what was found fault with if he were so disposed. The book, however, cannot retract itself. It cannot explain itself. It stands a *litera scripta*—a document in court which speaks on its own behalf. And if any one of these writers found himself in the company of men who expressed themselves against the religion of the country in a way which he thought incompatible with his position as a clergyman, had not he, I would ask, sufficient opportunity of saying, "I will no longer appear in such company?" Inasmuch, however, as no such attempt was made, and as each successive author allowed his name to be given to the world in the same companionship in each successive edition of the work, he, I maintain, rendered himself thereby morally responsible for the whole of its contents. Here is the true question. We are set in trust in this land for this—that we may be the depository of the truth which God has revealed, as held by this reformed Church of England. Was it or was it not our duty, when we saw the peace of the Church assailed, to use the instrument which, as we believed and still believe—I may say with additional force when we see the nice avoidance of the expression of any opinion that we were really in the wrong—firmly was our right, and because it was our right, imposed upon us a corresponding duty? One thing I venture to state is this—that I would rather subject myself, in the presence of my countrymen and of your noble House, to any amount of that invective and insinuation, and all those arts of I will not say what part of the Bar of England of which we have seen something to-night—I would, I repeat, rather a thousand times incur it all, than have to look back on my death-bed on myself as one of those who had not striven for the truth of our Established Church, and had not encountered, because I was afraid, personally, of the consequences, anything which the maintenance of that truth might entail. There is, my Lords, a single further remark which I would wish to make. We have heard of the importance of preserving peace and quietness on such questions as that which we are discussing: I firmly believe that such a judgment as that which we have pronounced is the best means of restoring peace to the Church. I believe, indeed, that that effect has already been produced. I know, at all events, that from all parts of this country I have myself received assurances of minds quieted, permitting men to go again about their ordinary duties without being stirred up by the feeling that the Church was resting under an imputation of having allowed to pass uncontradicted false doctrines promulgated by her teachers; and I am satisfied that if you would avoid the recurrence of such a state of things as you have witnessed you will find that the best way in which that can be done is by allowing the Church in her authorized manner to pronounce for her followers, as she has done in this instance, that she disclaims for her living ministry this erroneous teaching.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, the right rev. Prelate has thought proper to accuse me of having misrepresented what took place between us in a manner which will serve as a warning to me how I hold communication with him in future. The lesson will not be thrown away upon me. He has thought proper to construe a statement which I made, in the most perfect good nature, into a charge against himself and the most rev. Prelate beside him. But the most rev. Prelate at all events does not, I trust, look upon anything which I have said as conveying a serious charge against him, as having improperly desired to withhold the sentence passed by the Convocation. I should be the last man to make such a charge; but, should the most rev. Prelate feel that he has any grounds for complaint, I beg most freely to express my regret that any words of mine should have produced that impression. To return to the right rev. Prelate, I find that he has in the same excited manner which characterized the greater portion of his speech—and at which I beg to say that I was not at all surprised—with much license of language charged me with misrepresenting a passage in an Act of Parliament. My apology for him, I think, must be that he himself does not quite understand it. The passage cited claims for the Crown, as head of the Church, all jurisdiction and authority; but he says that the title was disclaimed by Queen Elizabeth. So it was in a spiritual sense, but "Head of the Church" is in common phraseology the ordinary mode of expressing the supremacy of the Crown; it occurs in subsequent statutes, and Queen Elizabeth claimed to herself jurisdiction in a more effective manner as supreme Governor of the Church of England.

MUTUAL SURRENDER OF CRIMINALS (PRUSSIA) BILL [H.L.]

A Bill for giving Effect to a Convention between Her Majesty and The King of Prussia for the mutual Surrender of Criminals—Was *presented* by The Earl RUSSELL; read 1ª*; to be *printed;* and to be read 2ª on *Monday* next. (No. 204.)

NAVAL DISCIPLINE BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to make Provision for the Discipline of the Navy—Was *presented* by The Duke of SOMERSET; read 1ª*; to be *printed;* and to be read 2ª on *Tuesday* next. (No. 205.)

House adjourned at a quarter before
Eight o'clock, to Monday next,
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, July 15, 1864.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—On Standing Orders Revision—Sir Henry Willoughby, Mr. Ayrton, and Mr. Richard Hodgson *added.*

Report—On Scientific Institutions (Dublin) (No. 495); on Dockyards (Second Report) (No. 496).

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—MISCELLANEOUS ESTIMATES.

WAYS AND MEANS—*Resolutions* [July 14] *reported;* Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000), Bill *ordered.*

PUBLIC BILLS — *Resolutions in Committee*—*Reported* — Fortifications and Works*, Bill *ordered;* Corn Returns*, Bill *ordered.*

Ordered—Metropolis Management Act (1862) Amendment*; Hackney Carriages*; Indian Medical Services*; West Indian Incumbered Estates Act Amendment*.

First Reading — Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* [Bill 211]; Indian Medical Service* [Bill 213]; Corn Accounts and Returns* [Bill 214]; West Indian Incumbered Estates Act Amendment* [Bill 215]; Hackney Carriages (Metropolis)* [Bill 216]; Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000)* [Bill 216]; Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* [Bill 218]; Metropolis Management Act (1862) Amendment* [Bill 219].

Second Reading—Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* [Bill 204]; Westminster Bridge Traffic* [Bill 205]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental* [Bill 207]; Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment* [Bill 210].

Committee—Cattle Diseases Prevention [Bill 175] on *re-committal*—R.P.; Improvement of Land Act (1864)* [Bill 187] on *re-committal*—R.P.; Bank Notes, &c., Signature* [Bill 206]; Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal [Bill 161]; Justices Proceedings Confirmation* [Bill 203].

Report—Contagious Diseases* [Bill 163]; Bank Notes, &c., Signature* [Bill 206]; Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal [Bill 161]; Justices Proceedings Confirmation* [Bill 203].

Considered as amended—Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension* [Bill 181]; Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* [Bill 194]; Militia Pay*; Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* [Bill 164]; Registration of Deeds (Ireand)* [Bill 176]; Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. [Bill 199].

Third Reading—Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* [Bill 196]; Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal* [Bill 197]; Harwich Harbour Act Amendment* [Bill 171].

Withdrawn— Game (Ireland) (No. 2)* [Bill 140].

CATTLE DISEASES PREVENTION (*re-committed*) BILL—[BILL 175.]

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 5 were *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Market for Cattle affected with certain Diseases).

LORD NAAS said, he objected to the clause, which authorized the local authorities to set aside a place in a market or fair in which to place diseased animals when brought for sale. The animal might be only suspected by an ignorant policeman, but the consequence to the proprietor would be that although the animal might be perfectly healthy the remainder of his stock would find no purchaser. Moreover, there was no machinery by which the object of the clause could be fairly carried out.

SIR WILLIAM MILES said, he could not agree with the opinion which the noble Lord entertained of the working of the clause, and he hoped that the Committee would proceed with it, although the words "or fair" might perhaps be left out with advantage.

MR. T. G. BARING said, the clause before it was adopted by the Committee was carefully considered. The penalty merely applied to those persons who knowingly sent diseased cattle to market, and he considered it a very useful provision. The operation of the clause would be confined to markets.

SIR LAWRENCE PALK said, he did not regard the clause as so objectionable, because the presence of a diseased sheep in a flock would be much more damaging to the remainder than if the animal were removed to such a place as that contemplated by the clause. He thought its working would be found difficult in fairs, but it certainly ought to be applied to markets, where the animals were generally fat beasts and were usually purchased by the butcher.

MR. CAIRD objected to the clause, because he perceived that the proposed remedy would oftentimes prove the means of propagating the disease which it was desired to prevent, as the animal would frequently have to be dragged from one end of the market to another, and come into contact with a large number of healthy animals.

MR. BRADY said, he believed that the effect of the clause would be to involve the appointment of a large number of Inspectors, and thus create a great deal of corruption. Further, the decision of the Inspector could not be taken as final; they must have a Court of Appeal. It would be utterly impossible to carry such a clause out.

MR. THOMPSON advocated the retention of the clause.

SIR GEORGE COLTHURST said, he thought they ought not to proceed with the Bill, as they had not the Report of the Committee.

MR. COGAN said, he hoped that the Government would consent to withdraw the measure for the Session.

MR. BLAKE said, he concurred in the opinion that the Bill ought to be withdrawn.

Mr. CORBALLY advocated the withdrawal of the clause, which he believed would cause much disturbance in Ireland.

Mr. H. A. BRUCE could not see the force of the objections urged against the clause, because it offered no obstacle to a man's taking diseased animals into the market. It only enacted that a certain place should be set aside for diseased animals, and a person whose animals were to his knowledge diseased, would incur a penalty if he did not make use of the place so provided.

Mr. MONSELL said, he would move that the Chairman do leave the Chair, as they ought not to proceed further with the Bill without having the evidence before them.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Monsell.*)

The Committee *divided* :—Ayes 24 ; Noes 39 : Majority 15.

Mr. COGAN said, the majority against the Motion was composed of a number of Gentleman who had come from the library and Committee-rooms, and who had consequently heard nothing of the discussion. As he felt certain that if they had heard the discussion they would have voted for the Motion, he should move that the Chairman report Progress.

Lord EDWARD HOWARD suggested confining the operation of the Act to England, and excluding Ireland from its provisions.

Mr. T. G. BARING said, that it was useless to continue the Bill in face of the determined opposition which had been exhibited against it by the Committee. At that period of the Session he should not have attempted to carry the measure had he not understood that the Opposition of the Irish Members was confined mainly to one clause referring to Inspectors, which he himself disapproved. He should, therefore, concur in the Motion for reporting Progress.

Mr. HUNT said, he regretted the determination of the Government, because he believed that it was a fair stand-up fight between the Irish and the English Members, and he should like to have seen it settled in a good old English way, and if the Government had proceeded with the Bill he believed that its opponents would have found themselves in a minority similar to the position in which they had been left by the last division.

Mr. H. A. BRUCE said, he would be quite content to pursue the plan recommended by the hon. Member for Northamptonshire if the opponents of the Bill would have been satisfied with the results of a round or two, but their opposition was so determined that it was useless to proceed with the Bill.

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress ; to sit again this day month.

INDIA—THE INDIAN ARTILLERY.

QUESTION.

Mr. O'NEILL said, in the absence of his hon. Friend (Mr. Torrens), he would beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, What steps have been taken to carry out the orders contained in the Secretary of State's (for India) despatch, No. 61, dated the 29th of February last, to have seconded, or made supernumerary Officers of the Indian Artillery employed in miscellaneous staff appointments, and which despatch is reported in paragraph 14 to have received the general concurrence of the Secretary of State for War, and of His Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding in Chief ?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON replied, that the despatch in question had been sent out to India, and communicated by a General Order of the Army there. No list of officers who had been seconded had yet been received ; but a list had been received of the officers of the artillery and engineers who were to be removed from these corps to staff appointments, and the promotions in succession to them had been already recommended to Her Majesty.

TURNPIKE GATES REMOVED.

QUESTION.

Viscount ENFIELD said, he would beg to ask the right hon. Member for Petersfield (as a Commissioner of the Metropolitan Roads north of the Thames), Whether he can state the number of turnpike gates and side bars that have been recently removed, the number of new gates and bars erected in their place, and upon what principle the distribution of these gates and side bars has been allotted to the different metropolitan parishes ?

Sir WILLIAM JOLLIFFE, in reply, said, that the number of gates removed by the Act of last year was twenty-five, and the number of side bars removed was fifty-four. All these gates and side bars were within the area of the Metropolis Local Management Act. The number of miles of road given over to the respective parishes was about fifty-five, and the number of miles continued as turnpike roads was sixty-seven. The number of new gates on the sixty-seven miles of road was nine, and of new side bars eight. The total number of places for the collection of toll under the new order of things was thirty-one. Under the old Act it was ninety-three. These were distributed so as to take a uniform toll of *2d.* a horse within each district, for the repair of the roads within the district where it was collected. The 41st clause in the Act of last Session was introduced to facilitate the roads comprised in each of the thirteen districts created by the Act becoming parish roads, at the will of the parishes, with the consent and approval of the Secretary of State, and to that he especially wished to direct the attention of his noble Friend and the inhabitants of the county of Middlesex, as the roads might be converted into parish roads with only the delay of a Session.

INDIA—ARMY BREVET RANK.

QUESTION.

CAPTAIN JERVIS said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whereas, when substantive and corresponding brevet rank come together in a Regiment, the former invariably takes preference, what steps will be taken to insure a senior officer holding only brevet rank against being superseded in a Regiment by a junior holding corresponding substantive rank? Will brevet Lieutenant Colonels of five years' service in that rank and thirty-one years' service in all be entitled to the brevet rank of Colonel under the latter part of Clause 69 of Despatch No. 194, June 19, 1864? And will an officer who had served eleven years (or twelve, as the case might be) in the rank of brevet Lieutenant Colonel, obtained in accordance with the above clause, or in such brevet and substantive rank combined, be eligible to take his turn in the List of Officers nominated for Colonels' Allowances?

SIR CHARLES WOOD replied that, inasmuch as all officers promoted to brevet rank would rank according to the dates of their substantive rank, he did not see how senior officers could be superseded by juniors. With regard to the second Question of the hon. and gallant Member, his reply was that brevet lieutenant-colonels of five years' service in that rank and thirty-one years' service on full pay altogether would be entitled to the brevet rank of colonel under the latter part of the clause.

In reply to Colonel SYKES,

SIR CHARLES WOOD said, that the appointments to the Irregular Forces were made, and always had been, irrespective of rank.

RELATIONS WITH BRAZIL.

QUESTION.

MR. BERNAL OSBORNE said, he wished to ask the First Lord of the Treasury Whether, pending the existing suspension of political relations between the English and Brazilian Governments, Her Majesty's Ministers have appointed a Consul at Rio de Janeiro in succession to the late Consul Westwood; and, if so, whom; if it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to appoint a Consul at the port of Santos, in succession to the late Consul Huntley; and whether Her Majesty's Ministers consider themselves bound to fulfil the assurance officially conveyed to the Brazilian Government by the Earl of Aberdeen, when Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, on 2nd July, 1845, to the effect that "he would be ready to repeal the measure of 1845 on the entire cessation of the Slave Trade in Brazil?"

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Sir, there is no intention at present of appointing a Consul at Rio. Mr. Morgan, the Consul at Bahia, has been ordered to Rio for the moment for the transaction of commercial business, but he is not the Consul there. The consulship of Santos is also vacant, and Mr. Haydon has been appointed for the moment to transact the business there. It is not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to propose to this House to repeal the Act of 1845; and I may mention that Lord Aberdeen was at the head of the Government from December, 1852, to December, 1855, and no steps were taken during his administration for repealing the Act in question.

MR. BERNAL OSBORNE: I beg to give notice that on going into Committee of Supply I shall draw the attention of the House to the state of our relations with Brazil.

AUSTRALIAN POSTAGE—QUESTION.

Lord **ALFRED CHURCHILL** said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether he would object to postpone the execution of the recent increase in the rate of postage to Australia until the colonies shall have been communicated with as to their desire to have a bi-monthly mail in conjunction with the increase of the postage rate ?

Mr. **PEEL**, in reply, said, in the recommendation made last year by the Post Office to the Treasury to increase the rate of postage on letters sent from this country to Australia, the object in view was of a double character — partly to reduce the amount annually granted by Parliament to meet the excess in the cost of the service over the receipts for postage, and partly to provide the means of defraying the expenses of establishing a second monthly communication with Australia. There was a very general desire to establish a second monthly communication with Australia ; at the same time there was a very strong objection on the part of the Government to ask that House to provide additional subsidies for the expenses of the Australian service. The Government did not proceed with their plan for establishing a fortnightly communication with Australia in consequence of having understood that it was intended to establish a communication with Australia by way of Panama independently of the Home Government. It appeared, however, that that was no longer the case, and therefore they were free to revert to the old plan. Under those circumstances he thought the course indicated by the question was a very reasonable one for the Government to pursue. The Government reserved the right of regulating the rate of postage if they thought proper; but, at the same time, they were desirous of taking part in any measure for increasing the frequency of communication with Australia. It was quite possible that the Australians, though they might object to an increased postage, might be willing to acquiesce in that increase provided it were accompanied with additional communication with this country. Under these circumstances the Government was willing to postpone the increase in the postage until time had been given to communicate with Australia.

Lord **ALFRED CHURCHILL** said, under those circumstances he would not proceed with his Motion on the subject.

UNITED STATES—SEIZURE OF BRITISH PROPERTY IN NEW YORK.

QUESTION.

Mr. **LAIRD** said, he rose to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he has received any communications from Lord Lyons in reference to the Seizure (by the Customs Authorities at New York) of a large amount of property, including gold coin, bills of exchange, and other securities, belonging to the firm of Messrs. A. Wolf and Co., British merchants at Nassau, N.P ?

Mr. **LAYARD**, in reply, said, that no report had been received from Lord Lyons in reference to the seizure by the Customs authorities at New York of the property alluded to by the hon. Member, but Lord Lyons had been requested to report on the subject.

PASSPORTS IN ROME.

QUESTION.

Mr. **CORBALLY** said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he has communicated with the British Consul in Rome with respect to the Passports of British subjects being required to be *viséd*, while those of American subjects do not require any *visa*. He did not attribute any blame to the British Consul, and he begged distinctly to disclaim any intention of making any personal attack on that gentleman when he alluded to the subject the other evening ?

Mr. **LAYARD** said, the fact was perfectly true, that fees were levied on the *visa* of all passports in Rome, except those of American subjects, and the reason of that was that when the unfortunate civil war broke out in America the subjects of the formerly United States, but who now belonged to the so-called Confederate States, could not get their passports *viséd* unless they were prepared to subscribe a declaration that they were loyal subjects of the United States. Those persons who refused to do that were unable to obtain passports, and therefore Cardinal Antonelli consented to relieve American subjects from the necessity of having their passports *viséd*. It was strictly an exceptional case, and the Roman Government exacted the *visa* from all other persons. Mr. Severn, the British Consul, did not receive the fees himself ; they were regularly remitted to Her Majesty's Government. The charge, therefore, that Mr. Severn was in collusion with the police was utterly unfounded, and had given that gentleman great pain.

SPAIN AND PERU—THE CHINCHA ISLANDS.—QUESTION.

Mr. CAIRD said, he would beg to ask, If Her Majesty's Government have received any assurance from the Government of Spain to the effect that, during the occupation of the Chincha Islands by that Power, no opposition will be offered to the fulfilment of contracts for the removal of Guano from those Islands?

Mr. LAYARD stated that the Spanish Government had given notice that the occupation of the Chincha Islands would not interfere with the carrying out of any contracts for Guano.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

IONIAN ISLANDS—ANNEXATION TO GREECE.—OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, he rose to call attention to the discrepancies which exist between the statements made by Her Majesty's Government and those of the advisers of the King of Greece respecting the conditions on which the Ionian Islands have been annexed to Greece, and also to the Convention between Her Majesty and the King of the Hellenes respecting the claims of British subjects and others, signed at London 29th March, 1864. As the Ionian Islands belonged to Greece, it was not his intention to go into the question of the policy or wisdom of their cession by England. Since the debate on the 18th of March on the subject, some papers had been laid before the House which had given rise to a certain amount of ill-feeling throughout Greece, and which also suggested questions of great importance to two classes of people in this country—those holding pensions under the Ionian Government and the Greek bondholders. There were also some remarkable discrepancies between the statements of Her Majesty's Ministers and those of the advisers of the King of Greece, which it was desirable should be cleared up. It would be recollected that on the 18th of March the hon. Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs asserted in a very decided manner that the proposals for the neutralization of the Islands and the destruction of the fortifications had been communicated to the young King and his counsellors, and had met with their approval. The hon. Gentleman said—

> "He held in his hand despatches which showed that in August the matter was discussed at Copenhagen long before the King left that city, and both His Majesty and Count Sponneck were well aware of what was proposed to be done, Count Sponneck in the middle of summer not only acceding to the proposal, but suggesting that the whole of Greece should be declared a neutral State."

The Chancellor of the Exchequer also made a statement even more strongly to a similar effect. These declarations on the part of Her Majesty's Ministers had placed Count Sponneck in a very awkward position, and had excited some irritation against him on the part of the Greek people. It was not his habit to deal in imputations concerning the falsification of despatches, and he did not mean to suggest that there was any intentional misstatement by the Ministers; but it appeared that after Count Sponneck arrived in Greece he declared that the whole proceeding took him by surprise. When they looked at the despatches, however, on which the statements of the hon. and right hon. Gentlemen were based, they would see that there had been a serious misapprehension. In a despatch, dated the 10th of August, 1863, Sir Augustus Paget wrote to Earl Russell as follows:—

> "Count Sponneck has learnt that there was a project of treaty communicated by your Lordship to the representatives of the five Powers assembled in Conference for the affairs of Greece, which embodied two conditions relative to the annexation of the Ionian Islands, which he understood to be the upshot of communications which had taken place between Her Majesty's Government and the Cabinet of Vienna. The first condition was the neutrality of the Ionian Islands; the second, that the fortifications of Corfu should be razed. After speaking of the possible effect which the knowledge of these conditions might have in indisposing the Ionian Parliament to vote the annexation, for which reason it became of still greater importance to King George to have the vote before setting out for Greece, Count Sponneck said that if the union between the Islands and the kingdom was to be a real one (an incorporation, in short), as was apparently intended, he did not understand how the Islands could be neutralized without extending the neutrality to the rest of Greece."

It was plain that Count Sponneck in saying that the neutralization of the Islands involved the neutralization of the whole kingdom, was merely using the *argumentum ad absurdum*, and endeavouring to show that the proposal was a grave political error. Sir Augustus Paget added that "Count Sponneck appears to have no objection to the razing of the fortifications;" but he submitted that that despatch did not justify the very strong expressions used by the Under Secretary and Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The next point to which he wished to draw attention was the unjust treatment of gentlemen who had accepted service in the Ionian Islands on the guarantee by the British Government of their salaries and pensions. Until lately there was, of course, no idea that these Islands would be given up by England, and these gentlemen naturally looked to the British Government for recompense. Indeed, they had sacrificed annually so much of their income in order to secure superannuation. In February, 1864, M. Tricoupi pointed out to Her Majesty's Government that they ought to accept the responsibility of meeting the indemnity to officials. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, however, declared that Parliament would not vote a credit for the purpose, but suggested that the amount might be diminished by withholding the indemnity in cases where other appointments under the British Government were accepted. That was at variance with a previous statement of the Duke of Newcastle, who evidently contemplated that the indemnity might be enjoyed even by those who received other employment. He thought the payment of these pensions would fall with some degree of harshness upon the Greek Treasury, and as it would be unjust to pensioners that they should not be paid, was the English Government to step in? In considering the question it must be borne in mind that the gentlemen entitled to the pensions had been sent out from this country, and that when they were appointed they had not the slightest conception that they would be placed in the position in which they found themselves by an act of policy on the part of the British Government. Were they to do battle with the Greek Government in order that they might obtain their pensions instead of receiving them direct from the Home Government, as they were entitled to do under the guarantees they had received? He trusted that the Government would give some explanations of their intentions upon the subject.

The third point he wished to notice was the future position of the bondholders. The value of the loan was nearly £8,000,000 sterling, and so far the bondholders had received scarcely anything. The Greek Government a few months ago forwarded a circular to the Allied Powers, inquiring if they would be willing to limit their demands on the Greek Treasury for five years to only £36,000 per annum in lieu of £140,000, which the Allies were paying for interest and sinking fund, so that the Greek Government might be able to make an offer to the holders of the bonds issued in 1824 and 1825, which if accepted would restore the credit of Greece, and thus insure her future progress. It was important to know if the application had been replied to, and in the event of the Greek Government making a pseudo offer, if the British Government was bound (under those circumstances) to limit its demand to one-third of the £36,000. In spite of the great difficulties by which they had been surrounded, Greece was prosperous, wages were high, the prospects of the country generally were good, and the revenue had increased by one-fifth. The Government, however, were depressed by the amount of debt for which they were responsible, and it was most desirable that some understanding should be come to on the subject, and it appeared to him that the best course to pursue would be for Government to forego a portion of their claim on Greece, and that arrangements should be adopted under which the remainder of her liabilities should be punctually liquidated. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs would afford them some explanation upon each of these three topics.

MR. LAYARD said, he regretted that his hon. Friend had thought it necessary to bring before the House the first part of his question. He had hoped that that matter had been forgotten in Greece, and that such a good understanding existed between Count Sponneck and the people of that country, that there could be no occasion for reviving it in reference to either of these irritating topics. But he could not allow the hon. Gentleman to contradict the statements which he (Mr. Layard) had made on a previous occasion without re-asserting that they were strictly true.

MR. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, he had only read an extract from the despatches.

MR. LAYARD: The only statement he had made in that House was that the intention of razing the fortifications of Corfu, and of neutralizing the Ionian Islands, must have been known to Count Sponneck before he started for Greece, because those questions were discussed at Copenhagen in the month of August, and the statement which he (Mr. Layard) had made was fully borne out by the despatches. The question was discussed in the month of August between Count Sponneck and Sir Augustus Paget, and Sir Augustus Paget declared that Count Sponneck raised no objection to the destruction of the fortifications. In a speech made in another place last year by Earl Russell, in the month of June, the noble Earl declared that the fortifications would be razed in consequence of demands which had been made by Austria, demands in which there were reasons to believe Prussia and Russia would acquiesce, and the statement then made was entirely approved by the Earl of Derby. It was also fully corroborated by the despatches. It was perfectly true that Count Sponneck had directed his secretary to write a most improper letter upon the matter to the Archbishop of Corfu, in which very unbecoming language was used towards Earl Russell and himself (Mr. Layard). That letter was posted all over the Island, and such a proceeding at such a moment might have led to grave consequences, but fortunately no such result had followed. He had hoped that the matter would have been entirely forgotten, and he was sorry that it had been revived. With regard to the pensioners, his hon. Friend was in error when he said they were gentlemen who had served the English Government. Those included in Table A of the Convention were gentlemen who came under the Superannuation Fund, and from whose salaries certain sums were deducted in order to provide pensions. [Mr. Baillie Cochrane : By the English Government.] They were paid out of the Civil List in the Island of Corfu, and had nothing whatever to do with the English Government. Having paid towards the Civil List in Corfu, it would be an extraordinary proceeding for this country to guarantee the payment of their pensions. We had done all we could, and had entered into a solemn diplomatic arrangement with regard to the payment of the pensions. By the Convention the Greek Government were bound every year to communicate with Her Majesty's Minister at Athens, who was also to receive notice that the pensions had been satisfied. There were two classes of claimants who had some cause to complain ; but their case had been strongly recommended by Her Majesty's Government to the Greek Government, and he trusted that the Greek Government would deal liberally with them. With regard to the bondholders, the hon. Member wished the Government to remit a portion of the debt owing to the public here in order that the bondholders might be served, but he (Mr. Layard) doubted whether the House would consent to such an arrangement. He did not think that the British Government were in any way called upon to make any arrangement for the benefit of the private creditors of Greece.

Colonel DUNNE said, it was of very little consequence whether Count Sponneck understood that the fortifications were to be razed or not. Count Sponneck could scarcely feel surprise at such a course being taken, because in the blue-book a conversation was reported between the Chancellor of the Exchequer and M. Tricoupi, in which the right hon. Gentleman distinctly expressed himself in favour of the neutralization of the Islands. We could not have handed over these Islands to Greece without neutralizing them or destroying their fortifications. Those fortifications would have served as a *place d'armes* for the invasion of Turkey, and would have enabled the frontier of that country to be turned. With regard to the gentlemen who had claims to pensions for their past services in the Ionian Islands, the treatment they had received was shameful. Her Majesty's Government ought not to have ceded these Islands to Greece without insisting on a much better security for the pensions of these gentlemen than that which had been obtained. They had for years subscribed to a fund which would have been sufficient to have ensured the pensions had it not been appropriated by the Ionian Government then under the protection of Great Britain. Our Government had remitted its own claims on the kingdom of Greece in order to add to the civil list of the young King George, but it ought not to have been generous towards a foreign Sovereign without first being just towards our own subjects. He understood that M. Tricoupi, the Greek Minister, had wished the British Chancellor of the Exchequer to place these pensions on our Consolidated Fund, and that the Chancellor of the Exchequer very properly refused to do anything of the kind ; but it appeared that the right hon. Gentleman had suggested that it would relieve the Greek Treasury if it were arranged that these gentlemen should forfeit their pensions on receiving other employment from the English Government. Now, if these gentlemen had a claim to pensions from the British Government, and the British Government chose to employ them again, it might be very fair that they should forego their pensions in consideration of their official salaries, but that was quite a different case; and he must say he thought it most extraordinary that such advice should have been given by a Minister of this country to the Greek Minister. He would take an instance by way of illustration. If an Englishman entered the service of Austria and earned a pension, would it be right that he should thereby lose a previous pension which he had gained in the service of his own country? Great disorders had taken place in Athens and other parts of Greece since the accession of the young King. A repetition of the fearful scenes which occurred when King Otho first went to Athens had been witnessed after the arrival of King George. A series of most brutal atrocities was enacted, the most horrible outrages were perpetrated upon women, and a state of confusion such as had not been surpassed in the times when he himself was in Greece, prevailed there soon after the glorification and rejoicing upon the election of the present King, all arising from the lawless violence of men who carried on war in order to make their own party predominant in the councils of the new Sovereign. The existing Government of Greece was one to which it was hardly fair to leave the claims of the officers who had lost their appointments through the cession of the Ionian Islands. The talents of those gentlemen were great and their services had been most valuable, and he deeply regretted the state of insecurity in which they were left in regard to their pensions. He felt sure that their case would be brought before that House before long, that they would have to be paid out of the Treasury of this country, and that, perhaps, we should even be involved in war with Greece on this matter.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he was not about to enter into the general discussion, but as he had been referred to he wished to say a few words. A conversation which he had had with the Greek Minister had been alluded to, and was said to be described in an official letter of that Minister. He had not seen the letter, and could only speak of that conversation from memory. It was a private conversation, and had nothing to do with the negotiations generally. It was true he had told M. Tricoupi that he did not think it would be possible for the British Government to ask Parliament to undertake the payment of the pensions of those gentlemen who had served in the Ionian Islands. M. Tricoupi wished to know whether the British Treasury could in any way be made auxiliary to pay that charge, and his answer was "No." The hon. and gallant Member said he had made to M. Tricoupi the suggestion that in the event of these gentlemen being appointed to offices in this country, the British rule should be applied to them, and that the amount of their compensation should be deducted from their salaries. Now, he never conveyed to M. Tricoupi any pledge whatever on the part of the British Government. He had simply stated his own individual opinion of what would be equitable, and left it for M. Tricoupi to make any proposal of that kind to the responsible department. The hon. and gallant Member said these gentlemen held their rights to their pensions on an insufficient security. Now they held it on the faith of an instrument to which the British Government was a party, and it was evident that the hon. and gallant Member himself regarded that security as no small matter, because he anticipated the contingency of England having under it to make war upon Greece in order to enforce the payment of these pensions. But apart from the question of security, the hon. and gallant Member questioned the equity of causing these pensions to abate; and he said if he went into the Austrian employment and received a pension for his services it would be hard on his coming back and taking service under the British Crown that his pension from the Austrian Government should abate. He granted it would have been inequitable to impose on those officers the rules and ideas which prevailed in reference to such matters in Austria or Greece. Did the hon. and gallant Gentleman believe that in cases of the abolition of offices in Greece officers were treated as they were treated here? He doubted whether any Government treated officers whose offices were abolished with one third of the liberality with which they were treated in this country. These officers were treated not according to Greek ideas and Greek usages, but according to English usages; and surely it was the plainest justice that they should apply the English rule, of which it was an essential incident that, in case of the resumption of office, the pension should cease? He did not consider that he was at all officially concerned in the matter, but he entirely defended the equity of that principle, and the adoption of any other rule would have been contrary to justice.

Mr. KINGLAKE said, he thought the view his hon. Friend the Under Secretary had taken of the case was a mistaken one. He had spoken of these officers as the mere servants of the Ionian State. That was not quite a fair light in which to regard them. In order to test whether they had or had not a moral claim for compensation for the loss of their offices, they should see in the first place who appointed them, and, next, who terminated that state of things under which they were entitled to their offices. When they came to consider who it was that drew these men from their former career of life, they found it was the Colonial Government in England. And when they inquired how it came to pass that their offices, on the continuance of which they had a fair right to rely, had been brought to a conclusion, they found again that the Colonial Office was a prominent party in the transaction. If, then, the circumstances should ever arise in which the question had to be considered, he hoped the British Government would have no difficulty in seeing that the claim of these gentlemen was one which in fairness and generosity could not be resisted.

UNION ASSESSMENT COMMITTEES.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. HUBBARD said, he rose to call the attention of the House to the Returns of the Resolutions and proceedings of the Union Assessment Committees, and to the necessity of assisting their operation, by the introduction of some moderating authority in the very large latitude they had taken in the application of the Act. His object was to afford the House an opportunity of judging how far it was necessary to assist the different unions. Much depended on the spirit in which the committees set to work, and whether they did so willingly and intelligently. As might be expected there were considerable differences observable in these respects. A meeting of delegates in Somerset, presided over by Sir W. Miles, passed a Resolution to the following effect:—

> "The feeling of the delegates in discussing the different questions propounded at the meeting was unanimous in the determination, as far as was possible, not only to secure a uniform and correct valuation of parishes in any particular union, but so to construct and carry out the Act, that it should not be only between parish and parish in a particular union, but that the same principles should be the guide in every union throughout the county; so that when the valuation is completed, not only will the assessment thus established be the assessment for Poor Law purposes, but will be a true and correct basis upon which all other county charges may be estimated."

That was a very favourable representation of the spirit of enlightened committees, but he was forced to admit that, owing possibly to the difficulties which beset their operations, the results arrived at by many unions were far from satisfactory. The first thing to be done was to arrive at a true definition of the gross estimated rental. Now, from the passing of the Act of 1836 down to 1859 there was unhappily great diversity of opinion as to the interpretation of the law in that respect. Mr. Lumley, of the Poor Law Board, in his *Manual* defined the gross estimated rental as rack-rent, with the addition of tenants' rates and charges. Others held that it was equivalent to the rack-rent alone; and in 1859 the Law Officers of the Crown, on being consulted by the Poor Law Board, decided in favour of that view, which was thereupon adopted by the Board. He found, however, that some of the Union Committees had ignored that decision, and in these assessments had followed Mr. Lumley's earlier interpretation; and he suggested that the Board should direct the attention of such mistaken Committees to the error they had therein committed. The next point was to ascertain the net rateable value. It appeared that the committees allowed themselves a considerable range in regard to deductions. The allowances on "naked lands," or lands without buildings, for instance, were from 1 to 3 per cent in Somerset, 2½ per cent in Bedford, Berks, Devon, Shropshire, Suffolk, and the East Riding of Yorkshire. 1 per cent only was allowed in Walsingham and another union in Norfolk, and nothing at all in two unions in Lincoln. On the other hand he found a deduction of 5 per cent in Northampton, Hertford, Gloucester, and some other counties. One union in Gloucester allowed 7½ per cent, and Market Harborough, in Leicestershire, allowed as much as 10. In the case of land with buildings and houses attached to it, the counties of Somerset and Buckingham and two unions in Norfolk allowed from 5 to 10 per cent; in the county of Southampton the rule was to allow 5 per cent where the rent was above £200, and 10 per cent where it was under £200 a year. In Derbyshire, Worcestershire, Lancashire, the East Riding of Yorkshire, and a great part of the North and West Ridings, the allowance was 7½ per cent; in Doncaster, Hartlepool, Teesdale, and part of Lincolnshire, 8⅓. In other unions in Lincolnshire it was 5 per cent, and in Shropshire generally 5 per cent, although in one union it was 15, and he could find no reason for so remarkable a discrepancy. The information was much less definite in regard to the allowances on houses. In the county of Buckingham it was from 10 to 20 per cent and from 10 to 25 per cent on cottages, which embraced a class of houses under the value of £6 or £8 a year. At Hartlepool and Teesdale the allowance was 16⅔ per cent on both houses and cottages; in Lancashire, 15 on houses and 20 on cottages; Somerset, from 10 to 15 on houses and from 10 to 20 on cottages; Cheshire, 10 per cent; Nottinghamshire, 10 on houses and 12 on cottages; and Bakewell, in Derbyshire, 12½ on houses and 20 on cottages. The discrepancies in excess of these allowances were considerable. In the Strand union, in the county of Middlesex, the allowance on the whole of the house property was 25 per cent. And these discrepancies were not confined to the allowances in different counties, but in various unions in the same county there were also great discrepancies. For instance, in the county of Bucks, the majority of unions allowed 5 per cent on land, whereas the union of Buckingham allowed only 2½; Newport Pagnell allowed 15 per cent on land and houses, Buckingham 10; Newport allowed 10 per cent on cottages, Buckingham 15. In Lincolnshire one parish allowed 10 per cent, another 8, another 5, and another 3; Shropshire generally allowed 5, but the Ludlow union allowed 15. He thought these discrepancies were so great that they called for correction at the hands of the Poor Law Board, because wherever they existed in the same county certain unions must necessarily be placed at a disadvantage with regard to the county rate, for it was admitted that the Union Assessment was to be the basis, not only of the Poor Law Assessment, but of the county rate. Great inconvenience arose from swerving from the requirement of the Act, that the assessment should be framed from the most truthful estimates which could be arrived at in reference to the gross rental and the necessary deductions for maintenance. It was no answer to say that an entire county agreed in accepting an enormous and disproportionate deduction. It had no right to do so. One class in particular was injuriously affected by such a system — namely, the clergy. The tithe rent charge was known to a farthing, and the outgoings were so few that there was no margin for granting any concession except the proper one. The clergy, therefore, were rated on their tithe rent-charge to the fullest amount. They had no right to complain of that, but they had a right to complain if, in their own locality, other property was assessed upon an incorrect basis. Upon that ground he trusted the Government would see that some alteration was imperatively required wherever these extravagant deductions had been made. Accuracy was in this matter desirable on more grounds than one. Even the elective franchise was materially affected by the process of assessment. House property had been generally valued at two-thirds of its value, so that a house worth £10 was only valued at £7, and many occupiers hitherto excluded would be admitted to the franchise under a truthful assessment. On these grounds he thought the matter required investigation, and in the absence of correct results by any other means, he thought they ought to be obtained by the appointment of Government Inspectors. He might be told that it was easy to point out discrepancies; but, with regard to the deductions, could he point out what should be their limit independently of differences of soil and locality? He thought he could at all events name the amounts which would ordinarily apply. Those limits were 2½ per cent on naked land, 10 per cent on farms, 20 per cent on houses, and 25 per cent on cottages. These allowances would, he thought, meet all but exceptional cases. If a farmer appealed against his assessment at 10 per cent on that principle, he might demand the assessment of land and house separately, and in that case there would be no relief, unless the house assessed at 20 per cent were nearly equal in value to the land assessed at 2½, a thing which would rarely occur, but still there was the remedy. As to "accommodation land," its assessment according to the rent is objected to as excessive. "We admit," say the occupiers, "that we give the rent at which we are assessed, but it is more than it is worth; we give it because the property is near our residence, or is convenient for our business, but the rent is beyond its value." But it is obvious that if the demand for abatement were conceded, they would be enabled to pay an excessive rent at the cost of the other ratepayers. A larger question was the assessment of parsonages and mansions. Parsons had complained of their assessments on the grounds that their residences could not, by law, be let without the sanction of the bishop; and squires, that their mansions, the land and shooting being let off, would not let at all. Both parties had caught at the words of the Act, that the annual value should be that at which the property would "let from year to year;" but the spirit as well as the letter of the Act was that they should be assessed at the "net annual value;" and in the case both of the parsonage and the mansion the right course would be to estimate what the house would let for if the owner were out of it and wanted it again. In fact, neither the squire himself nor the parson could be ignored in estimating the value of their occupations. There was great diversity in the practice of various unions in respect to the mode of ascertaining the gross rental of houses, and in settling the deductions. The only deduction which ought to be made out of gross rental, according to the analogy of farms and other property, was that for repairs. So with respect to the tithe rent charge, in some cases the amount of the rent charge, as commuted, was adopted; in others the last year's receipts, and in others again the cost of collection was deducted before entering the "gross estimated rental." He thought these anomalies should be removed, and the assessments be rendered uniform. Then, as to the deductions on account of the stipend of a curate, the law was most puzzling. It appeared to be an anomaly that there should be no deduction for the performance of the duty by the parson himself, but that there should be a deduction when the performance was by means of a substitute. It was, he submitted, necessary to include within the operation of the Union Assessment Committee, places and parishes which were now external to it. It was a great anomaly that parishes and unions should be exempted from the operation of two Assessment Acts which had passed that House, and it was absolutely due to the rest of the unions of the same county, that these exemptions should be removed. All parishes acting under local Acts should be brought in this respect under the general law. He next came to the nature of the matters to be assessed. Last year a considerable number of petitions were presented to that House praying for the removal of anomalies in regard to the exemption of particular classes of property, and a still greater number had been presented that year. A striking exhibition of the absurdity of the law as it now stood was this, that all mines but coal mines were exempt from rates. How had that happened? Because the lawyers maintained that, according to the true construction of the law of Elizabeth, coal mines only being specifically mentioned as rateable, all other mines must be excepted. In the time of Elizabeth coal mines probably were the only mines of importance in existence; but that was no reason why the Legislature should continue to exempt all other kinds of mines. A gentleman from Leeds had written to him that in a neighbouring township there were large stone quarries, which were not assessed either to the poor or the highway rates, although accidents in them greatly augmented the poor rates, and the stone waggons cut the roads into ribbons. The feeling on that question was so strongly in favour of a more rational and equitable adjustment that he believed no difficulty would be found in satisfying even those who might naturally demur at relinquishing the privileges they had so long enjoyed. He trusted, whatever the present impressions of the hon. Gentleman the President of the Poor Law Board on a mere casual discussion of the subject, he might be enabled to lay before the House next Session some legislative proposition for remedying the grievances to which he had referred.

Mr. C. P. VILLIERS said, he felt gratified to observe the attention which the hon. Gentleman had given to the working of the Act throughout the country. He had pointed out defects in the law and its administration, but it was only fair to consider what the question of local assessment had been up to that time, that it had been a system under which persons had almost been allowed to tax themselves, and under which the levying of £8,000,000 sterling had been intrusted to the most incompetent and irresponsible hands. The Act which had been substituted for a system that had been in operation for centuries had only been in existence for eighteen months, and the hon. Gentleman should not therefore be too impatient of actual or seeming irregularities, seeing that they were not the necessary consequences of the Act, and that every year they might be expected to diminish in number. The hon. Gentleman had called attention to certain irregularities that he had observed, and which he brought *seriatim* under the notice of the House. Some of these irregularities had come under his (Mr. C. P. Villier's) notice, and others had not. The hon. Gentleman first insisted upon the necessity of assisting the operation of the Union Assessment Committees by enforcing the legal construction of the gross estimated rental. He presumed his hon. Friend's meaning was, that the House should legislate further on the subject, but he did not know what else could be done that had not been provided for already. The hon. Gentleman referred to a legal construction having been put on the words "gross estimated rental." That definition had been given by the Law Officers of the Crown; it had been embodied in an Act of Parliament, and had been recognized in courts of justice; and a circular had been issued by the Poor Law Board, and addressed to all the Poor Law Unions in the country, directing them to act on that definition. Therefore, everything that law and authority could do had been done to impress the unions with the fact that there was a definition of gross estimated rental on which they might rely. The hon. Gentleman said there were some unions—he did not mention them—which persisted in disregarding the Act of Parliament and the circular of the Poor Law Board. If so he did not know what other legislation would induce these Assessment Committees to do otherwise. The instances to which his hon. Friend referred were, he believed, very few and far between. Of 700 unions he did not think there would be found six that disregarded the law of the land and the directions of the Poor Law Board. The hon. Gentleman next pointed to the wide range of deductions made by these Assessment Committees in obtaining the net rateable value. Having ascertained the gross estimated rental, they were allowed a discretion in determining the value to be rated, and his hon. Friend found a want of uniformity in the different unions. It was possible that might be the case at first, but his hon. Friend had not explained the circumstances so as to enable the House to declare that the Assessment Committees were not justified in these differences. The range of deduction might be 15 per cent in one county and only 10 per cent in another, but the House was not therefore to presume that the Assessment Committees had acted capriciously. The Act, as he had stated, had hardly been in operation eighteen months, and the publicity given to the assessment would cause the irregularity to cure itself. When the House was asked to legislate on the subject, he wanted to know how the want of uniformity could be cured unless Parliament fixed a maximum that should never be exceeded of 10 per cent, or some other percentage, as deduction for repairs, &c. But his hon. Friend must know that something depended on the character of the soil, the climate, and twenty things that belonged to one county and not to another. A maximum would be very arbitrary, and at all events it would not be desirable on the scanty information before the House, and so soon after the passing of the Act, to legislate on such a matter. He could not for these reasons agree to limit the range of deductions by law. His hon. Friend next asked him to prohibit arbitrary abatements from actual yearly rentals of property proposed upon the plea of its being accommodation land, and to declare that the value to the occupant of a mansion or parsonage was not to be ignored in estimating the assessable value of such property. He would grant that these arbitrary abatements ought not to be made, but his hon. Friend must remember that there was a power of appeal against anything arbitrary or unjust which had never existed before. He believed that the Assessment Committees were composed of competent men, and able and honourable men, who had done their duty in a manner which could hardly have been expected of them. The suggestions of his hon. Friend seemed to cast doubt upon their competency and honesty, but he certainly could not agree with him in that matter. His hon. Friend had laid great stress upon the tithe rent charge, but in what he said upon that subject he thought there was a little confusion, because of all descriptions of rateable property the value of tithe rent charge was the most readily and certainly ascertainable. There were questions as to the deductions which the clergyman was entitled to make, and of these there were two which were always and fairly admitted—one for the repair of the chancel of the church, and the other for the risk of collection. His hon. Friend had dealt chiefly with the deduction for the stipend of the curate. He was quite sure that the desire of the hon. Gentleman was to befriend the clergy, but he thought that in their interests he had better leave that matter alone. Formerly the clergy were never allowed that deduction, and some years ago the question was referred to a Committee of that House, who strongly recommended that no such deduction should be sanctioned. A case was then taken to the Court of Queen's Bench, and it was decided that the stipend of the curate might be deducted in cases in which the duties were so overwhelming that they could not be performed by the incumbent alone, or in cases in which the Bishop insisted upon the employment of a curate. Since then the Courts had set their faces against any extension of this principle, and both Lord Chief Justice Cockburn and Mr. Justice Blackburn had questioned the soundness of the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench. His hon. Friend asked him when the Government would consider the propriety of introducing a Bill to amend the law, by including within the operation of the Union Assessment Committee Act "all places and parishes now external to it." He thought that his hon. Friend had not fully considered what these places were, and what were the objects of the Union Assessment Act. That Act applied strictly to unions, and the places to which he referred were not unions or parts of unions. One of the first objects of the Act was to find a correct basis upon which to levy the parochial contributions to the common fund. These places that were not unions or parts of unions had no common fund, nor did they contribute to any. He did not mean to say that in such parishes and places there was no irregularity in the assessment of property; but they did not come within the scope of the Union Assessment Act. A single parish having no guardians could have no assessment committee. His hon. Friend also asked him whether he would bring in a Bill to extend the liability to rating to woods, mines, and other property which had hitherto been exempted. That was rather a difficult question to reply to. As his hon. Friend knew, several attempts had recently been made to legislate upon the subject, and he need not refer to the particular reasons which had prevented their success. He could only say that he had very carefully examined the evidence taken by a Committee of that House a few years ago, and he must confidently state that, so far as he understood the matter, there was no reason for these exemptions. The technical construction of the law was all very well in the courts, but if taxation was to be equal, and property was to bear the burdens to which it was liable fairly, it was not right that one class of property should be exempt from, while others were liable to, rating. Where property was of such a kind that it was difficult or impossible to collect the rates, that was a ground for exemption; but in this instance no such reason existed. The exemptions were not universal throughout the United Kingdom; they did not exist either in Scotland or Ireland. The ground on which the courts had held that mines other than coal mines were exempt was that they were not mentioned in the Act of Elizabeth; but they were liable to highway rates, sewers rates, church rates, and other rates which were not fixed, as was now so much the fashion, upon the basis of the poor rate. The exemptions having endured for a very long time, there were in existence a great number of interests which would be very tenacious of the exemptions which they had enjoyed so long; therefore, it was not easy to produce a change. It was, however, one of the advantages of the Act that all these matters were being looked into very closely, and judging from the memorials which had been received by the Poor Law Board, and the petitions which had been presented to that House, he could not believe that the same influence and interest which had hitherto prevented a change would prevail in the future. Whatever was practical in that matter he should be ready to recommend to the House, but it was no use introducing Bills when there was no chance of carrying them He did not, however, believe that it was impossible to levy rates, either upon mines or woods. He hoped that his hon. Friend would not be too impatient with respect to the operation of the Act. It was substituting a rule and order for the confusion which had hitherto existed. Things did not proceed very rapidly in this country, and his hon. Friend would no doubt be thought a little in advance of the rest of the world in his suggestion that more power ought to be assumed by the central board. He had no doubt that if a proper survey had been made and the assessment had been left in the hands of the Government officers, the thing would have been done more perfectly and more promptly, but his hon. Friend knew what was the system in this country, and how tenacious the people were of their local self-government and of doing everything for themselves. His only astonishment was that this Bill had worked so well, the best proof of which was the increase which had taken place in the amount of assessments. From a list which he held in his hands he found the increase in the valuations in the undermentioned unions to be as follows: — Birkenhead, before the Act, £204,453, by the Committee, £290,091; Altincham, before the Act, £198,465, by the Committee, £258,314; Penzance, before the Act, £115,714, by the Committee, £143,837; Romford, before the Act, £125,770, by the Committee, £150,137; Medway, before the Act, £101,338, by the Committee, £145,233; Alverstone, before the Act, £128,000, by the Committee, £193,145; Wolverhampton, before the Act, £209,100, by the Committee, £318,274; Cardiff, before the Act, £167,623, by the Committee, £277,460. It simply remained for him to assure his hon. Friend that he would give every consideration to those matters which he had brought before the House, and to repeat what he had before stated in the course of the Session, that he thought every person occupying the office he had the honour to hold ought to be in a position, from the evidence he would shortly have of the working of the Act, to introduce such Amendments as might be required to enable it to be worked efficiently.

BRITISH CLAIMS ON PORTUGAL.

PAPERS MOVED FOR.

MR. AYRTON said, he rose to call attention to the unsatisfied claims of British subjects on the Portuguese Government, and to move for papers. However much hon. Members might differ with respect to the duties of a Foreign Secretary, there could scarcely be any doubt that he could not be more usefully employed than in protecting the interests of British subjects abroad. He was, therefore, anxious to bring under the notice of the Foreign Office a case which appeared to him to be one of singular injustice. He had already called the attention of the House to the case during the last Session, and he consequently need not trouble them again at any length. In 1858 the Minister of Public Works in Portugal was extremely anxious to establish a line of steam communication between Lisbon and the Portuguese possessions on the African coast. He sought to attain his object by setting up a national joint-stock company at Lisbon, but when the design was matured he found himself in the position — in which Foreign Governments did not unfrequently find themselves — of not possessing the means requisite to carry out his object, and naturally looked to England to supply him with the necessary resources for the purpose. Application was accordingly made to some shipowners in this country, who said they were quite prepared to treat with him for the sale of vessels suited for the proposed line of packets. They were, however, anxious to have adequate security for the value of their ships before they parted with them, and instituted very careful inquiry as to how they were to be paid. The Portuguese Minister after some time arranged that the company which was about to purchase the vessels—not having a large amount of ready cash — should buy them on the credit of shares, which should be made equivalent to money by being guaranteed by the Portuguese Government. A dividend of 7 per cent was secured on the shares, and a further sum was raised on debentures, the interest on which was fixed at 6 per cent. The owners of the vessels, however, would not part with them until an act of association was framed and the guarantee confirmed by a vote of the Cortes. They further pointed out that as their debtors were a Portuguese company, over which the English shareholders had little or no control, it was expedient that the Government of Portugal should find some means of preventing them from misconducting their affairs and thus rendering the shares of little or no value. The Minister of Public Works accordingly appointed two Commissioners to watch over the company, and the owners of the ships thought that everything had at last been made safe. The shares and debentures were accordingly accepted and the ships and the money supplied. After, however, the undertaking had been in existence two or three years, it appeared that the Government Commissioners, instead of taking care that everything should be conducted in an honest and straightforward manner, were rather conniving at the irregularities which were taking place. The result was that the company got into a state of insolvency and had to appeal to the Government, who advanced a sum of £100,000 to relieve them from their embarrassments, and thus as mortgagees became the principal owners of the whole undertaking. The English shareholders under those circumstances were naturally desirous that the affairs of the company should be closely investigated; but the directors, with the connivance of the commissioners, actually created a number of shares for the purposes of a meeting, and with the power thus attained they were able to outvote the rest of the shareholders, to dispose of the shares according to their own wishes, and to vote themselves free from blame or liability in the matter. The English shareholders found, of course, that the shares were, in consequence of those proceedings, very much depreciated in value; the affairs of the company went on from bad to worse, and the whole concern was soon brought practically to an end. Their creditors here, however, thought that at all events the debentures constituted a simple debt, of which there would be no difficulty in obtaining the discharge; they brought an action, and the jury found all the facts in their favour; but the Court, after keeping all the papers a long time, pronounced, without assigning any reason for it, a decision against them. He was, moreover, informed that the Minister at Lisbon having been made acquainted with the proceedings, had arrived, with respect to the matter, at a conclusion of a most unsatisfactory character, amounting, in fact, to a denial of justice. Now, it was desirable, he thought, that Her Majesty's Government should take some notice of these transactions, particularly as it would appear that the Portugese Government were meditating another venture in our well-stocked money market. Every opinion that had been given by the diplomatic authorities had been entirely in favour of those claimants. In consequence of representations which he had made in the last Session, the Government of Portugal had been brought so far to a sense of its duty as to pay the arrears of interest up to the middle of last year. He hoped now that they would not only pay the interest which had since accrued but also the principal, and thus bring the matter to a close. He was aware of the difficulty which Her Majesty's Government had in getting the Government of Portugal to act rightly. A few years ago he had induced Her Majesty's Government to make representations in another case of injustice, and it had taken two years to bring the Portuguese Government to do what they were bound. He hoped the Under Secretary would exhibit now the same energy which he had shown on that occasion, and he begged to conclude by moving for the papers on the subject, in order that his hon. Friend might have an opportunity of giving some explanation.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copy of the Papers relating to the claims of British Subjects in respect of the Union Mercantile Company,"—(*Mr. Ayrton,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. LAYARD said, that the case to which his hon. Friend had called attention belonged to a class of cases with which it was extremely difficult to deal, and the difficulty had been rendered still greater by speeches which had been lately made in that House. He feared that Governments like the Government of Portugal were encouraged by such speeches to resist our demands. Without pledging himself to all the facts related by his hon. Friend, he believed his sketch on the whole was correct. British capitalists had been induced to invest their money in an undertaking which might to a great extent be called a Government one. That undertaking had not succeeded to the full extent, and the Government had repudiated the guarantee which it had given. An action had been brought in the Portuguese Courts, but, according to the opinion not only of our own agent but of the highest legal authorities in Portugal, there had been a gross maladministration of justice in the matter, and the English shareholders had not received fair play. Her Majesty's Government had referred the case to the Law Advisers of the Crown, and they gave it as their opinion that there were still tribunals in Portugal to which recourse might be had. As long as that was the case the Government could not make official representations. His hon. Friend the Member for Sunderland (Mr. Lindsay), who was somewhat connected with the matter, had gone to Portugal during the year, the Foreign Office furnished him with every assistance, he had been supported by Sir A. Magenis, and on his return home it was hoped that the affair had been settled. But the Portuguese Government had first repudiated the guarantee, and next the engagements into which they had entered. Friendly representations had been made to them over and over again through Sir A. Magenis, over and over again the Portuguese Minister had promised to settle the claims, and over and over again those promises had been broken. He could wish for their own credit that the Portuguese Government would settle these claims, and, indeed, it would be for their interest to do so. This was exactly the country which could develop the resources of Portugal by supplying it with money; but it was impossible that British capitalists should lend their money as long as the Portuguese Government remained guilty of so gross a breach of faith. He could assure his hon. Friend that the Foreign Office would do all it possibly could in the matter unofficially. It could not take any official steps on account of the legal difficulties that were in the way. The Portuguese Government said there was still an appeal. Her Majesty's Government held that appeal to be hopeless, and he believed the shareholders were of the same opinion, but still they could not act upon it. After what had passed in the House that evening, he hoped the Portuguese Government would feel it a duty which they owed to their own honour to satisfy the claims which were made upon them. He had not the least objection to produce the papers.

Mr. AYRTON said, he would beg leave to withdraw the Motion. He might add that he believed the claimants had exhausted all their appeals.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

FORFEITURE OF LANDS AND GOODS BILL.—QUESTION.

Mr. CHARLES FORSTER said, as there was a general concurrence of opinion from both sides of the House in favour of the principle of the Bill, and as the Bill consisted of but one clause, he could see no reason why it could not be carried into law this Session. He wished to ask, Whether, in the event of the Order of the Day for going into Committee on the Bill being discharged, the Attorney General will be prepared to introduce it as a Government measure early in the next Session of Parliament?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, the hon. Gentleman had done good service in taking up this Question, and the object he had in view was worthy of the assent of that House. Still it was not quite so simple a matter as he seemed to suppose, but must be dealt with rather more in detail than by a Bill of one clause. If the hon. Gentleman would trust the matter to him he would undertake that a Bill should be introduced next Session.

ASSIZES FOR THE WEST RIDING.

QUESTION.

Colonel SMYTH said, he wished, in the absence of the right hon. Member for North Wiltshire (Mr. Sotheron Estcourt), who had a Motion on this subject on the paper, to ask the Government, Whether, after the next Assize for the West Riding had been held at Leeds, they would allow the question of the future Assize Town of the West Riding to be reheard in case sufficient evidence should be laid before them to justify a rehearing?

Sir GEORGE GREY said, the best answer he could give was to refer the hon. and gallant Gentleman to Her Majesty's reply to the address of the other House, which referred to the terms of the Act of Parliament, and stated distinctly—as, indeed, was the case with every other assize town—that if hereafter public convenience in reference to the administration of justice should seem to require that a change should be made or an inquiry instituted, the Question should be re-considered. Of course this could be done as well in regard to the West Riding as to any other county. Leeds stood in no exceptional position—it was to the West Riding what Winchester was to Hampshire and Salisbury to Wilts, and nothing more; and according to the terms of the Act of Parliament reference might be made to the Privy Council if it were shown that a change was required in the interests of the administration of justice.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

Supply—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £5,184, to complete the sum for Magnetic and Meteorological Observations, &c.

Mr. AUGUSTUS SMITH said, he had before objected to the weather table issued under the auspices of the Board of Trade, and he still entertained the belief that no reliance could be placed on those prophecies or forecasts of the weather which had lately appeared, and which had very rarely been verified. It was said the forecasts were based on scientific principles, but unfortunately that did not save them from being contradicted by events. About two years ago a forecast was made of an expected gale from the north. It happened, however, that the gale blew from the south, and its effects were very mischievous. In another case a gale from the south-west was prophesied, but instead of blowing on our coasts, as it was stated in the forecast it would, it visited the Baltic, and fortunately was confined to that sea. He had gone through the different tables of forecasts, and had found them twice wrong to once right. He wished to know, whether any instructions had been issued by the Admiralty that their sailing vessels should be governed by the forecasts?

Lord CLARENCE PAGET said, he differed from the hon. Gentleman, and believed he expressed the opinion of every seafaring man in the country, when he characterized the remarks just made with respect to Admiral Fitzroy's signals as very unfair. Admiral Fitzroy never professed to prophesy exactly what the wind was going to be, but said that the system was still in its infancy, and required great development. It was, however, making progress, for every European Government was adopting it and making a comparison of observations. In reply to the Question, whether naval officers were to be governed by the weather signals, he could only say that he thought an officer would be blamed if he went to sea in spite of a bad weather signal, and caused damages to occur to his ship, unless he was under some stringent orders on no account to delay his voyage. All along the coast, the seafaring population paid great attention to the signals. His own constituents, who were upon the sea coast, had repeatedly expressed their satisfaction with the system; and he thought it would be extremely unwise, now that the system was becoming developed, suddenly to stop it.

Mr. DILLWYN said, he understood that his hon. Friend did not object so much to the weather drums which were intended to indicate from what quarter a gale was coming, and which might be serviceable, as to the pretences of forecasting the weather. Those weather prophecies, he thought, did not mislead the public, for the public paid no attention to them. These prophecies were like Ministerial answers—they might be read in a hundred different ways. He hoped his hon. Friend would divide the Committee against the Vote. The noble Lord talked of the system being in its infancy. It would be time enough to ask for a Vote when the system had attained a mature growth.

Mr. LAIRD said that, being connected with a seafaring population, he could state that the weather observations were considered very important, and had been the means of saving a vast amount of life and property.

Vote *agreed to*,

(2.) £500, Royal Geographical Society.

(3.) £1,000, Royal Society.

(4.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £500, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for enabling the Directors of the Royal Academy of Music to provide accommodation for the Institution."

Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE said, he wished to ask for an explanation of the Vote.

Mr. PEEL said, that the Royal Academy of Music had existed for thirty or forty years, during which time it had been a self-supporting institution. Its object more particularly was to afford to persons desirous of entering the musical profession an education in this country as good as on the Continent. The expenses of the Academy had been on the average of the last few years £500 a year greater than the receipts from the pupils. The deficiency was made up by voluntary subscriptions and by money derived from a sum which had been invested. That sum of money amounted originally to £10,000, but was now reduced to £4,000, so that it was obvious that if the sum went on diminishing in that way the society would have no alternative but to close their doors. Under these circumstances the society had addressed a memorial to the Chancellor of the Exchequer requesting that Parliament might be recommended to grant to the Academy a small sum, and that memorial was signed by a very long list of names, including almost every name of eminence in the musical profession. The Academy undertook to instruct teachers, and some of the most eminent professors had stated their opinion that it was worthy of support. The Vote was not proposed with the view of propping up a decayed institution, but with the object of enabling the Academy to recover itself. Under these circumstances he hoped there would be no opposition to the small sum proposed by the Government.

MR. BERNAL OSBORNE said, the House would remember that on a recent occasion a financial lecture had been delivered by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had told them that every man had his peculiar crotchet which he pressed upon the Government and Parliament, however expensive it might be to the public. There was before them at that moment an example of what the Government themselves could do in this way. That was the first time a Vote was asked for the Academy of Music. The Academy was a private one. ["No, no!"] He believed it was strictly a private Academy. In the present Session the House had put a stop to street music, which amused the people. They were now about to pay for music for the better classes. The House had degenerated into a rich man's club. The first attempt was to get £500 for the Academy of Music, but before long we would have them in a building, and when the public interests required that they should be turned out, the House would be asked for a Vote to keep them in. He could not understand how the Government could make such a proposition if they were anxious for economy. He knew the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Frederick Peel) was a musical man, that he attended concerts, and was acquainted with the Academy. Well, he also was acquainted with it; and he challenged the Chancellor of the Exchequer to produce six good singers whom it had ever produced. They did not want the Academy at the expense of the taxpayers of the country; and though the House was a thin one he hoped it would have sufficient spirit to reject the proposition. Again he challenged the Chancellor of the Exchequer to produce any person eminent either in vocal or instrumental music whom the Academy had handed down. It was nothing but an attempt on the part of a few amateurs to indulge their taste at the expense of the public; and he, therefore, moved that the Vote be rejected.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER observed, that there could be no doubt that his hon. Friend (Mr. Osborne) was exercising a right in objecting to a new Vote proposed by the Government, and there could be no doubt that it was quite within the province of the Committee to reject the Vote; but he could not see much relevance in the other matter which his hon. Friend had introduced—namely, the demands made on the Government by private Members. The two questions were quite different from each other. However, his hon. Friend opposed the Vote on two grounds. He said the Academy was a private institution, and he further said that the proposition of a Vote of £500 would be followed by demands for larger sums. Now, with regard to the first objection he entirely denied that the Academy was a private society unless they said that all the multitude of institutions for which they voted annual sums were private societies. They might say on the same grounds that the Royal Institution and the Royal Academy were private societies. Societies for the promotion of the arts and sciences in this country did not emanate or proceed directly from the State; but still the system had been for the State to afford a moderate assistance to those institutions. His hon. Friend said that these grants always grew enormously. That he denied. By way of illustration, he would take another grant—that to the Geographical Society, which was first proposed when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer ten years ago. If any hon. Gentleman asked the question of a member of the Geographical Society he would find that it mainly owed its prosperity to the grant of £500, which had first been voted ten years ago, and had never grown. It was a truth that the culture of music in this country had extended enormously in our generation. The people of England had become conscious of the fact that the taste for music was a gift conferred on mankind generally in various degrees. With some persons it was absent altogether, but as a general rule it was an universal gift. In regard to music, as in that of other sciences, it was found that benevolent persons were disposed to promote education among the young, but were not so ready to support schools and colleges for training teachers. His hon. Friend was mistaken in thinking that the Vote was intended for the support of an institution in which a particular class of music was to be cultivated. The Academy gave no preference to English music in particular. If his hon. Friend looked at the memorial in favour of the Vote, he would find that it was signed by some of the most eminent musicians of the various schools of music. At the present time the Crown, the Royal family, and a small number of persons had the exclusive honour and burden of supporting the institution, and it appeared to him when the claim presented itself, that it was not possible to say it was an illegitimate application, having regard to other Votes which the House passed annually. It was true there was no money-Vote for the Royal Academy, but that institution had a grant of premises which was equivalent to several thousand pounds a year. Before they undertook to submit the Vote to Parliament the Government had required the society to show them that they had the confidence of the musical profession. That they had now shown by the names of the Englishmen and foreigners who supported the application. Secondly, they had required that the society should discard any intention of acting on a system of private patronage; they had required that the society should throw open their doors to all comers, and conduct the institution on the most liberal principles. To both those conditions the society had conformed. Thirdly, the Government said they could not take upon themselves the responsibility of supporting the Academy. All they could do was to apply to Parliament for an experimental Vote, and if the countenance of Parliament was the means of securing for the Academy adequate public support the grant might be continued, but the Government could not make the society public pensioners. The expenditure of the Academy was several thousands a year, and the moderate amount covered by the Vote was only applied in aid of private subscriptions, the bulk of the expense being borne by the pupils. He did not think that the House would retrace its steps and revoke the grants made that very year in behalf of kindred objects, and he hoped therefore that this Vote would also command cheerful acquiescence.

Mr. AYRTON said, there was no analogy between the Academy of Music and the Geographical Society, which was essentially a public society, with public objects, whereas the Academy was merely for the purpose of giving persons a superior knowledge of music, and thereby enabling them to earn larger salaries than they otherwise could command. As to the precedents which had been referred to, every act of extravagance into which the House was inveigled by the Government, was made a precedent to justify further extravagance in some further Session. The Government seemed to be about to teach every thing to every body at the public expense, and when the Chancellor of the Exchequer spoke of a maximum grant of £500, he should look to the Science and Art Department. No sooner would the grant be made in London than the provinces would ask why they should not also have a share; and Dublin and Edinburgh would make demands which could not be resisted for the establishment of schools of music there. The Kensington Museum had led to a museum at Dublin and Edinburgh, and to an expenditure of thousands for erecting, filling, and keeping up those buildings, and for a travelling museum very much like that of Barnum or Wombwell. In the memorial which had been presented, the memorialists trusted that the time was not distant when music might stand here on the same footing as in those countries where the Government wholly and permanently maintained a school of music. These persons had not arrived at the happy frame of mind which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had attained when he said that he saw the end of this expenditure. Now he (Mr. Ayrton) only saw the beginning of it. The grant was for the maintenance of music of a high character among the upper classes, who ought to be able to pay for it themselves, while they were unable to endure the organs and the humbler music of the lower classes. A more contemptible vote was never presented to Parliament, and he hoped it would be rejected.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he did not wish to mislead the Committee, and he would, therefore, inform them that there had been an application from Dublin founded upon the proposed grant; but the answer given was that it was an experimental proposal, and that any other application was premature. Within very moderate limits he thought it not unwise to recognize the claims of Dublin and Edinburgh in such cases. But if even the grant of £500 were supplemented by grants of £200 or £300 to those two cities, the fears of the hon. Member must be easily excited if they were aroused by the contingency of such proposals. He hoped that the hon. Gentleman would not attempt to propagate the fallacy that it was a question between the music of the higher and of the lower classes, because the music of the higher classes was the opera, and was essentially foreign music, whereas the vote applied chiefly to music enjoyed by the middle classes, especially in London.

MR. CLAY said, that even if the consequences foreseen by the hon. Member (Mr. Ayrton) were realized, and the provinces obtained a share in the grants made for purposes of art, he could not say that any harm would be done by the softening influences of art being felt all over the country. The hon. Gentleman said that the object of the Academy of Music was to enable people to make money. That was not so. Its object was to improve the taste and increase the knowledge of music throughout the country; and if some persons thereby gained a higher position than they would otherwise have obtained, that was a mere accident, and was not the original aim and intention of the Academy. He remembered the time when nothing beyond hunting and drinking songs were known as English compositions, and when one opera, *Artaxerxes,* represented the English school. Things had now changed, and we had a musical school not inferior to that of any country, which result was mainly owing to the influence of the Royal Academy of Music.

COLONEL DUNNE said, he did not know whether it was competent to him to move a similar grant for Dublin, but if it were, he would do so, and an hon. Friend was equally ready to propose a Vote for Edinburgh.

MR. AUGUSTUS SMITH said, he wished to know if the science of music was to be encouraged by a grant of public money where was the system to end? He thought that the less Government had to do with such institutions the better it would be for everybody. Formerly agriculture and fisheries were sustained by public money, but since the grants had ceased neither agriculture nor the fisheries had been less productive. If any Government management were to be given to any particular science, he thought it would be most usefully given to a school of cookery, as there was no country in the world in which the proverb, "Providence sends food and the devil cooks," was more verified than in England.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE reminded the hon. and gallant Member for Portarlington (Colonel Dunne) that it was complained that Ireland was suffering from a pressure of taxation. The hon. and gallant Gentleman wished for additional expenditure, because additional expenditure was proposed for England. But increased expenditure meant increased taxation, although it might be well for a rich country to bear the increased taxation, yet it would bear more hardly upon a poor and suffering country like Ireland. He would be sorry to impede the spread of musical taste and knowledge, but he was disinclined to support that new Vote.

COLONEL DUNNE explained, that he did not desire to increase expenditure, but what he complained of was, that while Ireland had too much of the taxation, she had too little of the expenditure.

MR. DILLWYN said, he could not see the analogy which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had drawn between the grant for the Academy of Music and the grant made to the Royal Academies, the Geographical Society, and the Royal Society. With respect to the Royal Academy, they had the benefit of a public building, for the use of which they drew an immense revenue, and yet were found resisting the demands of the country. The grant for the Geographical Society was for a public purpose—the exhibition of their collection of maps. The Royal Society received a grant of £1,000 to carry on certain experiments for public purposes. The Vote could not be said to be of an analogous character, and therefore he should oppose it. It was in the continuance of a system by which they were very fast assuming a paternal character and educating the whole nation. He thought it would be much better to leave the people to their own voluntary efforts.

MR. ADDERLEY said, he thought the principle upon which such rules as that they were discussing might be justified was this—that in some things the natural demands of the people were not so vigorous as they ought to be for the interests of the nation, and those demands were particularly connected with the fine arts. In those cases the State, or those who represented it, were justified in giving public money in the interests of the people for the purpose of stimulating a demand which, when it once became natural, would be beneficial to the nation. On that ground they justified the Vote for science and art, and the result had proved the justness of the principles upon which that Vote was proposed; for notoriously the taste of the country had been stimulated, and the designs of our manufactures raised, and the consequence had been a great pecuniary benefit (even to put it on that ground) to the country at large. The question was whether music should be treated upon the same footing as other arts, and he thought that it ought; and that if the Vote were rejected they should in consistency withdraw the other Votes which were given for the encouragement of science and art. The principle which had been acted upon was to give public money where it was felt that an artificial stimulus was required to promote a particular object.

MR. BERNAL OSBORNE observed, that if the principle of the right hon. Gentleman were adopted, the Vote before the Committee would be only the thin end of the wedge, and before long they would be asked to vote for music schools all over the country. The Academy of Music was a private society started forty-four years ago by the Earl of Westmoreland and other noblemen and gentlemen, under the patronage of George IV., but till now not a sixpence of the public money had been voted for it. It appeared, however, that the subscriptions of the patrons had fallen off considerably; and hence the appeal which was made on behalf of a bankrupt private society. For his own part he should have been content with *Artaxerxes* even (to which, by the way, the hon. Gentleman had not done justice) rather than have this false system of Government aid established. There was a beautiful air in that opera, "In infancy our hopes and fears." Well, the Vote was in its infancy, and they had better crush its hopes at once. He held that the State ought not to pay for more than the mere rudiments of education. If they had a Vote for music, why not for dancing? An enthusiastic dancer once undertook to prove that all the orations of Cicero and Demosthenes might be represented by dancing, and there was a great deal to be said for the art. Some day they might have the Chancellor of the Exchequer institute an analogy between the Geographical Society and the Academy of Dancing. If the House was not a mere rich man's club they would put a stopper on that stimulating process at once.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, that while the hon. Member for Swansea declared that all these things should be left to voluntary effort, the hon. Member for Liskeard showed that voluntary effort had in this case been at work for forty-four years, and could go on no longer. There was surely some inconsistency in these views. He believed the Government had done right in proposing the Vote to a society which had contributed greatly to the improvement of a national taste for music.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, that if there was one art or science more than another which could stand by itself and did not require the aid of Government, it was music. There had been of late years an immense advance in musical taste in this country, and there was no art more popular. It was in no need of a miserable Vote of £500, and he hoped the Committee would reject it.

MR. HENNESSY said, he must protest against the Chancellor of the Exchequer offering to Ireland the prospect of a paltry grant in aid of music when everything in the country had gone to rack and ruin through his mismanagement. What they wanted was something practical.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, the hon. Member had mistaken what he said.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER thought that the knowledge of music was in such a condition in this country that improvement was highly desirable; and he protested against the time of the Committee being wasted in discussing a Vote which was so small as to have scarcely any effect upon the expenditure of the country.

The Committee *divided*:— Ayes 52; Noes 42: Majority 10.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) £771,473, Customs (Salaries and Expenses).

SIR HENRY WILLOUGHBY said, he wished to ask how it was that there was an increase in the Vote this year of upwards of £17,000? There was strong reason to believe that the Reports of imports and exports were not correct, that there were no accurate data upon the subject, and he wanted to hear from the President of the Board of Trade what was the machinery by which the Returns were obtained, and whether he would undertake to show that the monthly and annual Returns, especially of exports, were accurate?

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, he believed there was no reason to doubt the general accuracy of the Returns. The imports with regard to quantity were ascertained from the entries made and also from information supplied by the dock authorities. He believed it was the practice of the Customs to compute the value of the imports from the prices of the various articles according to the price current of the day. As to the exports, in the case of quantity the bill of lading on which the duty was formerly levied was no longer required, but there was a Customs bill of lading shown by those who unloaded the ships to the Customs officers at the dock gates. The value of the exports must depend in a great degree upon the declaration of the merchants, but he had no doubt that they gave a very fair and accurate account. He believed that there was no reason to doubt the general accuracy of the Returns made by the Customs of the imports and exports of the country.

Mr. PEEL said, the increase in the Vote of £17,000 was purely nominal with the exception of a sum of £4,600, which arose from a small addition to the Customs establishment in the course of last year.

Vote *agreed to.*

(6.) £1,313,467, Inland Revenue (Salaries and Expenses).

(7.) £2,114,616, Post Office (Salaries and Expenses).

(8.) £492,536, Superannuations, &c., Customs, Inland Revenue, and Post Office.

Sir HENRY WILLOUGHBY expressed himself dissatisfied with the explanation given by the President of the Board of Trade upon the Customs Votes. He should not have raised the question if there had not been evidence on the table that the Returns were very inaccurate.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that in 1860 the Government proposed that a certain charge should be levied on bills of lading for exports, mainly with a view of giving the Customs authorities power to obtain very precise and accurate statistics with respect to goods exported. A great deal of complaint, however, was made by the trade on that subject, and a Committee reported that the old mode of obtaining such statistical information was sufficient for its purpose.

Mr. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD said, the real question was, whether the President of the Board of Trade could pledge himself that the statement he had made about the existing machinery for collecting this information was a correct one, and whether the right hon. Gentleman himself could rely in any way upon that machinery?

Mr. MILNER GIBSON said, he had stated that they took the declaration of the merchants as to value.

Mr. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD said, he wished the right hon. Gentleman to explain more explicitly what was the exact machinery by which the value and quantities of exports were ascertained.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON said, he would beg before he did that to be permitted to make further inquiry. They had not the same means of ascertaining such particulars in regard to exports as they had in regard to imports; and in the case of the former they placed reliance on the declaration of the exporter.

Mr. WHITE said, he could himself testify to the absolute inaccuracy of the Board of Trade Returns, especially in respect to non-dutiable articles. Some merchants were in the habit of declaring goods at double their true value, and very often gross exaggeration took place. At the same time, as the merchants had no more interest in misrepresenting in one year than they had in another, these Returns afforded a rough means of estimating the progress of our trade.

Vote *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported on *Monday* next; Committee to sit again on *Monday* next.

WAYS AND MEANS.—REPORT.

Resolutions [July 14] *reported.*

In answer to Sir Stafford Northcote,

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he expected that a portion of these bonds would be paid off next year.

Sir HENRY WILLOUGHBY inquired the rate of interest on the bonds.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that the rate of interest would be specified in the Bill.

Resolutions *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Massey, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Peel.

SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CLERGY DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL.

[*Lords.*] (No. 161.) COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee).

Clauses 1 to 3 *agreed to.*

Clause 4. (Persons admitted into Holy Orders by Bishops in Scotland not to be admitted to Benefices, &c. in England or

Ireland without Consent of Bishop of the Diocese).

Mr. KINNAIRD moved the omission of the following words at the end of it:—

"Any such Bishop shall be entitled to refuse such consent and approbation without assigning any reason for such refusal, any law or practice to the contrary notwithstanding."

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 10, to leave out the words "and any such Bishop shall be entitled to refuse such consent and approbation without assigning reason for such refusal, any law or practice to the contrary notwithstanding."—(*Mr. Kinnaird.*)

Sir WILLIAM HEATHCOTE said, the adoption of the Amendment would be fatal to the object of the Bill.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 48; Noes 5: Majority 43.

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* with an Amendment as amended, to be considered on *Monday* next.

POISONED FLESH PROHIBITION, &c., BILL. [Bill 199.]

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Lord NAAS moved that the clause excluding Ireland from the operation of the Bill be omitted.

After short debate, Clause *omitted.*

Bill to be read 3°, on *Monday* next.

METROPOLIS MANAGEMENT ACT (1862) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Baring, Bill to amend "The Metropolis Management Amendment Act, 1862," *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Baring, Mr. Cowper, and Mr. Tite.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 219.]

HACKNEY CARRIAGES (METROPOLIS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Locke, Bill to amend the Laws relating to the Hackney Carriages of the Metropolis and the Proprietors and Drivers thereof, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Locke, Sir Morton Peto, Mr. Alderman Salomons, and Mr. Ayrton.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 216.]

INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE BILL.

On Motion of Sir Charles Wood, Bill to repeal certain parts of the Act of the sixteenth and seventeenth years of Her Majesty, chapter ninety-five, and to make provision for the Medical Service of Her Majesty's Indian Forces, *ordered** to be brought in by Sir Charles Wood and The Marquess of Hartington.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 213.]

CORN RETURNS BILL.

Acts *considered* in Committee.*

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Law relating to Publication of Accounts of Corn Imported, and to Returns of Purchases and Sales of Corn.

Resolution *reported.*

Bill *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Milner Gibson and Mr. Hutt.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 214.]

WEST INDIAN INCUMBERED ESTATES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Bill to amend the West Indian Incumbered Estates Act, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Chichester Fortescue and Mr. Peel.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 215.]

EXCHEQUER BONDS (£1,600,000) BILL.

Bill for raising a sum by Exchequer Bonds for the Service of the year one thousand eight hundred and sixty-four; *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 217.]

FORTIFICATIONS (PROVISION FOR EXPENSES) BILL.

Bill for providing a further sum towards defraying the expenses of constructing Fortifications for the protection of the Royal Arsenals and Dockyards, and the Ports of Dover and Portland, and of creating a Central Arsenal; *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 218.]

House adjourned at a quarter
after Two o'clock till
Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, July 18, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee — On Judgments, &c., Law Amendment Bill *nominated** (*List of Committee.*) (No. 194).

Public Bills — *First Reading* — Harwich Harbour Act Amendment* (No. 210); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* (No. 211); Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal* (No. 212).

Second Reading—Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia)* (No. 204); Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans)* (No. 206); Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* (No. 209).

Committee—Burials Registration* (No. 144).

Third Reading — Street Music (Metropolis)* (No. 196); Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties)* (No. 198); Railways (Ireland) Acts Amendment* (No. 178); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland)* (No. 189); Administration of Trusts (Scotland)* (No. 199).

CUBA SLAVE TRADE.—PETITION.

LORD BROUGHAM, in rising to present to their Lordships a Petition from certain Inhabitants of Kingston, Jamaica, praying for the Suppression of the Slave Trade, said, he would not make a promise to detain them a short time, because that promise, often made, was never kept, but would engage only to occupy so much as was absolutely necessary of their time by the importance of the subject and the facts he had to state He hoped they would bear with him when he said that in a Parliamentary life of much above half a century there was nothing on which he looked back with such satisfaction as his having been enabled to pass the Act treating the slave traffic, not as a trade or contraband, but as what it really was, a crime of a grave description, and punished it as it deserved; and also his having, with their Lordships' concurrence and that of the Colonial Legsilatures, shortened the three years, the period of apprenticeship, substituted by the Act of 1834 for slavery as an intermediate state before entire emancipation. He rejoiced to say that the Act of 1811 had effectually relieved this country from all share in the crime, for it had only in one or two instances been found necessary to enforce it; and as for the poor slaves, they had shown by their peaceful demeanour how well they deserved entire freedom, there never having been a breach of the peace in all our colonies. They also had shown by their subsequent conduct how well disposed they were to benefit by their freedom, of which an example was afforded in a petition two or three years ago from a public meeting in Jamaica, attended only by freed slaves; the petition was signed by 800 of these poor people, and of the whole only two signed with a mark, the whole 798 having learnt to write and signed their names. He had now to complain of the manner in which the Spanish Government had set at naught the treaty they had entered into, by continuing to sell slaves. He was not one of those who held that it does not become this country to interfere on any account with anything going on in a foreign country. There were cases in which it was not only honourable in this country to do so, but when it was a matter of duty for it to interfere. There must either be a treaty binding us, or else such peril to the universal peace of European society as in the end might affect us; but that there should never be interference he was not prepared to say. Here was a case in which interference was called for not only by humanity and justice, not only to relieve millions of our fellow creatures from undeserved and cruel bondage, not only to free the great continent of Africa which was now crippled and held down by the remains of this detestable traffic, but by the direct and most important interest of our fellow countrymen in the West Indies. The noble and learned Lord then pointed out the systematic manner in which Spain, in the face of treaties, had from 1817 to the present time not only permitted but fostered that traffic; the importation or diminution of importation of slaves into Cuba depending not on the action of the Spanish Government, but on the personal character of the Governor of that colony. While not desiring to advocate anything like a return to the principles of protection, he believed that the only effectual way for this country to check the slave trade would be to place a heavy duty on slave-grown sugar from Spanish colonies. In urging that a higher duty should be imposed on the slave-grown sugar of Cuba and other colonies than on our own free-grown sugar he had been supported by his three excellent and lamented Friends—Alexander Baring (the first Lord Ashburton), Lord Chief Justice Denman, and the great Duke, that illustrious man whose irreparable loss was deeply deplored every day and every hour, both in war and in peace, and all questions whether of foreign or domestic policy. His advice was surely fit to be followed by Spain, which to him owed, as an independent state, her very existence; but he never would have recalled to her recollection these obligations, for his great mind held the maxim that the giver of favours could not have too short a memory, or the receiver too long. But we might urge his advice, and pursue the policy he recommended, if on no other, yet on the ground of the immense services he had rendered to Spain. The conduct of Brazil contrasted most favourably with that of Spain in this matter, the slave trade to the former country having been suppressed; and there was now a strong case for repealing the Aberdeen Act.

EARL RUSSELL said, that every one must acknowledge the great services which the noble and learned Lord had rendered to the cause of the abolition of slavery; but there was here a difficulty which the noble and learned Lord did not seem to recognize. When this country had arrived at the conviction that the slave trade ought to be put an end to, and an Act was passed to that effect, the British Government had to deal with its own officers and its own colonies, and the trade was therefore entirely suppressed; but when we had to deal with Foreign Governments and officers, over whom we had no control, difficulties arose. Every Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in recent times had been compelled to address protests and remonstrances to Foreign Governments; still, we never had been able to secure the object of the entire abolition of the slave trade. The Spanish Government always professed to be willing to carry out the treaty; but owing to the strength of private interests in Cuba, and the consequent unwillingness of the Spanish Government to offend those who had an interest in maintaining the slave trade in that Island, we never had been able to obtain efficacious aid from that Government in the suppression of the traffic in negroes. He concurred in the tribute which his noble and learned Friend had paid to the present Governor; but he believed that that functionary had found private interests too strong for him. He doubted whether the differential duty suggested by his noble and learned Friend as a remedy would be effective for the object which he had in view, as slave-grown sugar from Cuba would still be received in France, Spain, Russia, and other European countries, and therefore the effect of a differential duty would be very small. Having on a recent occasion spoken in reference to Brazil, he did not think it necessary to make any further remarks on that empire.

The Earl of MALMESBURY said, he willingly bore testimony to the great efforts of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Brougham) to secure the entire abolition of slavery, but he thought the noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell) would bear him out when he said that private interest was exerted to keep up the slave trade in Brazil. The Government, however, were not to blame, for it had been exerting itself as much as possible to stop the traffic. Under these circumstances he felt that the condemnation cast upon the Brazilian Government in another place by the noble Lord at the head of Her Majesty's Government was calculated unjustly to wound the feelings of that Government. He now wished to repeat what he had told their Lordships on a former occasion, that the

time had arrived, or nearly arrived, when Lord Aberdeen's Act might be done away with. In the last conversation he had with the late Earl of Aberdeen, that noble Earl said that the time had arrived when it would afford him great pleasure to see the Act repealed.

Lord BROUGHAM expressed his opinion, that the Act of the United States Government giving us the right of search was a most important one. He believed that in the course of the next two months events at the other side of the Atlantic would render it expedient, and if expedient desirable, for England and France to use their good offices in endeavouring to put an end to that cruel war between the North and South which every friend of humanity must deplore.

Petition to lie on the table.

JUDGMENTS, &c., LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

Select Committee *nominated.** The Lords following were named of the Committee; the Committee to meet on *Friday* next, at Eleven o'clock; and to appoint their own Chairman:—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. Steward, E. Shaftesbury, E. Romney, L. Wodehouse, L. Cranworth, L. Saint Leonards, L. Wensleydale, L. Chelmsford, L. Kingsdown, L. Lyveden.

House adjourned at half past Six
o'clock, till To-morrow,
Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, July 18, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee*—Navy Estimates.

Resolutions [July 14 & 15] *reported.*

Ways and Means—*considered in Committee*—Account No. 46 of the Finance Accounts [presented June 7] *referred.*

Public Bills — *Ordered*—Private Bill Costs *; Poor Removal *.

First Reading—Cathedral Minor Corporations * [Bill 220] (*Lords*); Private Bill Costs * [Bill 221]; Poor Removal * [Bill 222]; Defence Act Amendment * [Bill 223] (*Lords*).

Second Reading — Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* [Bill 218]; Indian Medical Service * [Bill 213]; Corn Accounts and Returns* [Bill 214]; West Indian Incumbered Estates Act Amendment * [Bill 215]; Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000)* [Bill 217]; Metropolis Management Act (1862) Amendment * [Bill 219]; Clerks of the Peace Removal * [Bill 209] (*Lords*); Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues * [Bill 202].

Committee—Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) [Advances] [Bill 204]; New Zealand

(Guarantee of Loan) [Bill 150]; Navy and Army Expenditure (1862-3)*; Westminster Bridge Traffic [Bill 205]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental* [Bill 207]; Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment* [Bill 210] (*Lords*); Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. (*re-committed*)* [Bill 199].

Report—Westminster Bridge Traffic [Bill 205]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental* [Bill 207]; Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment* [Bill 210]; Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c.* [Bill 199] (*re-committed*).

Considered as amended — Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal [Bill 161] (*Lords*); Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c.* [Bill 199].

Third Reading—Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension* [Bill 181]; Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* [Bill 194]; Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* [Bill 200]; Militia Pay*; Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* [Bill 164]; Bank Notes, &c., Signature* [Bill 206]; Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* [Bill 176]; Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c.* [Bill 199]; Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex)* [Bill 203], and *passed*.

Withdrawn—Charitable Trusts Fees* [Bill 128].

METROPOLITAN DISTRICT RAILWAYS BILL.

(QUEEN'S CONSENT SIGNIFIED.)

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. CRAWFORD, on behalf of the City of London, objected to the further progress of the Bill. It was one of a class of Bills which the corporation of London felt it their duty to take exception to at a very early period of the Session. The Bill was not one promoted by any authorized Company, but was promoted by certain individuals for the purpose of making a railway along the Thames Embankment and the new street to Cannon Street, and from thence, by tunnelling, to the Tower. The corporation objected to the proposal to carry the railway from Cannon Street, and they also objected to it because it was intended by this Private Bill to deprive the City Gas Company of certain rights which had been reserved to it by the Thames Embankment Act, which was a public Act. They further said that the merits of the Bill had not been duly considered by the Select Committee, three days only having been devoted to it. They objected also to it on account of its dealing with a vast amount of private property; and as the railway would pass under substantial buildings in one of the most crowded parts of the City, great danger was likely to result from the undertaking, unless further examination and inquiry were afforded. They represented, that so far from this undertaking relieving the streets from their present enormous traffic, it would increase it, and therefore it was an unwise and an unnecessary thing to allow the railway to be made. Already the streets, especially Fleet Street, were blocked up with vehicles, owing to the gigantic works that were now being carried out in the City of London, so that it was a great inconvenience to those who had business in the City, in consequence of the delay that took place from the over-crowding of Fleet Street; and they said that that obstruction might be indefinitely increased if this gigantic work was allowed to be carried out at the same time. Moreover, they said that the Bill, if carried, would deprive the City Gas Company from having their 50,000 tons of coal, which they consumed annually, brought by water, and they would be compelled to obtain it, to a considerable extent, by carting it through the streets. The objection would not be so great to the Bill if the proposed line stopped at Cannon Street, and the corporation asked for time in order that the House might consider an alternative plan propounded by the City for connecting the embankment with the London, Dover, and Chatham Railway at Blackfriars. The promoters of the Bill were entitled to no commiseration. There was no company in the case—the scheme was the property of a well known Parliamentary solicitor and equally well-known railway contractors, who had complied with the Standing Orders of the House by depositing borrowed money; and he complained that the Select Committee had not directed the attention of the House to the fact of its not being a *bonâ fide* scheme. He moved that the Bill be read the third time that day month.

MR. GOSCHEN seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day month."—(*Mr. Crawford.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. SPEAKER said, the hon. Member for the City had in his speech mixed up two questions—one, the question of Order; and the other, the merits of the Bill. That was a somewhat inconvenient course, and he asked the hon. Member whether it would not be better to get rid of the first objection before entering on the merits of the Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD said, he would adopt that course.

Mr. SPEAKER, having recited the provisions of the Bill, said, that as there was an exact case in point, where the City of Bristol by a Private Act repealed certain provisions in a public Act, this Bill could not be stopped on a point of Order.

Mr. AYRTON said, that if the Bill were thrown out the inhabitants of the metropolis, with the exception of the City corporation, would be greatly prejudiced, and he expressed a hope that the House would not listen to the opposition of the corporation. The proposed line formed part of a complete system of circular metropolitan railways, which it was desirable should be carried out for the benefit of the whole of the metropolis, and a most inconvenient gap would be created in the system if this Bill should be thrown out.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, that the majority of merchants, bankers, and traders of London, as well as the corporation, were opposed to this Bill. He might say that all who had business in the City were opposed to it.

Lord STANLEY said, that the promoters of the Bill had proposed certain compensations and arrangements with the Gas Company, with which the Company were perfectly satisfied. So far from the 50,000 tons of coal consumed annually by the Gas Company impeding the traffic of the streets, there was no difficulty in foreseeing that it would be brought by railways. It was true the line was laid out for passenger traffic only, but there was no reason why they should not carry their coal at nights. He believed it was the plan of all railways to carry their goods traffic on at night. At all events, he thought he might venture to say that but little of the 50,000 tons of coal would come on the streets of London. It had been objected that the Bill had not been brought in by a company, but by individuals. But, with regard to these Private Bills, he apprehended all Parliament had to do was to consider whether the scheme was one likely to prove beneficial to the public, and not with reference to the promoters, and he never knew of any difficulty in finding money for a line that was likely to pay. The principal objection to the Bill really was, the amount of property that would be destroyed in its construction. He was not surprised at the general feeling that prevailed early in the Session with reference to the land required for the different schemes in the City, but there was far greater fear than knowledge on the subject, arising from a belief that all the land scheduled must be taken and occupied by the railways. Of the four schemes, two had been rejected, and one had been considerably curtailed. In reality the amount of property to be taken by this gigantic undertaking, as it had been called, was 197 houses, all of which, with the exception of 19, would be rebuilt when the works were completed. He was rather surprised that the hon. Member for the City had not mentioned what the present Bill proposed to do for the relief of the obstruction of the streets. The railway would also be carried out in such a way that its construction would be coincident with that of the drainage works, which otherwise must be carried under Cannon Street, and thus any interference with that important thoroughfare would be prevented. The reason why the Bill did not occupy the Committee so long as the others was, that they had already considered substantially the same questions. He wished to say one word with respect to the alternative plan which had been put forward by the corporation. He confessed that he was distrustful of alternative plans which were put forward by parties who were not bound to execute them, and which were often started at the last moment more in order to hold out some sort of expectation to the Committee, that if the scheme before them was rejected some other one would be adopted, rather than with a view to any actual operations. He objected to that alternative plan, in the first place, because it would interfere with a great deal of very valuable property not touched by the line which the Committee had passed; and he objected to it, in the second place, because it would place the City on a branch line instead of including it in the main line. He should add that the general plan of an inner circle had been suggested by the Lords' Committee of 1863, and had received the sanction of the Joint Committee of both Houses which sat this year. In conclusion, he had to state that he believed no other scheme would give so much accommodation to the trade of London with so small an interference with the street traffic or with private property as the one embodied in the Bill, As the other House would have the opportunity of considering the Bill, and of hearing what its opponents had to say, he hoped the House would not reject it at this the last stage, but allow it to go where argument and evidence could be heard on both sides, and where the objections entertained to it could be fairly weighed.

MR. THOMSON HANKEY said, that every person with whom he had conversed upon the subject entertained the belief that it would be most unwise for the present to bring more railways into the heart of London. He did not see how the other House could give this Bill proper consideration at this period of the Session; and all that the opponents of the Motion before the House asked was that the question should be again considered in another Session.

MR. SCOURFIELD drew attention to the fact that the promoters of this Bill had made a deposit of stock borrowed for the occasion, a proceeding which a Select Committee had just pronounced to be an evasion of the spirit if not of the letter of the Standing Orders. Under all the circumstances of the case, he thought the House ought not then to pass the measure.

MR. MASSEY said, that this particular scheme had been considered both by the Joint Committee of Lords and Commons and by the Committee of that House presided over by the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley), and the noble Lord's name was a sufficient guarantee that the duties of the Committee had been efficiently performed. Two important bodies, the corporation of London and the Metropolitan Board of Works, represented by able counsel, had opposed the line, but without convincing the Committee that it was a bad one. It was for the other House, and not for them, to say whether or not the subject could be properly investigated before the Session closed. As to the deposit of borrowed money, although a Select Committee had condemned the practice, he was sure it was not intended, and would be rather hard, to give retrospective effect to the recommendation of the Committee, especially as the practice had been tacitly acquiesced in by the House for some years. As the opponents of the Bill would be able to state their case in the other House, he saw no reason why that House should reverse the decision of their Committee, and hoped the Bill would be read a third time.

SIR WILLIAM FRASER said, that he had been a Member of the Committee, and had gone into it with opinions rather averse to the scheme embodied in the Bill; but the evidence which had been adduced subsequently led him to the conclusion that it was the very best which had been devised for meeting the requirements of metropolitan traffic.

MR. TITE believed that the amount of injury done by this railway to the City would be much less than was supposed, but he thought it would be wise to postpone the Bill until next Session, when they would have had the opportunity of seeing the progress of other works.

Question, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read 3°, and *passed.*

PUBLIC OFFICES—SATURDAY HALF HOLIDAY.—QUESTION.

MR. O'REILLY said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether Her Majesty's Government will give their favourable consideration to the propriety of extending to all the other public offices the Saturday Half Holiday, which has long prevailed to a certain extent in the Audit and some other Offices, and which, as the Secretary to the Treasury has stated, has been granted to the Post Office, without entailing on the public inconvenience or expense?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON said, this was a Question of some importance to the public service, and without communication with the heads of Departments he was unable to answer the Question of the hon. Gentleman.

UNITED STATES—SEIZURE OF THE BARQUE "SCIENCE."

QUESTION.

MR. BLAKE said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he can state if any decision has been come to by the Government of the United States of America respecting the seizure some months since of the barque *Science*, of Waterford, at Matamoras, by a Federal ship of war?

MR. LAYARD said, in reply, that by the last accounts from the United States they had heard that the *Science* had been released, but they had received no particulars as to whether damages or compensation had been awarded.

TRAFFIC OF THE CITY OF LONDON.

QUESTION.

LORD ERNEST BRUCE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, When the provisions of an Act of Parliament, which received the Royal Assent on the 28th of July, 1863, intituled "An Act for the better Regulation of the Traffic in the Streets of the City of London, and for the prevention of obstructions therein," are likely to be carried into effect; whether Colonel Fraser, the City Commissioner of Police, did not several months ago send in a proposed set of Rules, Orders, and Regulations, approved of by the City Law Officers, for the approbation of the Secretary of State, and what has been the cause of so long a delay?

SIR GEORGE GREY replied, that he had previously stated the cause of the delay in bringing these traffic regulations into operation. Colonel Fraser had no authority in the matter, but the Court of Aldermen, having power by law to make regulations for the traffic, had transmitted to him, through the town clerk, some months ago, a series of regulations which they had made, in order that they might receive his sanction. He had referred those regulations for the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown, who reported that some of them were in excess of the powers vested by law in the Court of Aldermen. He had accordingly sent them back, and on Tuesday last he received, through the town clerk, a revised set of regulations, which appeared to be free from all legal objection. He had, therefore, given them his sanction, and they would at once come into operation.

TREATY OF VIENNA AND PRUSSIA.

QUESTION.

MR. AYRTON said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury a Question respecting the territorial guarantee contained in the Treaty of Vienna. He wished to know, Whether any representations have been made on the part of this country to Prussia to the effect, that if Prussia insists upon departing from the Treaty which settled the limits and conditions of the Germanic Confederation, the British Government will not hold itself further bound by that guarantee?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: No communication has been made of that nature to the Prussian Government, and I do not think it would be expedient to follow the example of Prussia. That country having in the beginning of the Danish difficulties declared that she might repudiate the Treaty of 1852, in consequence of Denmark not having fulfilled some of her obligations which were totally independent of that treaty, we should have no right to tell Prussia that we are absolved from the Treaty of Vienna on account of another transaction taking place in 1863 or 1864.

ARMY — EXPERIMENTS WITH RIFLED ORDNANCE.—QUESTION.

MR. J. A. SMITH said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether there would be any objection to lay before the House a Letter addressed to Earl De Grey by Mr. Alfred Jeffery on the 29th of April last in reference to his Correspondence with the War Office, and the results of his experiments with Rifled Ordnance since July, 1854?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON, in reply, said, there would be no objection on the part of the War Office to lay on the table the Correspondence which had taken place between that Department and Mr. Jeffery if the hon. Member thought fit to press for it, but there would be some inconvenience in producing an isolated letter from that Correspondence. He might, however, state the opinion entertained with regard to Mr. Jeffery's inventions. Mr. Jeffery, as long ago as July, 1854, submitted a specimen of his compound shot to the Government, which very shortly afterwards determined to institute experiments with projectiles on Mr. Jeffery's principle, and also to place at his disposal guns to be rifled on any system which he might think best adapted for carrying his projectiles. Experiments with cast-iron guns had been conducted and brought to a conclusion, and there had been further experiments with his projectiles from wrought-iron guns. More importance had always been attached to Mr. Jeffery's projectiles than to any system of rifling which he had brought forward. The Ordnance Committee had given it as their opinion that Mr. Jeffery had succeeded in the objects which he originally proposed to himself—namely, that he had effected a mechanical junction between the two metals, iron and lead. They also thought that Mr. Jeffery was the first to propose a very slow twist in guns. Yet no practical result had been attained, because the Ordnance Committee had not deemed it their duty to recommend that Mr. Jeffery's system should be adopted in the service; but it was by no means impossible that at some future time some part of his inventions might be adopted. The Ordnance Committee had on all occasions borne willing testimony to the public-spirited motives which appeared to have actuated Mr. Jeffery in his transactions with that Department, and to the fair and open manner in which he had always acted; and the Secretary of State for War was quite prepared to concur in that opinion of the Committee.

DENMARK AND GERMANY—THE TREATY OF LONDON (1852).—QUESTION.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, he would beg to ask, What Her Majesty's Government deemed to be the present position of the Treaty of 1852, and whether they held it to be still in force?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: The position of that treaty is like the position of any other treaty, the conditions of which have been found practically not to be capable of being strictly enforced. All the contracting parties to that treaty have been sharing in negotiations, the object of which was to modify it. It is perfectly competent for those who make a treaty, if after the lapse of time its conditions are not applicable to existing circumstances, to agree to a modification of that treaty; and that was the result of the Conferences which were lately held in London. The position of this treaty is, therefore, like that of any other treaty in which the parties who signed it are willing by common consent to make some modification.

MR. ARNOLD, POLICE MAGISTRATE.

EXPLANATION.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, he desired to explain that Mr. Arnold, the Police Magistrate, thought the statement he had made the other night in answer to the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley) was calculated to throw blame upon him. He wished, therefore, to say that he had desired to cast no blame whatever upon Mr. Arnold. He had merely intended to convey that Mr. Arnold had not represented to the Secretary of State or the Commissioners of Police that the conduct of a Police Constable to whom he had made reference required investigation. Mr. Arnold said that his usual course in such cases was to make a verbal communication, but he thought that, where the conduct of a Police Constable was concerned, it was desirable that the Magistrate's opinion should be recorded in writing, together with the grounds on which it was based.

MR. WHALLEY said, he wished to ask whether Police Magistrates were to be expected to make these communications to the Home Office respecting the misconduct of the Police when, as had happened he believed in three instances, they had previously done so in vain?

SIR GEORGE GREY said, he was not aware that the fact was as stated by the hon. Gentleman. All he could say was, that if the conduct of a constable required to be brought under the notice of the Commissioners of Police, it ought to be done in writing and not by a verbal statement, which might be inaccurately reported.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

POLITICAL RELATIONS WITH BRAZIL.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. BERNAL OSBORNE rose, pursuant to notice, to call attention to the state of our political relations with Brazil, and said, Sir, I feel that some apology is due not only to the House but to the immense commercial interests which are affected — to the owners of Brazilian stock, and to all who are engaged in commercial intercourse with the Empire of Brazil, that some apology is due for my bringing on this subject at the eleventh hour to a fatigued House, exhausted by the labours of the Session. But if the House is exhausted by its labours, I think it is bound to remember the great issues which are at stake in the question of the unsatisfactory relations which have for a long period existed, and which still exist, between this country and the Empire of Brazil. The question is so important that I think even the Chancellor of the Exchequer would do well to interrupt his private conversation, and to listen to what is now going on—because it materially affects the credit and responsibility of Her Majesty's Ministers, as I will show presently. The case of our relations with Brazil at this moment may be put shortly. I believe the Empire of Brazil is the one isolated example in the civilized world, of a State with which we have numerous transactions of various kinds, with which we have not a single commercial treaty or a treaty of any kind except the Convention of 1826. I hope the House will give me its attention while I state the nature of our transactions with Brazil. I find the commerce carried on between this country and Brazil amounts to not less than £12,000,000 a year. I find that the Brazilian debt held in this country amounts to nearly £9,000,000. Moreover, there are three English companies engaged in making railways in Brazil, which have guarantees for upwards of £5,000,000 of capital. Added to these three companies are various other companies, composed entirely of Englishmen, and employing English labour, who have undertaken not only to drain the capital but to light the towns, to work the mines, and to perform other operations in that country. There is a numerous English population scattered all over the country, and yet that population is not secured in its property, nor protected in person by any sort of treaty. That fact must at once strike the House as a state of things which is so peculiar that we are entitled to ask how it has been brought about, and why it is allowed to continue by Her Majesty's Government? What is the cause of this entire absence of treaties? The cause, I am unfortunately obliged to say, is to be found in that meddling, mischievous policy which is never content unless it is interfering with small States and subjecting them to insult and to injustice. That policy in the case of Brazil has not only been tyrannical towards her, but has been mischievous in its effects upon England. Without going into a history of all our transactions with Brazil, I may say that there can be no doubt that from 1822 to 1844 Brazil was in such a state, owing to the weakness of her finances and the weakness of her Executive, that the slave trade was carried on to an enormous extent; but I am prepared to maintain that from the period when Brazil became altogether independent, the policy of that empire has been essentially anti-slave-trade. A very remarkable fact occurs by which I will prove that assertion. It is proved by what is called the Convention of 1826. In that Convention were incorporated the slave treaties we had made with Portugal, whereby the right of search was given, and the power of adjudication by mixed Commissions. But besides that there was a most unexampled provision in that Convention—one which, I believe, was never introduced in any slave trade treaty with any other Power. It is that stipulation which is at the bottom of all the bad feeling which has been generated in Brazil towards us. By that provision, if Brazilian citizens were found to be engaged in the slave trade, the Brazilian Government engaged to treat them as guilty of piracy. Such a provision exists in no other treaty, but the Brazilians yielded that concession to us, and proved by adhering to it that their policy was anti-slavery, and in utter opposition to the traffic in slaves. That provision was in force from March, 1830, to March, 1845, when so strong was the public feeling in Brazil against our exercise of the right of search—which had been tremendously abused by the English Government—so great was the public discontent that the Government of Brazil was forced to give it up, and to notify to the English Government that the adoption of the Portuguese treaties, as far as they were applicable to Brazil, must cease. The English Government accepted that notice, and the arrangement terminated in 1845, and then no other stipulation remained but the first article of the Convention of 1826. Lord Aberdeen's Government was then, I believe, in power. And here let me say that, in speaking of Lord Aberdeen, I can never do so in this House or elsewhere without doing justice to his intrinsic probity, his honesty, and his good intentions. Lord Aberdeen was induced to get the Parliament of that date to pass an Act, the 8 & 9 *Vict.* c. 122, called the Aberdeen Act. That Act authorized British cruisers to seize Brazilian ships upon suspicion of being employed in the slave trade, and to carry them before British Vice Admiralty Courts for condemnation. That must strike the House as a most extraordinary provision. That provision, however, was extensively put in force. Innumerable vessels were seized and were sent before the Vice Admiralty Court at St. Helena — acts which naturally produced a very bad feeling in Brazil against this country. When that Act was discussed in this House, who was the man who spoke loudest against it? The man who more than any other opposed the Act was a man who had been Attorney General, and who afterwards became Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, and ultimately Lord High Chancellor—Sir Thomas Wilde. He said, in effect, that so illegal, so monstrous was the Act that it was impossible England could ever inflict it upon any country but one which was unable to resist. That was the opinion of Sir Thomas Wilde, the Lord High Chancellor of the Whig Government. Another great Whig ornament of the House also spoke loudly against the Act, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ashton-under-Lyne (Mr. Milner Gibson). I wish he would now bring his influence to bear upon his noble Friend at the head of the Government, and would now use those glowing words which he used on that former occasion. If he would do that he would be doing much towards restoring amicable relations between this country and Brazil. That right hon. Gentleman not only resisted that measure, but he brought forward an express Motion and divided the House upon it. At that period large cargoes of slaves were being landed in Brazil. If at that time he thought the Act was unjust, what does the right hon. Gentleman say now, when, as I will show, the slave trade is extinct? and how can he reconcile it to himself to sit cheek by jowl with the noble Lord who insists upon retaining that Act? But Lord Aberdeen never meant that Act to be permanent. We have had so much of blue-books lately that I will not trouble the House by making many references, but I must refer to one despatch. When Lord Aberdeen notified the passing of this Act to the Brazilian Government, what did he say? In a despatch dated the 2nd of June, 1845, Lord Aberdeen said—

> "Her Majesty's Government are far from wishing this mode of adjudicating vessels shall be permanent. They will be ready, as soon as any measures of the Brazilian Government shall enable them to do so, to recommend to Parliament to repeal the Act."

That was an express pledge given to the Brazilian Government that if they then adopted measures tending to the extinction of the slave trade, Parliament should be invited to repeal the Act as soon as the circumstances justified such a course. I think even the noble Lord will not deny that that was an express promise. Brazil received this Act—a weak State—a State which could be experimentalized upon by the policy of the noble Lord, having no navy and no means of defence. What could Brazil do? It did all it could do. It protested against this Act as an infraction of the law of nations—and in that the Brazilians were fortified by the opinion of Sir Thomas Wilde—and they refused altogether to enter into any commercial treaty with this country until that Act was repealed. The protest was treated as all protests are by our Government from States which have not Armstrong guns to enforce them. Not content with the Act as hitherto carried out by our cruisers, who had only attacked Brazilian vessels which were suspected when they were found on the high seas on the coast of Brazil, the noble Lord in 1850 actually ordered our cruisers to carry their operations still further, and to do an act which he believed had never been done before under similar circumstances—he ordered them to invade Brazilian ports and to cut out the suspected vessels even when in the Brazilian ports and waters. This system continued for two years; and this measure created the greatest ill feeling in Brazil towards the English. Did we succeed by what I will term this legislative piracy in stopping the slave trade? The feeling of the Brazilians was very strong against the slave trade—for I beg to call the attention of the House to the fact, that that trade was carried on not by the Brazilians themselves but by foreign capitalists and adventurers, chiefly Americans, Spaniards, and Portuguese, but in some instances—at least, so it has been whispered — by Liverpool merchants. The Brazilians, however, were so much disgusted with the meddling policy of this country towards them that, instead of supporting us by measures in their Chamber, they took no steps to aid in putting down the slave trade. Subsequently, however, the greatest exertions were made by the Brazilian Government to put down the traffic, and with such success that even the noble Lord now at the head of the Government wrote as follows to Lord Howden, our Ambassador at Madrid, on the 15th of May, 1851, enclosing a copy of the Brazilian laws, and holding up Brazil as an example to the Spanish and Portuguese Governments. These are the noble Lord's words—

> "No reasonable doubt can be now entertained, that if this same system is energetically pursued for another twelve months the slave trade to the Brazils will be almost entirely extinguished."

So great were the exertions of the Brazilian Government, and so great their success, that in April, 1852, I find that Lord Malmesbury, then our Foreign Minister, withdrew the order for British cruisers to enter the Brazilian ports and waters, which was given by the noble Lord in 1850; and I must say that the conduct of Lord Malmesbury, at all events, in connection with his management of our affairs with Brazil, reflected great credit upon him, although it has been the fashion of hon. Members sitting upon the Ministerial side of the House to cast much abuse upon him. In consequence of that order British cruisers ceased to invade Brazilian ports and waters, and a better state of things soon arose. The Brazilian Chambers, sensible of the kindness and conciliating disposition by which the conduct of the noble Earl had been dictated, redoubled their efforts to suppress the slave trade. In 1853, a Committee, the Chairman of which, I believe, was the late Mr. Hume, and on which were the hon. Baronet the Member for Droitwich (Sir John Pakington) and the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley), came to the conclusion that it would be right, in consequence of the great exertions of the Brazilian Government for the suppression of the traffic, to consider the propriety of repealing an Act which was still regarded as so obnoxious. Since 1852, so successful has been the policy of the Brazilian Government, in consequence of the measures carried by Lord Malmesbury and the conciliating tone of the noble Lord's despatches, that the slave trade had virtually ceased by 1856. I think there were only two attempts to run slave cargoes between those years. One of those cases occurred, I believe, in 1852, when an English ship was taken by a Brazilian cruiser in Brazilian waters. The captain and crew of that ship were severely punished, and all the slaves liberated. But there was still another case which I know will be adduced, and to which, as I wish to avoid nothing, I will refer. In 1853 a ship containing 250 Africans was taken by a Brazilian cruiser, but forty-seven of the Africans were stolen. This fact caused a great outcry, and all the missing slaves, with the exception of about sixteen, were ultimately captured. Since the year 1856, I am prepared to prove on undoubted authority, that no slave has been run on the coast of Brazil, and that the slave trade there is entirely extinct. I will give a short quotation upon this point, for I do not like to make a statement of this nature without fortifying it by high authority, and what authority can be higher upon the subject than the opinion of the noble Lord the First Minister of the Crown? On the 5th of June, 1856, the noble Lord said—

> "The slave trade might be regarded as extinct in Brazil, for though attempts had been made to revive it, they had not been attended with much success. There was generally evinced throughout the Brazils a spirit of determined hostility to the revival of the traffic."

Since that period the Brazilian Government have passed law after law; and, what is more, have attempted to enforce them in the strictest manner possible. It is a curious fact that not a single slave was employed in the construction of the 200 miles of railway made by English companies in Brazil. Moreover, I must say to his honour, the Prince de Joinville, who married a Portuguese Princess, is most decidedly opposed to the trade, and by his exertions and the spirit of the Portuguese Government, free labour has almost superseded slave labour. The whole of his estates are colonized by Germans, and, I believe, by a great many Swedes. The slave trade in Brazil has thus of late years received a blow from which, I think, it can never recover. What has been the conduct of this House in reference to this traffic? It was not too much to expect that the House would, with the extinction of the slave traffic, repeal the obnoxious Act of 1845—an Act which the Brazilians regarded as unjust and insulting; but the House did nothing of the kind. The House has been content to wait year after year, and to leave our enormous trade without protection. We have witnessed several abortive attempts on the part of several Governments to enter into treaties with Brazil, and both Lord Clarendon and Earl Russell have made ineffectual attempts in that direction. The Brazilians absolutely refused to enter into any treaty with us unless the Act of 1845 were repealed. And yet that Act still remains upon the statute-book, irritating public opinion in Brazil, doing incalculable mischief to our trade, and making our policy a byword among nations. Now I will call the attention of the House to the occurrences of last year, which I think ought to be taken into consideration. We all remember the case of the *Forte*, and the severe reprisals which were made upon the Brazilians by a

British squadron. That case was referred to the general arbitrator in the disputes of nations, the King of the Belgians, who in June, 1863, gave his decision to the effect that the British officers were altogether in the wrong.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Not altogether.

MR. BERNAL OSBORNE: Do you contradict it?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Yes.

MR. BERNAL OSBORNE: Well, really, the noble Lord has the face to contradict anything. I did not expect that the statement would be contradicted, for, if I have read that award aright, the King of the Belgians said that the British officers were wrong, and that some amends ought to be made to the Brazilian Government. I can only wish that I had provided myself with the despatch, for the denial of the noble Lord shows how careful one ought to be. At any rate the decision was not in our favour. That, at least, the noble Lord will not gainsay, although he may, possibly, be able to get off upon a quibble of words. Well, there was another case. I find that in 1859 the British cruisers captured and retained a steamer belonging to the Republic of Paraguay, which was taken in the River La Plata. The whole affair was carefully kept secret until I asked whether any apology had been made. It was denied that any apology had been made; but the fact is that in 1862 Mr. Dorian, the British Chargé d'Affaires in that part of the world, was empowered to apologize to the Republic of Paraguay for the affront which had been offered to their steamer. I believe this to have been the first apology ever made by the noble Lord, and as such it is very curious, and deserves to be recorded in letters of gold. I have not the despatch by me, but I do not think that this will be denied. An apology was offered to the Government of Paraguay; but up to the present time no concession has been made in respect to the case of the *Forte* to the Brazilian Government. Do you dispute that? The Under Secretary has been rather unfortunate in his contradictions to me. He contradicted me in a previous debate, and he has not vacated his office yet. We have had incidental debates on this subject before, and after the question has been referred to Portuguese mediation I cannot understand why irritating and offensive language should be used by Her Majesty's Government. What must be the feeling of the noble Lord at the Foreign Office when he became aware of the use of such language. On the 8th of February, 1861, the noble Lord the Foreign Minister wrote to Mr. Christie—

> "I think it right to observe for your information and guidance that, as the Government of Brazil have of late acted in perfect good faith in regard to the suppression of the slave trade, it would be advisable in any communications which you may have on this question of the emancipated negroes, to avoid as much as possible any discussions which may tend to continue the feeling of irritation which has so long existed in the public mind in Brazil against this country in reference to the slave trade."

That being the despatch of 1861, how can the irritating and improper language used in 1864 be reconciled with those expressions, and I should like to know whether the Portuguese Government would continue their mediation in the face of such language? Perhaps I may be contradicted in that, but I have information in my pocket which defies contradiction—and it may be that I am in a position to give some information to the Foreign Office, which is at once ignorant and insolent. What has been the policy of the Brazilian Government with regard to the *emancipados?* By a decree of 1858, the Brazilian Government altogether forbade any emancipated negroes to be appropriated to private individuals. None of these negroes could be apprenticed, except under the Government. The adoption of that step was most material. It has been denied that any of those men were really emancipated; but I have the Report of the Minister of Justice to the Brazilian Chambers, and from that it appears that in 1860-1 200 *emancipados* were made free; 147 in 1862-3; and 71 down to May, 1864. Yet in the teeth of all this it is denied by the First Minister of the Crown that any satisfaction had been given on these points, or that the Brazilian Government has taken any steps to emancipate these men. I now come to the most extraordinary statement that I have ever heard from the Treasury Bench—and I have heard a great many. It was said, in answer to a question—it looked very much like an arranged thing, and like what is called in the sporting world a "plant"—it was said that there were twenty requirements, without satisfying which no negro could obtain his freedom. I was puzzled to find where the document containing those requirements came from. It is well known that our agents and Consuls abroad all know the tenor of what the Foreign Office wishes, and Mr. Christie knows the spite of the noble Lord at the head of the Government against Brazil, and was willing to supply him with fuel in this way. On the 3rd of April, 1852, these twenty requirements were forwarded in a despatch from Mr. Christie. But where did he get them from? From any official document? By no means. They are contained in an Opposition newspaper, which is a sort of half *Owl* and half *Punch*, and the object of publishing them was to ridicule the law's delays in Brazil. However, Mr. Christie was only too happy to see them in the newspaper, cuts them out, and sends them to this country, and the noble Lord the Prime Minister seriously produces them in this House as official. What would the noble Lord say if he saw quoted in the Brazilian Chambers *Punch's Essence of Parliament* as authentic?—and yet that would be just an analogous proceeding. It is too bad that a nobleman holding the position of First Minister of the Crown, should come down to this House and endeavour to persuade the representatives of the country that that list of twenty requirements was an official Brazilian document, when in fact it was no other than a squib. In sober sadness I ask what is the policy of the noble Lord in regard to Brazil? Is it a hostile policy? Does he wish to worry these unfortunate Brazilians until, like Denmark, they should resist? I really do believe that the best thing they could do would be to show some spirit and resist the Act of 1845, and that would be sufficient to upset the present Ministry and would lead to the repeal of that piece of legislative oppression. It would not be difficult to prove that there has always been an understanding in Brazil that the Act would be repealed. The noble Lord the Prime Minister said the other night that Lord Aberdeen did not repeal the Act in 1852, when he was in office. Why, the noble Lord (Viscount Palmerston) was in Lord Aberdeen's Cabinet, and I always understood that he was an awkward colleague to Lord Aberdeen. We all know that, when the noble Lord takes up a thing, he does not lightly leave it off. I have no doubt that Lord Aberdeen would have repealed that Act but for the presence in his Cabinet of the noble Lord. Lord Aberdeen, in the debate on the 17th of June, 1858, said that the Act was so obnoxious to Brazil that it was called there "the Algerine Act;" that, on its introduction, he had stated that nothing would give him greater pleasure than the arrival of the day when it should be repealed, and he was not sure that the proper time for its repeal had not already arrived: it was, however, for Her Majesty's Government to decide; but the conduct of Brazil in this matter had been such as to entitle that country to much consideration at our hands; and he could only recommend the attention of Her Majesty's Government to the realization of what he promised when he originally introduced the Act. That was Lord Aberdeen's opinion so late as 1858; and although the First Minister of the Crown in 1864 had testified to the extinction of the slave trade to a great extent, and although it had been condemned by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ashton-under-Lyne, yet the obnoxious Act remained upon our statute-book. Surely, using the language of menace and irritation is not the way in which a country like Brazil, no longer in its infancy, should be treated. If we want to get on with any country, we should employ terms of conciliation and not irritation. From the repeal of the Act of 1845 what state of things would result? Brazil would be too happy to enter into a commercial treaty and a postal convention with you on the condition, however, that you remove a stigma from them by repealing the Act of 1845. There could not be a better time than the present for the repeal, because in February of the present year there was a meeting of a new Parliament in Brazil, and I believe it is well known that the temper of that Assembly is such that if you repealed the Act of 1845 they would be ready to grant you anything in the way of commercial freedom. But so long as that Act remains in the statute-book, and so long as language is used in defence of that Act, so long will you have a state of irritation in Brazil, most unfortunate for that nation and most injurious to the commerce of this country.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Sir, while the hon. Gentleman recommends mildness of language—of which he is so great a master—he has not himself used the mildest language in discussing this subject; but it is my intention rather to follow his precepts than to imitate his example. The hon. Gentleman says I am a great hand at denying. I think I may retort upon him that he is a great hand at asserting. I know—every body knows—the source whence the hon. Gentleman draws his information. [Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE: Where from?] From an active Brazilian agent. [Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE: I deny it.] The hon. Gentleman knows perfectly well whom I mean. [Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE: No. What is his name?] He is indebted to an active Brazilian agent —an Englishman, I am sorry to say— who is very ready to supply information— what I think is sometimes incorrect information—to newspapers and others who are willing to undertake the cause of Brazil. I do not blame him, for he is doing his duty and is paid for it; but I only wish that those who adopt his statements in Parliament would take the trouble to be quite sure that what they assert is exactly correct. There was much in the speech of the hon. Gentleman which might provoke me to go into an angry discussion. [Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE: Be provoked then.] Never mind. Her Majesty's Government are now engaged through the Portuguese Government in negotiations, the object of which is to re-establish diplomatic relations between this country and Brazil. I do not think, therefore, that the hon. Gentleman has shown great judgment in endeavouring just at this moment to raise a controversial discussion on the matters to which his speech related. If I were to go into details in reference to his statements, the necessary consequence would be that I should be led to say things which he would again condemn; and thus the controversy would go on. I trust the House will allow that I am better performing my duty in abstaining from entering upon the details which the hon. Gentleman has gone into. As the hon. Gentleman has endeavoured to impress the House with an idea of the disadvantages occasioned to commerce, not only by our present relations with Brazil, but by those which have existed for some time, I will simply state the amount of our exports to and imports from Brazil in a certain period of time. From 1850 to 1852 the imports varied from £2,000,000 to some £2,100,000, and the exports from £2,000,000 to £3,000,000. From 1860 to the present time our imports from Brazil have been as follows:—In 1860, £2,200,000; 1861, £2,600,000; 1862, £4,400,000; 1863, £4,500,000. I say that that is not a state of things which shows that our commerce is under any disadvantages. Our exports to Brazil have grown not quite in the same degree. From 1850 to 1852 they amounted to from £2,000,000 to £3,500,000; in 1860 they were £4,500,000; in 1861 they were rather more than £4,500,000; and in 1862-3 they were from £3,700,000 to £3,900,000. Therefore, as far as our commercial intercourse with Brazil is concerned, it cannot be established that it has suffered in consequence of the matters which have, no doubt, occasioned a considerable amount of irritation on the side of the Brazilians. It is quite true that the Brazilian slave trade has ceased since 1852. In the beginning of that year the Brazilian Government passed laws and established regulations which have, I believe, prevented any material importation of slaves into Brazil. But when the hon. Gentleman says there is such a dislike to the slave trade in Brazil, I must remind him that out of a population of 7,500,000 there are 3,000,000 slaves or only 1,000,000 short of the number in the Southern States of America. There are 10,000 *emancipados*. [Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE: There are more.] Then that tells still more against the hon. Gentleman, and at the rate at which, according to the hon. Gentleman, they are set free, they may be all dead before they are liberated. I must not, however, waste time by going into a controversial discussion with the hon. Gentleman on these subjects. I am anxious that the negotiations now going on should be successful; and I think the House would act wisely if it refrained from debate on this question, and did not allow things to be said on one side or the other which might revive angry feelings, and embarrass the negotiations which the Portuguese Government, with the best motives and in the best spirit, have undertaken to carry on.

MR. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD: Sir, I do not desire to address the House at any length; but the speech of the noble Lord (Viscount Palmerston) which we have just heard is so different in spirit to the one he delivered on a former occasion, that it is necessary I should make a few observations. The noble Lord has appeared in quite a new character, particularly with regard to Brazil. He says that he thinks the House will be of opinion that he will best discharge his duty by avoiding irritating language towards the Brazilian Government. ["Hear, hear!"] And I think that cheer shows the noble Lord that it is the opinion of the House that he will best discharge his duty by using moderate and courteous language towards that country. I can only express my regret — a regret which I know is shared by many Members—that what the noble Lord feels to be his duty now he did not feel to be his duty on former occasions. What was the language which, within a very short period, the noble Lord used in this House with reference to the Brazilian question? The noble Lord told the House that the conduct of the Brazilian Government was flagrant, disgraceful, and flagitious; and the noble Lord went on to say that, instead of giving merit to the Brazilian Government for any efforts on their part to put down the slave trade, it was only under the fear of the Aberdeen Act that the slave trade was not carried on now. The noble Lord refused on that occasion to give the slightest credit to the Brazilian Government, for what all the world acknowledges to have been most noble and praiseworthy conduct in their efforts to suppress the slave trade. The noble Lord may laugh, but that is an opinion which has been expressed by some of those who are as anxious to put down the slave trade, and who are as good friends of the negro as the noble Lord himself. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Liskeard (Mr. B. Osborne) has quoted the opinion of Lord Truro; I quoted the other day the opinion of Lord Aberdeen; and I ask the noble Lord if he has not read that Lord Brougham said the other night, in another place, that the Brazilian Government were worthy of all praise, and had met with the success they deserved. And yet the noble Lord thinks he is performing his duty and is using moderate language when he uses the terms, flagrant, flagitious, and disgraceful towards the Brazilian Government. [Viscount PALMERSTON: I did not use the word flagitious.] The noble Lord did not confine his courtesies of language only to the Brazilian Government, because he told me that it argued great ignorance on my part that I did not know the contents of the document to which he referred. The hon. Member for Liskeard has already referred to that document; and what is it? It now appears that it was a squib from an opposition newspaper, which was cut out by our Chargé d'Affaires, and sent home to the noble Lord. It has never been laid on the table of the House, but it has appeared in a blue-book which is never distributed to Members. And this unauthentic document is that upon which the noble Lord, in the exercise of his courteous language towards Members on this side of the House, says is a mark of the grossest ignorance on my part that I did not know it. I have a number of statements, not derived, as the noble Lord says, from Brazilian sources, but from our own blue-books, which show that the Brazilian Government have the greatest difficulties to contend with in dealing with the *emancipados*. The country is extensive and the plantations are separated by vast distances, and the *emancipados* having been located in old times upon the plantations, there is great difficulty in getting an account of them. It is evident, however, that the Brazilian Government are making every effort in their power to get the negroes set free. In 1861 Mr. Christie mentioned that in one district letters of emancipation were being granted to the blacks in large numbers, and added, "This I know to be true;" also, that in the very last year the Brazilian Government had been exerting themselves in the most praiseworthy manner in reference to the *emancipados*, and had set free a great many employed in the Government establishments. And I defy Her Majesty's Government to show that the Brazilian Government has not exhibited a most anxious desire to use every effort to carry into effect the stipulation with reference to their freeing the *emancipados*. I will not detain the House longer, but I could not help congratulating the noble Lord on the new course which he has adopted, and I hope he will continue to think that he will best discharge his duty by using moderate language to other countries, and that it will not be inconsistent with his duty not to use offensive language towards those who sit opposite to him.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON said, he did not reproach the hon. Gentleman with not knowing the contents of the document referred to and laid on the table of the House last year. What he meant was, that the hon. Gentleman having been in the Foreign Office must have known the general conduct of the Brazilian Government in respect to the *emancipados*, and that frequent applications had been made to them for lists, which we have not been able to obtain.

MR. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD said, he did not know it. It never came before him in the shape the noble Lord had put it.

SIR HUGH CAIRNS said, he could not allow the discussion to close without expressing his regret at another point in the speech of the noble Lord. The noble Lord said the statistics he had read showed that the commerce of the country had suffered but little, if at all, from the interruption of diplomatic relations with Brazil. He was sorry to find that the Government entertained that opinion, for he feared it would lead them to take very little trouble to get diplomatic relations renewed. From communications with persons engaged in commerce between England and Brazil, he knew that traders laboured under constant and serious apprehension with regard to the risks to which their property—amounting to three or four millions sterling—was exposed in Brazil from the want of that protection which British commercial interests enjoyed in every other country, and that they stated in the most decided manner their conviction that the renewal of diplomatic relations would be followed by a considerable expansion of commerce. He trusted, therefore, that the Foreign Office would endeavour to ascertain whether or not this was a delusion under which the Government laboured. He pronounced it an utter and complete delusion. He was quite aware that the noble Lord could point to the Returns, showing the increase of imports and exports; but could the noble Lord contradict what he had stated—that the merchants were filled with apprehension in regard to their property, and that they said the exports could be, perhaps, doubled if commerce received due protection? He would give the noble Lord another instance which was worthy of his attention. In this country our merchants had at this moment claims against the Brazilian Government to the extent of several hundred thousand pounds. No person ever disputed the justice of those claims, and an attempt had been made to adjust them by means of a mixed Commission. Her Majesty's Government had repeatedly said that there ought to be means provided for repaying to the subjects of this country the claims to which they were justly entitled; yet, from the bad terms on which they were with the Brazilian Government, they had utterly failed in obtaining a satisfactory adjustment. He could tell Her Majesty's Government also, from his own personal communications with merchants in this country who were interested in the question, that they had long since ceased to importune the Foreign Office with regard to the resumption of diplomatic relations, simply because they were convinced of the inveterate and determined hostility felt by the noble Lord and the Foreign Office to the Government of Brazil. And he must say that when they heard such language as was heard in that House not many days ago from the noble Lord, that impression on the part of the merchants of this country must necessarily be confirmed. Reference had been made by the hon. Gentleman who introduced the discussion (Mr. B. Osborne) to the Aberdeen Act as being the primary and chief cause of the bitter feeling existing between this country and Brazil. In his (Sir Hugh Cairns) opinion, the causes of the rupture of diplomatic relations were these two—the Aberdeen Act and the language of the noble Lord. The noble Lord had not ventured that evening to say a word on the subject of the Aberdeen Act. As a question of international law, it was impossible to look at that Act without feelings of unmitigated amazement. He firmly believed that there was not a country in the world of whose strength we had any reason to be afraid against whom we should ever have ventured to direct such a measure. How was it that that Act happened to pass? It was because Sir Robert Peel brought it in under the sanction of his Government, and because the noble Lord who was then in Opposition supported it, and thus neutralized the opposition which would otherwise have been raised to it. But what did Sir Robert Peel say with reference to it? Did any one wish to know the history and merits of the Act? Let them read the short debate which took place upon the subject of that Act in 1845, and they would find that Sir Robert Peel said he felt that it was a most extreme and even extraordinary measure. He stopped the progress of it for some days in order that he might consider whether the objections made by Sir Thomas Wilde could be answered. He then said—

> "It seems a very strong measure indeed for us to legislate for Brazilian subjects; and although we have the Treaty of 1826, which stipulates that the slave trade shall be deemed to be piracy on the part of Brazil, we will not venture, in our legislation, to deal with the persons and lives of Brazilian subjects, but will only deal with their property." [3 *Hansard*, lxxxii. 1071.]

He (Sir Hugh Cairns) would like to know what right had we to deal with their property any more than with their lives? If the argument was worth a rush, the stipulation in the treaty that the trade should be piracy, if it gave this country the power of dealing with it by its municipal laws as piracy, gave it the power of dealing with the lives of those engaged in it just as much as with their property. The vice of the Act was at once shown, and condemnation branded upon it by these expressions. Let any one read the speech of the Attorney General of that day, who attempted to defend the measure, and say whether there was one word in his speech which answered the objections of Sir Thomas Wilde. In fact, the treaty was a stipulation between two countries that it should not be lawful for the subjects of the Emperor of Brazil to be concerned in carrying on the slave trade; but what did that mean? Did it mean that a foreign country was to pass laws to punish the subjects of another country as they thought fit? All that the Government of Brazil said was that they would have municipal laws passed in their own Legislature to punish their own subjects within their own jurisdiction. [Viscount PALMERSTON: Read what follows.] The words that followed did not alter the case in the least. All that was said was that it should not be lawful for the subjects of the Emperor of Brazil to be concerned in carrying on the slave trade under any pretence, and that carrying it on by any person who was a subject of His Imperial Majesty should be deemed and treated as piracy. But by whom was it to be so deemed and treated? Not by our Parliament so as to enable us to fix penalties; but it was to be so deemed and treated by the Brazilian Government, who if they had not power to punish it as piracy, could go to the Legislature and obtain that power. He again repeated that there was not a nation which would not have said, and said most truly, that this was a flagrant attempt to infringe the independence of its Legislature and its Sovereignty, and it would have been resented on that account.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he rose to do an act of justice to Mr. Christie, our Minister at Brazil, who had been spoken of in terms of reprobation by the hon. Member for Liskeard.

MR. BERNAL OSBORNE: I beg pardon. I said he was universally unpopular in Brazil.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, the hon. Member had stated that Mr. Christie had somehow or other been provided for in this country. Now, whatever Mr. Christie derived from this country he had earned by honest service. But this was not the only act of injustice of which the hon. Member had been guilty. The hon. Member attributed to Mr. Christie having sent home an extract from a Brazilian paper, which had been quoted by the noble Lord at the head of the Government. Mr. Christie did no such thing. He held in his hand papers, which were accessible to every Member of that House, which showed that the extract in question was sent home by Mr. Elliot, the present Chargé d'Affaires, subsequent to Mr. Christie's recall. He had not the least wish to impugn the accuracy of the document, or to except to the hon. Member's description of the source whence it was derived, but he was anxious to exonerate Mr. Christie from the blame that had been heaped upon him for having in his diplomatic character sent home that document. He thought the substance of this debate must lead the House at once to understand that Mr. Christie was not likely to meet with justice at the hands of the Brazilian Government. He was sorry to say it appeared that the Government of Brazil were seeking to compel that House to repeal an Act of Parliament by persecuting Englishmen in Brazil. Such was the corruption among the Brazilian Judges that seven of them had been displaced since the difference between England and Brazil had been referred to arbitration, first to the King of the Belgians and now to the King of Portugal. He held in his hand a letter from a high official of the name of Don Jose do Narcimento Silva with reference to the case of a Mr. Reeves, which was under adjudication in Brazil. Mr. Reeves was a claimant — a joint claimant—for a sum of £20,000. With the permission of the House he would read the letter of the eminent person in Brazil to whom he had referred to the Judge who was to try the case. The writer said—

> "Most Illustrious and Excellent Judge,—Your Excellency is a Judge in the cause in which an Englishman (Reeves) denies the maternity of a lady Deslinda, in order to deprive her of her inheritance from her son, and I am so convinced of the right of this lady that I take the liberty of asking you to vote for her. Read the arguments of Nabuco, compare them with the proofs in the cause, and you will see that what I ask is just. I thank you by anticipation for your kindness, and beg you to give orders to your most affectionate friend, &c."

He could multiply proofs of attempts to corrupt the Judges engaged in trying cases between Brazilians and Englishmen. He hoped that the result of this discussion would be to show to the House that if harsh measures appeared to have been used towards Brazil it must be borne in mind that Brazil had been persecuting English subjects, and had refused to answer the notes of the English Government, and had maligned Mr. Christie by agents here as well as in Brazil. They must remember the animus manifested by Brazil, and that Brazil was trying by these means to coerce the English Legislature into a repeal of the Act, which was certainly justifiable at the time it was passed. Indeed, if the accounts which we received of the state of the internal slave trade of Brazil were true, the Act was not only justifiable but was actually necessary. He believed that that Act was necessary still, for the price of slaves in Brazil was rising, and he suspected that one of the inducements which made the Brazilians so anxious to obtain the repeal of the Act of 1845 was that they might "abate," as they called it, the price of slaves. Within Brazil at this moment the internal slave trade was of a most (he would not use harsh terms) painful character. Slaves were torn from one province to be sent to another; husbands were separated from their wives, the mother from the child, and children sold from ten to twelve years old. This was the state of things under which we were asked to abandon the policy we had hitherto pursued. If ever there was a justification for our interference in any case against the renewal of the slave trade, he believed it was in the case of Brazil; and when the hon. Member for Liskeard appealed to the fact that the English railway companies who were constructing railways in Brazil had never employed a single slave on their works, he (Mr. Newdegate) thanked God that his fellow-countrymen had discarded that infernal traffic in the undertakings in which they were engaged. He thought, however, that the very fact of the hon. Member mentioning that circumstance showed how general was the employment of slave labour in Brazil.

MR. T. BARING thought his hon. Friend who had just spoken (Mr. Newdegate) had rather wandered from the question, which was not whether Mr. Christie had been abused, or whether Brazilian Judges were corrupt, but whether by conciliation and kind language we were not likely to renew friendly relations with Brazil, to increase our commerce, to obtain justice for Englishmen, and to succeed in the negotiations which were now taking place? His hon. Friend might say that the internal slave trade was an abominable traffic, and so it was; but the Act of 1845 was not levelled against the internal, but against the foreign slave trade; and when there was evidence that in Brazil the latter had ceased, the whole case of his hon. Friend fell to the ground. The question then was, whether we were to persevere in a course of action which had drawn a line of separation between this country and Brazil; or whether we should now enter upon a policy of conciliation, instead of that taunting, irritating policy which we had hitherto pursued?

ST. BERNARD'S REFORMATORY, LEICESTERSHIRE. — OBSERVATIONS.

MR. PACKE said, he rose to call attention to the Report of the Inspector of Reformatories, on the state of the St. Bernard's Reformatory at Whitwick, in Leicestershire. In doing so he begged to assure his noble Friend the Member for Arundel (Lord E. Howard) and the other Roman Catholic Members of the House, that he was actuated by no invidious motives. Last year an outbreak had taken place in this Reformatory of so serious a nature that some of the police who were called in were nearly murdered by the boys who were engaged in the disturbance. The Reformatory was then under the management of the monks of St. Bernard; but as it was found they were not able to deal with such refractory youths, it was afterwards transferred to other hands. On the 19th of June, 1863, it was agreed to commit the management to a number of gentlemen, whose names were among the most respectable of the Roman Catholics of this country, and among them were two clergymen. On the 19th of June Mr. Harper, one of the committee of management, wrote a letter stating that the government of the institution was completely altered, and that rules had been formed by means of which the boys would be kept in the most perfect order. One of the rules was to the effect that no boy should be suffered to go out of the school without being under the supervision of one of the authorities. That rule the managers had no means of enforcing. Mr. Sydney Turner, the Inspector of Reformatories, wrote to the Secretary of State, informing him that the arrangements were complete; that the new system ought be allowed to go on for one year from the 1st of July; that during that interval the number of inmates would be limited to 100, and that the experience of twelve months would enable them to see whether the Reformatory could be successfully conducted. Within four months from that time the Inspector visited the institution again, and expressed himself perfectly satisfied with what he had seen, although he said there were 143 boys within the walls. It appeared, then, that as regarded the number of boys the arrangement which had been entered into with the Secretary of State four months before had been altered. At the end of the last year the chairman of the bench of magistrates in the neighbourhood of the Reformatory wrote to the Secretary of State, informing him that for several nights the police had been obliged to be in the institution; that between thirty and forty of the inmates, who had got loose, had been put into gaol for various offences; and that four of them had been committed to take their trial for burglary. The facts of the case were these—the boys had got up at night, tied the sheets of their beds together, let themselves down from the windows, a height of about nineteen feet, and so having escaped committed this burglary. Here was a body of nearly 150 of the worst young scamps to be found in the country, youths brought up to crime, who having the means of escape within their reach might commit any depredation they liked in the neighbourhood. When he was a boy at Eton the windows of the boarding house in which he lodged were barred, so that there were no means of getting out at night. Well, he should like to know whether boys who were notorious for vice were to be trusted in rooms where there were no bars to the windows. Things soon after arrived at such a pass that the police were several nights obliged to remain in the Reformatory to help to take care of those boys. His right hon. Friend the Home Secretary sent down Mr. Sydney Turner to investigate the facts. In his Report Mr. Turner stated that an effective staff of officers ought to be engaged. What he (Mr. Packe) had apprehended had taken place, and the authorities had shown that they could not manage the maximum of 150 boys. Mr. Sydney Turner was in error when he said that the number would be limited to 100. But this gentleman concluded his Report by stating that he believed there was no reason to fear their being taken by surprise in the future. Why they should have been taken by surprise between 1863 and 1864 he could not understand, as the authorities well knew the ferocious temper of the boys. When the new management was instituted an efficient staff of officers was to form part of the establishment; but the sequel

showed how far the staff had been able to keep the boys in any kind of order. As an acting magistrate of the county of Leicester the point on which he wished to dwell had reference to the employment of the county police in aid of the management of this Reformatory. In Leicestershire they had no more police constables than were necessary to keep the peace of the county, and they could not, therefore, spare any part of the force to assist the authorities of that institution in maintaining order there. How was it that this Reformatory could not be managed without such extraneous assistance? The chief constable, in his letter of the 5th of June, said he trusted that arrangements had been made with Inspector Ward and constables for speedily calling in other assistance in case of need. But the police ought not to be made to stand sentry to a Reformatory. From a letter addressed to a local paper the other day, he found that Mr. Quick, the manager of that Reformatory, said he had sent for twenty of the London police, but he was referred to the police of the county, on whom he had to fall back. Mr. Quick was, he believed, a very respectable man, and a clergyman, who wished to manage these unruly lads by mildness and kindness; but he was deficient in firmness, and was really no more capable of managing such an institution than he was of being Governor of Newgate. These boys were principally Irish, from Liverpool and its neighbourhood. As matters at present stood, the conductors of that Reformatory did not find efficient men to restrain these felonious boys from committing depredations over the county; and he desired to impress upon the Secretary of State that the county of Leicester ought not to be called upon to furnish police to control this ill managed institution.

Sir GEORGE GREY said, he was not surprised that the hon. Gentleman, as a Member for the county of Leicester, should have called the attention of the House to the disturbances which had recently taken place in the St. Bernard's Reformatory. The facts of the case were all contained in the papers which had been laid on the table, and from them it appeared, that although the Reformatory some time ago was certainly not managed in a way which could be regarded as in any degree satisfactory, yet its management had been greatly improved during the past year. The gentlemen in whose hands the management of the institution had been placed last year had exerted themselves to the utmost in reforming it and placing it on a better footing. At the same time, he agreed with the hon. Gentleman that sufficient energy had not been shown by the rev. Mr. Quick, who was, no doubt, anxious to do his duty, but who was not a fit person to have the control of lads of such a class. But since the late outbreak, which certainly did take the officers by surprise, he was given to understand that the managers had determined to increase their staff materially, by which means the attendance of the police would be dispensed with. It was not reasonable that any large number of the county police should be obliged to abandon their ordinary duty elsewhere, and to go to the neighbourhood of that Reformatory. He was informed that there would be associated with Mr. Quick a lay manager, who had been accustomed to the discipline of the army, and who would be better able to control these lads than a clergyman. It should be mentioned also that this was not the only case of outbreak in a Reformatory. There had been outbreaks of a similar description in other Reformatories, which were under Protestant management; but he hoped that the precautions now taken would prevent any recurrence of these disturbances. [MR. PACKE: The windows should be barred.] If such disorderly proceedings were continued, it would be absolutely essential for the peace of the neighbourhood to withdraw the certificate from the institution; but it would be difficult to avoid doing more harm than good by its immediate withdrawal, because the lads would no longer be in legal custody, and would, perhaps, be guilty of acts more mischievous and calculated to excite greater alarm than if they were detained in the Reformatory. A ship had been assigned by the Admiralty to be placed in the Mersey for the reception of boys of that class; and although the lads now at St. Bernard's Reformatory might not be transferred to that ship, yet, by using that vessel as a means of exercising an efficient discipline over all the boys who might hereafter be committed to a Roman Catholic Reformatory from that part of the country, the necessity of sending any more of them to the St. Bernard's Reformatory would be obviated. At all events, unless every ground of complaint was effectually removed, the permission to send boys to this Reformatory would not be continued. But, although the alarm which had been excited in this case was in a considerable degree well grounded, he hoped the House would not discourage the efforts now being made—which were certainly well meant—for the improvement and good management of this Reformatory.

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, the House could not be surprised that very considerable interest had been excited in the neighbourhood of this Reformatory by the proceedings which had taken place, and he believed he might say that the feeling was unanimous that the Reformatory ought to be removed. The boys placed there had been brought from a great distance, and it was quite clear they had been placed under a management which was not capable of conducting an establishment of that description. The whole neighbourhood had been kept in constant apprehension, and even the monks themselves were quite as anxious as others to be freed from the neighbourhood of these refractory lads. The right hon. Baronet had detailed the steps which had been taken for improving the future management, and as representing that part of the county he must say he should be very glad if those measures did succeed; but if another outbreak should occur he hoped the certificate would not be extended; that the boys would be sent to the ship at Liverpool; that measures would be taken to free Leicestershire from the evils to which the county had in no way contributed, and that they would hear no more of these most serious and unpleasant outbreaks.

MR. HEYGATE said, the alarm which prevailed on this subject had been somewhat exaggerated in the newspapers and elsewhere; still, as he lived in the immediate neighbourhood, he must say he could not look with indifference at repeated outbreaks of this character. The right hon. Baronet, however, had exercised a wise discretion in not withdrawing his certificate, as a very great improvement had taken place in the management. These outbreaks were to a large extent attributable to the number of boys crowded together being greater than could well be managed in one reformatory; and a Report to that effect had been made two years ago by the Inspector. The re-convictions almost always came from reformatories where the largest number of boys were collected together. With reference to the increased expenditure which these outbreaks had occasioned to the county, it was quite true that two or three policemen had for some time after patrolled the neighbourhood; but the expense, even if it had not been repaid, which it was subsequently, had been insignificant. He hoped the change which had been made in the government of the Reformatory would lead to a better state of things, and that the right hon. Baronet would recommend a smaller number of boys to be kept there in future.

Mr. NEWDEGATE expressed his hope that no establishments of this kind would be set on foot for the future.

PASSPORTS IN FRANCE—QUESTION.

Sir WILLIAM FRASER said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether passports are required by British subjects travelling in France? The subject would, no doubt, be interesting to the large body of perſons who were about to travel on the Continent. Looking to the tone of the articles which appeared in the German papers, he did not think Englishmen going to Switzerland would be likely to go through Prussia—they would, no doubt, much prefer going through France. Some time ago a notice appeared in the *Moniteur*, which stated that the subjects of Her Majesty would not be required to produce passports when travelling in France. This very liberal notice not only showed the kind feeling of the Emperor of the French, but it was also a most politic statement, for it induced large numbers of Englishmen to take the route through France to the Continent; but, notwithstanding the notice to which he referred, cases had occurred of British subjects being seriously molested in consequence of not having passports. He could mention several such instances. One English gentleman while travelling in the South of France, on arriving at the chief town of a department, was asked by the gendarmes for his passport. He replied he was a British subject and he understood a passport was not required. The demand was repeated: he made the same answer, and calling his servant pointed to his baggage, which bore his address in London. Notwithstanding this, he was forcibly removed and marched along a hot road in the South of France, in order to be brought before an official—he supposed the *sous préfét* of the department. This gentleman stated that there was no charge against him, he was dismissed, and he found his way back to the hotel. Complaint was made to the English Ambassador, who, he believed, communicated with the Government of the Emperor; but the gentleman in question had, he believed, received no apology or redress from any one. He did not bring forward this particular case as a grievance, but he had heard of many others, and that for one case that obtained publicity many were probably never heard of. The answer of the French Government might be—"True, a British subject needs no passport in France; but how are we to know that a traveller is a British subject?" He admitted the force of that dilemma. They had all read the description of Britons by the Irish poet—

> "Pride in their port, defiance in their eye,
> I see the lords of human kind pass by."

But if foreigners might be pardoned if they did not recognize the travelling Briton by this description, for the haggard individual, generally accompanied by females, who was seen wandering about railway stations of a morning in a state of listlessness, hardly bore any of the poet's marks of a Briton about him. Still he did not think that he ought to be exposed to the risk of being detained for some hours for not having a passport when he had been told that no passport was necessary. He believed that if a communication were made by the Foreign Office to the French Government it would be a convenience to a large number of persons. The Government of the Emperor having notified that British subjects required no passport, the *onus probandi* was, he thought, thrown upon the French officials to show that a British subject was not what he professed to be, instead of the *onus* being upon him to show that he was a British subject. He trusted that some arrangement would be come to for doing away with this source of inconvenience to English travellers in France.

Mr. CARDWELL said, that the subject should receive the attention of Her Majesty's Government.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

Supply *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £860,276, Post Office Packet Service.

MR. CAVE, in rising to put the question of which he had given notice, in regard to the West India Contract, said, he wished to make a few remarks in explanation of his meaning. Early in the Session he had been surprised to receive at the West India Committee the copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury to the Colonial Office, dated the 11th of March, calling upon the colonies to contribute towards the expenses of the Packet Service. That letter contained some remarkable passages; among other things credit was taken for the liberality of the proposal only to desire the colonies to contribute where they are directly concerned. They were not to be asked, for instance, to pay for the service from St. Thomas to Mexico. It would certainly be somewhat astonishing to call upon a British colony to pay any portion of the expense of the packet service from one foreign country to another. The geographical knowledge of Government Departments had been said to be limited, and a story had been told of a despatch addressed to "the Island of Demarara," but he (Mr. Cave) would not suppose that the Treasury could be ignorant that St. Thomas was not a British island, but was, perhaps, by that time almost the only possession left to the unhappy King of Denmark. The last passage, however, of the letter was most worthy of note. It ran thus—

> "It will be necessary that the payments to be made by the several colonies should be made not later than the 30th of June next, and the corresponding payments not later than the same day in each succeeding year."

This looked so much like an attempt to tax the colonies without their consent, that he put a question to the Secretary to the Treasury, who informed the House that the meaning intended to be conveyed was that those colonies which wished to avail themselves of the packet service would be expected to contribute. He (Mr. Cave) then moved for the correspondence relating to these circumstances, which had lately been delivered to hon. Members. He there found that in 1862 there was a letter from the Treasury to the Colonial Office, stating the intention of Government to terminate the contract at the beginning of this year, indicating very vaguely, and, as it had turned out very incorrectly, the substance of the new contract, and suggesting that the West India Colonies should contribute in certain imperfectly explained proportions. The letter was communicated through the office to the West India Colonies. Owing to the vague and hypothetical nature of the communication but little attention was paid to it in the West Indies. Such replies, however, as were sent home were in the main decidedly unfavourable. Under such circumstances, he should have imagined that the Government would have gone more closely into the matter, fixed upon a maximum contribution for each colony, which might easily have been done, and then either left the conveyance of mails to open competition, or in case the replies received were sufficiently encouraging, entered upon the new contract only in respect of such colonies as came into their terms. But what did the Government do? They left the matter wholly in abeyance for two years, and sent no other message to the colonies, and entered into a fresh contract with the Royal Mail Company without giving the colonies any voice in the matter. They bound themselves for six years to pay nearly £173,000 a year, and passed the contract through the House in a hurry at the end of last Session, suspending the Standing Order which required contracts to be laid on the table for a month, or rather, inducing the House prematurely to approve of the contract, as it was impossible to comply with the order, and that with so little publicity that there was no trace of it in *Hansard*. He did not, however, complain either of the new contract or of the Royal Mail Company. He believed the terms were fair enough, as contracts went, if it was requisite to have a contract at all. And he quite concurred in the opinion expressed in the Postmaster General's last Report, that the company had done their part remarkably well. He (Mr. Cave) had every reason to speak well of them. The contract was approved by the House, and therefore was a matter of certainty at the end of last Session—namely, in July, 1863. Nothing was hinted about West India contributions, which might, of course, have been calculated by the same time; but on the 11th of March this year the peremptory demand to which he had alluded was made, which reached the West Indies about the beginning of May. This gave them two months to convene their Legislative Assemblies to pass the necessary Bills, after debate through both branches of their respective Legislatures, to raise and pay the money, amounting in the case of Jamaica alone, the most impoverished of the colonies, to no less than £11,634. Why, the demand of Austria and Prussia that the unhappy Danes should revoke their Patent of Constitution within an impossible time was not more unreasonable. No wonder if the replies were—as he had been informed they were—unfavourable; and yet credit was taken in these estimates for the whole amount of £37,554—a remarkable instance of reckoning chickens before they were hatched! Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman could give the House some information upon the point, as well as upon the course Her Majesty's Government intended to take. If the right hon. Gentleman replied that he would simply refuse to carry the mails, then—if he (Mr. Cave) might be pardoned for using a very ordinary expression—he would be cutting off his nose to spite his face, as he would lose the postage of the letters and yet be bound to pay the whole subsidy, nearly £173,000. He doubted whether the right hon. Gentleman would punish the colonies so much, after all, as he supposed. When the contract which had lately expired commenced, the West Indian waters were in the undisturbed possession of the Royal Mail Company. Now, no less than five competing steamship lines had appeared, or were in contemplation. There was, first, the heavily-subsidized French line of the Messagéries Impériales, sailing once a month, calling at the English Islands of St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Grenada, and Trinidad, and passing within hail of Jamaica. There was, secondly, the Spanish mail line from Havannah and Porto Rico, passing close to Jamaica, and not far from the Leeward Islands. There was, thirdly, the West India and Pacific Company, sailing four times a month from Liverpool, and calling at Jamaica and Trinidad. These three lines of steamers were actually running, and their days of sailing were advertized. Fourthly, a line was projected between Jamaica and New York in correspondence with Cunard's steamers; and, fifthly, a line was contemplated from England to Madeira and Demerara. The Government, while they were thus deprived of the power of sealing up the recusant colonies—which, if it could be done, would probably inflict greater inconvenience on this than on the other side the Atlantic — had positively tempted them, under any circumstances, to avoid sending their correspondence by Her Majesty's mails, because they had lately doubled the postage on letters sent by the Royal Mail steamers, and very much reduced that on letters sent by private ships, which would, of course, apply to every line he had enumerated, except, perhaps, the French and Spanish. He could not imagine on what principle the Government had acted in dealing with this postage. Formerly the postage to foreign countries was three times the amount to the British colonies; for example, it was 6*d.* to Jamaica and 1*s.* 6*d.* to Cuba, on the ground, as he had always understood, that foreign countries which contributed nothing directly should thus pay indirectly some portion of the subsidy. He asked the right hon. Gentleman last year, when the change was made, whether any part of the subsidy was now to be paid by these foreign countries. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to wonder at the question, and said that such a thing was never heard of. He would now give him a precedent. A correspondence had lately taken place between the Colonial Office and Mauritius, in which that Island had been called upon to pay £6,000 a year more to the Peninsular and Oriental Company on account of the refusal of the French colony of Réunion to pay any longer its proportion of £12,000 a year, the French Government having determined to run a line of its own. And he might add that the West India Telegraph Company had applied for a subsidy from those foreign colonies through which it might pass, and that those applications had been favourably received. Either this packet service was, according to one opinion, such a benefit to this country, both in maintenance of communication and securing large and swift vessels in case of emergency, that it ought to be kept up by the Imperial Exchequer; or, according to another view, it was of equal advantage to the countries to which the mails were carried, in which case we should neither demand payment from British colonies alone, nor continue to bear the whole loss of running mails to foreign countries. It was only fair to admit that the case was one of difficulty. The colonies and their correspondents here would doubtless have complained had the contract been abruptly terminated, and there would have been difficulties in the way of bringing all the colonies to an agreement; but there were two years to spare from the time that the idea was first propounded by the Postmaster General, and those difficulties would have been far less than these in which the Government found themselves involved by the course they had preferred. He, therefore, begged to ask what prospect there was of recovering the proportion to be paid by the colonies, £37,554, and what measures would be taken by Her Majesty's Government in the case of the colonies declining to contribute their quota?

MR. PEEL thought that, upon whatever question of detail the hon. Gentleman might raise objections, he would not deny that the claims upon the West India Colonies were perfectly fair and legitimate. It was quite as much for the advantage of the West India Colonies as for the advantage of this country that regular postal communication should be maintained, and if they shared the benefit it was only reasonable that they should share the cost. The rule applied to those colonies was a rule generally adopted with respect to other colonies. In the case of India, one-half of the expense of the mail service was defrayed by the Indian Government; and in the case of Australia, one-half of the loss arising upon the postal service was paid by the different Australian Colonies. Canada and Mauritius maintained mail services at their own expense; and with respect to the Cape, which made no contribution, the proceeds of the postal charges were more than sufficient to meet the expenses. With respect to the mode in which the claims upon the colonies had been computed, he would observe that the mail line went direct to St. Thomas and there branched off in three directions, and no claim was made upon the West Indian Colonies for the expense of those portions of the service which extended beyond St. Thomas to Brazil or Mexico. The Correspondence upon the table showed that when the West India Mail Company was asked what reduction in their terms they could agree to if their service was confined to the West India Islands, and not extended to Mexico and other foreign ports, the answer was, that no reduction could be made, because it was precisely from those other portions of the service beyond the West Indian Colonies that they expected to derive a remuneration which would compensate for the loss upon other branches of the service. The hon. Gentleman had asked what answers had been received from the West Indian Colonies. He (Mr. Peel) had only seen three answers—of Jamaica, of Granada, and of British Guiana—all of which were unfavourable. What he had stated at the beginning of the Session was, that if the colonies were able to contribute but declined to do so, then the Government would consider what steps should be taken. But if it were proved that a colony was unable to pay the amount demanded, the Government would be disposed to treat it with every consideration. With respect to the difference between the treatment of our own colonies and those belonging to other countries, he would remind the hon. Gentleman that a very large proportion of the whole amount of sea-postage was derived from those foreign colonies—as much as £45,000 out of a total of £60,000 in 1860.

MR. CAVE did not think the cases of India and Australia were quite in point. India had not self-government, and the consent of the Australian Colonies had been obtained before the contract was concluded, a course which ought to have been followed in regard to the West Indies. He did not object to the principle of the colonies paying their fair proportions; he objected most to the manner in which the demands upon them had been made. He thought the Government should have asked their consent, and should have waited for their answers before making arrangements.

Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) £1,600,000, Exchequer Bonds, *agreed to.*

(3.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £14,355, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for the Civil Establishments on the Western Coast of Africa."

SIR FRANCIS BARING said, he had upon former occasions called attention to this Vote, and he felt bound to do so again, because recent occurrences had made it still more necessary that the attention of the Committee should be given to it. He did not desire to go into any discussion of the Ashantee war or of the transactions connected with it, but he wished to call the attention of the Committee to the imperfect control of Parliament over this Vote, with a view, if possible, of inducing the Government to make a better arrangement in future. For his own part he thought it a mistake to endeavour to extend our forts and our possessions in that part of the world. By such a course they did not advance the great cause which was the justification for the great sacrifice of life upon that coast—the suppression of the slave trade—while, on the other hand, these settlements were of little or no advantage in a commercial point of view.

It appeared that at Lagos, of which place we took possession because of the once flourishing trade carried on there, since our occupation the trade had very much diminished. He was afraid that our occupation of Lagos had been in part the cause of some of the squabbles which we had got into in that part of the world. What he wanted to press upon the Committee was, that there ought to be some control over what was done on the African coast. At present Parliament knew hardly anything of what was going on until it was called upon to vote the money which had been spent. It was very difficult for the Secretary of State to control the Colonial Governors. They did what they thought proper, and when they told their story to the Colonial Secretary he had to choose between disavowing and recalling the Governor or of approving steps which, had he been consulted beforehand, he would probably never have sanctioned. There were in the colonies none of the checks which existed in this country; probably the resident Europeans were all for taking possession of their neighbours' property, desired to spread their power and influence, and looked at things in a light very different from that in which they were regarded in this country. Some check or control over the doings of these Governors was more than ever needed now, because there seemed to be among them a disposition to spread the territory of this country, seizing a bit here and a bit there in a manner which would produce difficulties that might ultimately take the form of war, like that with Ashantee. As an illustration of the sort of thing which went on upon this coast, he would mention what had occurred at Lagos. He did not intend to repeat any opinion upon the steps which had been taken—although he retained his original opinion, he would now say nothing about the occupation of Lagos itself; but what he complained of was that all these things were done without any check or control, and without Parliament knowing anything of what was being done. On the 14th of November, 1862, the Governor of Lagos issued a proclamation recalling from Abbeokuta all English residents in that place—a measure he should say of very doubtful legality, and one which was not brought to the knowledge of Parliament until the publication of the blue-book about a month ago. The difference which had caused the issuing of this proclamation led on the 2nd of March, 1863, to a blockade of Abbeokuta, which had this unfortunate result—that although the King of Dahomey, who seemed to be rather in favour at present, was marching towards that place, the Abbeokutans were prevented from obtaining guns and gunpowder with which to defend themselves against him. Last year there was another small war which was only brought to the knowledge of that House by a private Member; and in the month of February Governor Freeman took possession of a small piece of territory, as he declared, because it interfered with his financial arrangements. These measures might be right, or they might be wrong, but they ought not to have been taken without the knowledge and without being subject to some control on the part of the Home Government and the Parliament of this country. He was afraid that the Secretary of State would always have difficulty in dealing with Colonial Governors; but in his opinion the best mode of protecting the country against their mistakes was, that all these matters should as early as possible be brought to the knowledge of Parliament. There was nothing like a discussion in that House for making men act with caution. If these Governors knew that within a certain time after they had taken a step it would be discussed in that House, he would answer for it that there would be considerable hesitation and delay before they took the initiative in wars, or seized upon territory. What he should recommend was, that the Secretary of State should address to all the Governors stringent directions in the spirit of those contained in his despatch to Governor Pine, forbidding them, except in cases of necessity, to seize territory or to go to war without previous communication with him; and that beyond that, whenever such an event occurred, the Government should, if Parliament was sitting, immediately, and if it was not, then within a few days after its meeting, lay upon the table papers explaining what had been done. He felt satisfied that if some such course were pursued, matters would be much more carefully conducted, and that the Secretary of State would be assisted in keeping a check on those whom, under existing circumstances, he was unable to keep in order.

Mr. W. WILLIAMS said, he observed a charge of £2,000 a year for a steamer for the use of the Governor of Gambia. He should like to know what duties were performed by that steamer? There was also £4,000 for the maintenance of forts and establishments on the Gold Coast. Was there any need of such an outlay in order to keep off the poor blacks? The Vote of £4,600 for Lagos included £3,125 for works and buildings. He should be glad to know what those works and buildings were?

SIR JOHN HAY said, he wished to draw the attention of the Committee to two items in the Vote—that of £500 for the relief of famine on the Gold Coast, and that of £2,000 for the Ashantee war. It was hardly just to the country, he thought, to lead it to suppose that the expenses of a war which would more probably cost £200,000 would be defrayed by the latter amount, or that the famine in question could be effectually relieved for the sum which the Committee was asked to vote for the purpose. Since, he might add, the question of the Ashantee war had been discussed in that House, some further papers with respect to it had been produced, and the Colonial Office had, he was bound to say, duly performed its part in that respect. He was, however, surprised to find that the military authorities had furnished no information as to the operations which had very recently taken place. But to return for a moment to the famine, he found at page 9 of the "Further Papers" to which he alluded, a despatch addressed to the Duke of Newcastle, and dated July 13, 1863, in which Governor Pine said—

> "I highly approve and earnestly join in the prayer of the deputation, that your Grace will be pleased to provide this Government with supplies of provisions; for I firmly believe that the greatest distress will exist ere long, and that thereby, unless provided against, the movements which I so earnestly advocate, so soon as the rainy season shall be over, will be retarded."

Now, shortly after that letter was written, 500 additional troops were landed on the Gold Coast, and in the month of October, the Governor having evidently received from the Colonial Office a letter which was not to be found in the papers wrote as follows:—

> "I regret to perceive that your Grace is not in a position to hold out any promise of aid from Imperial funds with respect to a provision against the famine which I now regret to state is ravaging the country, in proof of which I have to mention that the price of a bushel of Indian corn, the staple article of food, has risen from 2*s*. 6*d*. to 13*s*. 6*d*., and I have not the slightest prospect of being able to alleviate the distress from colonial funds."

While such was the state of things, 1,600 men had been sent out to add to the distress, who never drew a trigger, who died, or were dying off, under the influence of the climate; and it, therefore, appeared to him absurd to come to the House of Commons to ask for such a sum as £500 to alleviate the famine which prevailed. Mr. Blanc, the Commissary General, had, he believed, endeavoured to make provision for the troops to a certain extent, and by his labours the distress had, no doubt, been diminished; but there must have been a large outlay of public money, which we should eventually have to pay. To advert, however, more particularly to the operations of the war, he must say that the papers with respect to it, which had been preceded by such a note of triumph, were not of the value which hon. Members had been led to hope. When he came to examine them he found they contained only the plan of operations of May, 1860, in which many places in which operations had now taken place were not mentioned. [MR. CARDWELL: They relate to Major Cochrane's operations.] Exactly so; to Major Cochrane's operations four years ago, and not to those under discussion. There was no plan of the operations in which the troops were engaged which could be of any advantage in the present discussion. There was nothing about the Prah or the expedition to Comassie. Now, in the *West African Times*, which should be an authority on the matter, he perceived that great jubilation was expressed at the expenditure which was going on throughout the course of this year—something like £14,000 a month for the last fourteen months. To ask for a sum of £2,000 under those circumstances did, he must confess, seem to him to be somewhat absurd. He could, he might add, to some extent confirm what fell just before from the right hon. Baronet the Member for Portsmouth (Sir Francis Baring), because he had information to the effect that in the course of last autumn an English officer arrived at Sierra Leone, having with him some sick men, for whom he wished to provide; but he found the military hospital quite full, most of the cases arising from gunshot wounds, the result, as he was told, of a battle which had taken place at Lagos. Now, how was it, if that were so, that we had never heard of that battle? It was desirable, he thought, that the House of Commons should be enlightened as to when and why, and by whose orders a war was being conducted in Lagos. But to return to Cape Coast Castle; he believed that matters were worse than they were when the House discussed the question. He held in his hand a letter frem a medical officer, who was now the principal, and, indeed, the only medical man at the station, in which he said—

"I have now but bad news. There is no end of sickness here. I never had so much to do in my life; one of my assistants died in my room last Monday evening. His was a most melancholy case. He was sent out from the West Indies in charge of the troops which came to aid us, and which have only helped to crowd our house. He and Dr. Flynn, an old Trinity chum, were sent in charge, and with general orders to proceed at once back; but the great want of medical officers required that I should detain them. Dr. Flynn I sent on to Lima (after being two months here) with invalids. Dr. Greig, the other, I sent in charge of troops on the march to the Prah, with orders to return at once. On his return he took ill of fever and dysentery, not severe at first. I brought him out of his lodgings to stay with me in my own room, where I could often see him; but, notwithstanding all care, he died on the 31st of May. He was buried on the 1st of June, the first officer in the new burial ground. Since its use on the 1st of May a man has been buried every day nearly. I have now only one to help me, and he is constantly taken ill. I have been sometimes alone for the whole work. Since I have been here, of five officers four have died, three of the medical staff, and one engineer—nine altogether, and fourteen invalided home. An officer of the 2nd West arrived with the troops on the 9th of April. He brought his wife, an old traveller, well accustomed to the tropics. She was carried on board ship in a basket on the 14th of May, and died two days after at sea. Anything like the privation and abomination of this place it would be impossible to find. I forgot to mention that if the military staff had been invalided home every mail that leaves carries a freight of fever-stricken mortals, who are hoisted on board in a basket, and then have to bear a single sea voyage in the worst ocean-going steamers that leave England. Coal coasters at home are larger and better than this African line. I wish the English people knew the real cost in life and money of this attempt to put down slavery. I suppose that is the only reason for keeping up these settlements. I am convinced. What the war is for I don't believe is known in England, and what it is costing in the articles above mentioned, I don't think either is known; or else, if so, they must see some great value unappreciated out here in the natives or country. Well, this is all unpleasant, and so any news of this place is ever likely to be."

That letter would prove that the statements which had been made upon the subject had not been exaggerated. No doubt the Government had had their attention directed to the letter from Commodore Wilmot, a man of consummate ability, and than whom no one was more competent to express an opinion upon matters relating to the West Coast of Africa. In that letter that officer spoke of the insane nature of our operations upon the coast, and urged upon the Government the impropriety of carrying out the scheme upon which they had determined. He was sorry that his noble Friend (Lord Clarence Paget) had hesitated to give him the information which he had asked for on a previous occasion, with reference to the speed of the squadron stationed on the West Coast of Africa; but as his noble Friend had hesitated to afford him that information, he had been compelled to obtain it from other sources. We maintained seventeen steamers on the coast, and of these he found that the *Rattlesnake* was the only vessel capable of going ten knots an hour, and that of the others the fastest could only go 8·3 knots an hour. This calculation of speed was made according to the measured mile, and, as they all knew, the measured mile was the greatest possible effort that could be made, for something always occurred to prevent such a rate of speed being attained when a ship came into actual service. The fact was that we had a squadron of about seventeen vessels on the coast, the speed generally being seven knots an hour, some of them not being even so fast. And this was the case when they knew that the very fastest American steamers were sold to the Spaniards for the purposes of the slave trade. He had in his pocket an account of a very fast vessel passing through four of our steamers, communicating with the shore, and going out again with impunity —in fact the traders laughed at our ships. The senior officer of a squadron had given orders to our steamers not to give chase to any vessels, because by such a course they would only be led off the station without doing any good, but to lay at anchor near the places where it was expected that slaves might be embarked. It was absurd to suppose we could put an end to the slave trade by spending £700,000 upon a squadron which was insufficient for the purpose, and that not owing to any fault of the officers or men on board the vessels themselves. In addition to this, we had had a war in the swamps of Africa in which we had lost more than half of our men without seeing an enemy, and had fought the battle of Lagos about which we had never heard a word. He maintained that we were spending a million of money in vain, and, unless we altered our tactics, the sooner we recalled our slave squadron and abandoned our forts on the coasts the better. He had himself seen service in that quarter of the world, and no one could be more anxious to see an end put to the abominable traffic in slaves, but he could not approve any policy which involved only loss of life to our men without affording us any corresponding advantage. To promote a famine by landing men when a famine already existed, and to come down to the House to ask for £2,500 for that which had cost £250,000, was nothing less than absurd.

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £12,105, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, for the Civil Establishments on the Western Coast of Africa."—(*Sir John Hay.*)

MR. WHITESIDE said, he could give an answer to the question that had been put as to what we were doing in the colony, from a letter which he had received from a gentleman who was not connected with the army, but who was residing at Cape Coast Castle. This gentleman said that the protectorate was supported by the Imperial Government at a cost of £4,000 a year for the salaries of the Governor, the Chief Justice, the Colonial Secretary, the Collector of Customs, and the Police Magistrate; besides £750 a year for house rent for the Governor and other officials. Besides that amount the Governor borrowed £2,000 a year from the military chest, but it did not appear that he ever repaid that sum. It was to be returned when the protectorate was in a position to pay it. As the receipts from the customs were about £3,000, it was evident that the protectorate would never be able to support itself. In a war the Natives refused to render the slightest aid to the Government unless they were paid high wages, and they even declined to protect their own country unless they were paid for it. The gentleman whose letter he was quoting from said that the war was useless and unjust. It was useless, because no good could come of it, as there was not a single Ashantee on the coast; and to show that it was unjust he said a chief of the Ashantees having stolen a quantity of rock gold, and according to the law of his country had incurred the penalty of death, he ran away to the protectorate and claimed protection of the Governor; upon which the King of Ashantee sent to the Governor to give up the chief; the King was invited to a conference; but he replied that he could not hold a palaver with white men. Palaver was the phrase used to designate diplomatic proceedings, and a very good word it was for the purpose. The King, therefore, returned to his own country. Our troops were sent into the bush on the 14th of April and returned in June. They again took the field in January, and remained until June, when this letter was written. Although the army had not met a single enemy, the small garrison had lost sixteen white officers, six white sergeants, and over 200 men, by fever and dysentery. Twenty-three officers had been invalided, and many of them would never be fit for duty again. Four West India regiments arrived in two divisions in August, and most of the officers were invalided. The military expenditure before the war was about £800 a month; it was now over £8,000, and that did not include stores sent from home. He might mention that one steamer took out £45,000 worth of stores, and received £5,000 for it. The surgeons had been particularly unfortunate, for out of five four were gone. The right hon. Baronet the Member for Portsmouth (Sir Francis Baring) asked what was to be done to check the Governors from entering upon transactions of this character, and he (Mr. Whiteside) answered him by saying that it should be a direct Vote of Censure upon the men who, though they might not be personally answerable for the results of the war, had given it their sanction; and although his hon. and gallant Friend (Sir John Hay) failed in such a Motion the other evening by some six or seven votes, yet both fact and argument were with him. It was inhuman to send our soldiers into the bush where the men died without meeting an enemy. The King of Ashantee left the climate to do the work which his troops could not so efficiently perform. Now, somebody must be responsible. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Portsmouth had raised the question whether this thing should be repeated. They could not get at the Governor, but they could get at the Colonial Office. That office had acted most unwisely, and although they did not intend to do wrong, yet were they responsible. Directions had been given to abandon the stores, which cost £45,000, and the King of Ashantee would find them very useful for the next campaign. Of course arrangements were made—they always were after a Vote of Censure had been passed—for removing the survivors from the Gold Coast; but had the Government calculated what the King of Ashantee would do? Might he not come down and remove Governor Pine and the rest of them? To invade his territory was just what irritated one of these Kings most. [Mr. T. G. Baring: The territory was not invaded.] No, but the army was sent for that purpose. They went, but they did nothing. If it had been intended to march against the capital and kill the King, they might have done that, but they did not. They did nothing but suffer and die. The Colonial Office was responsible for what had taken place, for the Governor would never have made war without their consent, and they had not taken any step to alleviate the suffering they had caused until a Vote of Censure threatened them in that House.

Mr. CARDWELL: I entirely sympathize with every expression of regret for the sufferings of our soldiers on the Cape Coast, which has fallen from the hon. Member; but the right hon. Gentleman ought to have had the candour to acknowledge that the Colonial Office has done everything in its power to mitigate those sufferings the moment the news of them reached this country. The right hon. Gentleman, with that disregard for accuracy of dates which so frequently interfered with the good effect of his eloquence, has said that my proceedings were the natural result of a Vote of Censure. Now, so far from waiting for a Vote of Censure, the necessary measures were taken long before any Vote of Censure was heard of, and as soon as the news reached this country, as the right hon. Gentleman might have known if he had read the papers with any care. So, with regard to the stores also, the right hon. Gentleman might have known by reading the papers that special precaution was taken to prevent any part of the stores, particularly guns of any kind, falling into the hands of the King of Ashantee. There is quite enough to be regretted in this affair, and when we are speaking of a great public calamity it is just as well that hon. Gentlemen should be more accurate in their facts and their dates than the right hon. Gentleman has been. There are a few points on which I wish to offer an explanation to the hon. and gallant Member for Wakefield (Sir John Hay). The hon. and gallant Gentleman remarked very naturally that the item of £500 for the relief of famine was a very small one. But this item was the only sum which had been sanctioned by the Treasury as yet, and therefore was the only one proper to be introduced into the Vote. It has nothing whatever to do with the support of the troops, an item which will be included in the Military Estimates. It only related to the civil department. The hon. and gallant Baronet read a passage from a despatch of Governor Pine, in which he asked that supplies of provisions might be furnished to avert the distress which he believed would shortly exist; and in accordance with that request, with the sanction of the Treasury, twenty-seven tons of rice were sent out, at a cost of £390, which, with freight and sundries, came up to £500. Then the hon. and gallant Baronet said that this was a costly war, and that £2,000 could not possibly be the whole expense of it. That observation is, no doubt, perfectly correct. I am afraid it has been a costly war, and I am conscious of the evils of costly wars; but this item of £2,000 has nothing to do with the military expenditure—it relates only to charges incurred by the Civil Government, and civil charges only are comprised in the present Estimate. In the early part of this war the Governor sent home two items of expenditure, the first of which was £1,395, on account of this war, already paid by the Colonial Government. There was afterwards an account of £3,123 more spent in the war, but not paid, because the Colonial Government had not got the money—making a total of £4,158. The Treasury here declined to have anything to do with the £1,395, which they said was a charge properly belonging to the Colonial Government; and, with regard to the £3,123, they said they were not satisfied with the explanations they had received; but, looking to the urgency of the case, they would allow £2,000 on account until more satisfactory explanations were sent, and that is the sum set forth in this Vote. The hon. Member for Lambeth (Mr. Williams) asked me why £2,000 was given to the Governor of Sierra Leone. Now, I must remind hon. Members that there has been a greater reduction on the Colonial Estimates of late years than on many others, as hon. Members will see on looking through the Votes. For myself, I am most anxious to co-operate with the House in further reductions in these Votes, but with regard to this £2,000 it has always been included in the Estimate. The £2,000 for the steamer was a part of the settlement with the colony, and has also been always included. Whether the Government of this country should pay for its maintenance is a question very different from the use and value of that steamer, which is undoubted and cannot be disputed. Of all the accessories of a colonial establishment a steamer, doing the work which this does, is the most valuable. Portions of the settlement are removed 150 miles from the mouth of the river, and the steamer affords the inhabitants a most invaluable means of communication. With regard to the £3,125 for buildings and works at Lagos, that sum is for buildings required in the colony, such as a court-house, buildings for the Customs' service. a powder magazine, &c.

I believe I have now answered the questions which were put to me in detail, and all that remains for me is to notice the weighty matters referred to in the remarks of my right hon. Friend the Member for Portsmouth, who opened this discussion. I entirely agree with my right hon. Friend in most of the principles which he has laid down. I think the object of this country in establishing a settlement on the West Coast of Africa cannot be a self-interested one, having in view the increase of the wealth of England. The great design which has always interested this country in connection with our proceedings on that coast is the repression of the slave trade, and with it the introduction of legitimate commerce and of Christianity as the civilizing agent of mankind. An extension of territory in that country would be what no one would wish to see carried into effect; and certainly any desire of aggrandizement or territorial acquisition there would be foreign to our purpose and alien to our policy. What our policy should be and is was well laid down by a Committee of 1842, of which Lord Derby, Earl Russell, Mr. Speaker, and other distinguished men were Members. Speaking of the Western Coast of Africa they said—

> "The relation of the Native tribes to the English Crown should be not the allegiance of subjects to which we have no right to pretend, and which it would entail an inconvenient responsibility to possess, but the deference of weaker Powers to a stronger and more enlightened neighbour, whose protection and counsel they seek, and to whom they are bound by certain definite obligations."

That policy may be right or it may be wrong—I am not now arguing that question; but in Lord Grey's book our policy is described in the same sense, and as it is the policy to which this country has adhered, I hold with my right hon. Friend the Member for Portsmouth that to extend our territorial possessions on the West Coast of Africa is not the most desirable mode of giving it effect. Such a system of acquisition would be attended with many evils which, as far as possible, should be avoided. I am asked what the view of the Government is with respect to expeditions into the interior of Africa? I may answer that question by pointing to the policy which we have endeavoured to give effect to in reference to the expedition which has been brought under direct discussion. We have sent out orders to put an end, if possible, to expeditions on the Gold Coast. With respect to Lagos, I anticipated these discussions by announcing to the Governor of Lagos that our policy was to be one of abstaining from taking part in the disputes among Natives. A war that has been raging there between two tribes is very mischievous to trade, and inflicts great suffering on the Natives; but I do not think it would have been right for us to take a part in it, or to endeavour to put an end to it by force. It is difficult to lay down in clear terms what the details of a policy are. Those details must be complicated and difficult where our object is not the usual one of acquiring wealth or extending our power, but where our policy is solely and entirely a disinterested one—namely, at great inconvenience and no inconsiderable sacrifices to ourselves, to abolish a traffic disgraceful to human nature, and extend the advantages of religion, civilization, and legitimate commerce to the miserable inhabitants of Africa.

MR. ADDERLEY said, he believed that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies had done all that could be done in the case which had been brought so prominently under the notice of the House. He thought that of the papers now before Parliament the most satisfactory one of all was the despatch of the right hon. Gentleman, in which certainly he showed a determination to apply a remedy to an existing evil, and to prevent a recurrence of the unfortunate complications and embarrassments that had given rise to it. But, unhappily, these steps had been taken too late. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Portsmouth (Sir Francis Baring) that under such circumstances remedial measures must come too late. That was the point which they had to consider. It was difficult to fix a censure and to say who was to blame, and, even if it was not, censure would be too late. What they wanted to do was to prevent a recurrence of circumstances in which it was useless to blame any one for disaster, and in respect to which information came too late. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies had stated to the House the expenditure which we had incurred accurately according to the Returns which had reached him; but he doubted whether these Returns gave all the military expenditure for recent operations.

Mr. CARDWELL: It was not the military expenditure. I said we were on the Civil Service Estimates, and that these were expenses incurred by the Civil Governor on account of the war.

Mr. ADDERLEY: He was, then, quite correct in thinking that they had not before them an estimate of the expenditure for the whole of the affair. The present case afforded a striking exemplification of the mistaken policy we had adopted on that coast. The policy of setting up a protecting Power on the West Coast of Africa was both wasteful and mischievous, and he took this opportunity of giving notice that on the first day of next Session he should move for a Select Committee, which might inquire into the whole subject, with the view of preventing a recurrence of such evils as those which we were now lamenting. By assuming the task of protecting barbarous tribes, we not only scattered our army to an unnecessary extent, but exposed our troops to a demoralizing and deadly service — not only by warfare, but by the pestilential climate of some of the most unhealthy parts of the world. It was folly enough for us to assist great colonies as vigorous as ourselves in their wars for self-defence, without setting up Protectorates on the coast of Africa to which barbarous tribes would look for aid in mutual hostilities, and for plunder for themselves. We have had experience enough to show us how insane a policy this was, and the sooner we backed out of it the better. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies told them he had written to the Governor of Lagos, urging as the wish of the Government a pacific policy. But would the Governor, with the English flag and the English Exchequer at his back, carry out the wishes and intentions of the Government in that respect? He would remind the right hon. Gentleman and the Committee of the saying of the first Napoleon, that the true policy of this country was to concentrate our forces at home, and send them abroad as they might be required; not to scatter them, as we do, in every direction, in search of service, and embroil ourselves with all the world; and he said that it was fortunate for mankind we so wasted our strength, which concentrated would make us almost too powerful for the rest of the world. It was said that the policy adopted by this country was necessary in the interests of commerce and of civilization. But the fact was that commerce was disturbed and impeded by such a policy. Look at what had taken place in the present instance. Governor Pine wrote home to say that it was useless talking of peace, for he had an arduous task to perform in defending an extensive line of coast, bordered by tribes, some of whom were under British protection, while they had rivals under other protection; and he seemed to have grand notions of his position, calling upon the Home Government to support him, but fortunately calling in vain. The time had come, he wrote rather magniloquently, when the question must be settled now and for ever, whether the English flag was to be trampled on by savage and sanguinary tribes. But, surely, there was a prior question to be settled, namely, whether the English flag should be trailed about all over the world as an Irishman trailed his coat-tails at a fair, to be trodden on and insulted by any one who had nothing to do, and nothing to lose. Governor Pine thought that good policy, economy, and mercy would be served by sending him a force sufficient to decide at once and for ever the supremacy of England over African barbarians. The House of Commons would probably be of opinion that none of these results would be so insured. Major Cochrane and Commander Wilmot both cautioned the Governor that the House of Commons would never stand such a course; but he was blind to their remonstrances, pressed on the Colonial Office the necessity of doing what he asked, and at last quarrelled with these two officers because they had so wisely cautioned him not to quarrel with the King of Ashantee. What made the absurdity the greater was, as appeared from Governor Pine's own statement, the war he proposed could only be carried on by the sacrifice for the time of the chief object for which we maintained this settlement — namely, by suspending our efforts for the abolition of the slave trade. He (Mr. Adderley) deprecated strongly the policy of sentimental colonization which was too much adopted by this country. He considered that a better case than this could hardly be brought forward to illustrate the impolicy of the course we were pursuing in this direction. He thought the time had now come to consider whether we had any inducement for exposing our officers and men any longer in a climate so deadly that when it was proposed at the end of the American war to make West Africa a convict station, Mr. Burke made a celebrated speech in this House, in which he described it as a place where "all death lives and all life dies" —a place too dreadful even for criminals to be sent there in commutation for death. He should take the first opportunity next Session of moving for a Committee of Inquiry into the use of our West African establishments, and he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies to enable him to prepare for it, and to have in readiness the evidence which would be necessary for a fair investigation. He hoped that that inquiry would lead to the abandonment of the Gold Coast forts, and the concentration of our settlements, or disposal of them otherwise. The right hon. Gentleman said that he was against all extension of our possessions on this coast. But with the best intentions this extension was going on, and would continue to go on unless they resolutely set their faces against it. Fifteen years ago the Gold Coast was only a lieutenant governorship under Sierra Leone. Then it was constituted a governorship. During Earl Grey's tenure of the Colonial Office we purchased the Danish forts there for £10,000; and the Dutch forts were now being offered us for sale. If, as the result of the inquiry he proposed, the Government could see their way clear to withdraw from the Gold Coast, and concentrate their forces in two places, or even in one, upon this coast, the greatest benefit would result from the appointment of a Committee. It should be remembered that whatever our squadron might have done for checking the slave trade, no such end had yet been in the least advanced by the troops, whom we had employed on shore, for they could do nothing but embroil us with the tribes along the coast, while they certainly did nothing for the civilization of the country. The slave trade could be best repressed by a differently composed squadron on the coast, and he quite agreed that it would be well to have faster and fewer vessels there. He hoped, however, that the Protectorate would be abandoned, for the only result had been a large loss of valuable lives, while neither commerce, nor suppression of the slave trade, nor civilization of the tribes, had apparently been promoted by it.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR said, he was glad that the right hon. Gentleman was resolved to move for a Committee next Session: if he had not made the announcement he (Mr. Henry Seymour) should have done so himself, for he wished to see the whole question ventilated. He hoped, however, that in the meanwhile the Colonial Office would have devised some better means of managing the affairs of these settlements. He must say, however, that he thought the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Adderley) was riding his hobby too hard when he designed to confine England to the limits of these Islands; it seemed to him (Mr. Henry Seymour) absurd to talk of restraining this nation within such narrow limits.

MR. ADDERLEY said, what he desired was to restrict the number of our forces abroad.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR remarked, that the natural course for a people so powerful, vigorous, and enterprising as that of England was to expand and to occupy nearly every region of the world; and if Napoleon had seen the present wealth, power, and influence of this country in all parts of the world, he would have approved the policy of the British Government for the last thirty or forty years. As to the outcry about these paltry military expenses, he would ask how our colonies could have become so prosperous if they had not been aided in their weakness by the mother country? While our colonies and possessions added largely, on the whole, to the wealth of the mother country, there must necessarily be some which, like the territories of the United States, required for a time an expenditure from the mother country in order that they might become the sources of wealth to the generation which followed. Instead, therefore, of restricting our present policy, he would extend it still further; and if this question were debated he should be prepared to prove, that our expenditure all over the world was returned to us a hundred-fold by the prosperity of our colonies and possessions. Take the case of Ceylon—we were now exporting from that colony 40,000,000 lb. of coffee a year, and British capital there was to a great extent bringing 10, 20, and 30 per cent per annum to those who laid it out. The imports into this country from the West Coast were increasing, but the products from the interior could not be obtained without the aid of posts established upon the coast; whereas on the east coast, where there were no British settlements, it appeared from accounts given by Captain Speke, that at a short distance from Mozambique towards the interior, the price of Manchester goods increased 2,500 per cent, in consequence of the difficulty, from want of possessions on the coast, of causing the goods to penetrate into the interior. Until they broke the outer crust of the continent they could not gain the interior. Then let them look to the progress of civilization. He thought the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Adderley) could not have examined the position of Sierra Leone and the Gambia, where schools and missionary stations were established, whereby Christianity and civilization had been extended, as well as commerce promoted. Then as to the suppression of the slave trade—Commodore Wilmot, in a valuable minute on the subject, had proposed the occupation of Quettah, as a means of putting an end to the slave trade on the only part of the western coast of Africa where it still prevailed to any extent. He wished to observe that our vessels on the coast were most inadequate in speed; not one of them could go more than nine miles an hour, whereas the slavers were notoriously the fastest vessels that could be built. It had been said that this squadron, besides its proper duties in suppressing the slave trade, could be relied upon as a squadron of reserve in case of war; but it would be of very little use against the fast vessels of other nations. He did not find fault with the policy of the Government, but with the way in which that policy was carried out. Why, slavery was acknowledged in British courts of justice in the limits of the Protectorate! We had done away with protectorates almost everywhere, and he did not see why the protectorates on the Gold Coast should not be done away with also. Reference had been made to the Dutch possessions, and the Minister for the Colonies was aware that a movement was taking place in the Chamber in Holland with regard to the Gold Coast, and it was said there, "either let us have our affairs managed better, or sell the territory to the British Government." The estimate of the revenue which might be obtained from these possessions was £50,000 a year. The cost of management was £20,000. Now, if we could settle the question satisfactorily with the Dutch the customs revenue might be divided, and the colony be made self-supporting. The climate was not so bad as had been represented, and was not nearly so injurious to health as the Gambia and Sierra Leone; and he trusted the Government would not abandon the coast, but that next year the subject would be thoroughly sifted by a Select Committee. There was one great defect in the Estimates, for it was impossible to ascertain how much these colonies cost this country. The civil expenditure was set out, but there was no statement as to the naval and military expenditure. The House ought to be furnished with an estimate of the expenditure of each colony. He believed that if we entered into any well-devised scheme for the suppression of the slave trade, Lagos would form an important portion of that scheme; but all the efforts that had hitherto been made had failed from want of administrative ability, for neither Mr. Freeman, at Lagos, nor Mr. Taylor, at Abeokuta, had conformed to the habits of the people. He should like to know when the account of the military expenditure of the Ashantee war would be laid upon the table, and what was its estimated cost for the coming year. It was understood that the Vote was to be postponed until that statement could be laid before the House, and until the policy of the Government could be explained. The question had been shirked by one Member of the Government, because it was not in his department, and he thought the responsible member of the Cabinet ought not to consider it beneath his dignity to give the necessary explanation as to the civil and military expenditure.

Mr. ARTHUR MILLS said, the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had misunderstood the remarks of his right hon. Friend (Mr. Adderley). He did not understand that his right hon. Friend had stated his intention of moving for a Committee to inquire into the whole subject, but that the question of the Protectorate was one which ought to be inquired into; and in that opinion he (Mr. A. Mills) fully concurred. He should be sorry if the investigation was directed to particular acts of the Government on the Gold Coast. With respect to the policy which had been pursued by this country, people were asking who was to blame—the Admiralty, the War Office, or the Colonial Department? But if any body was to blame it was not any particular Ministry, or any one official Department, but Parliament itself, which had allowed a system to go on which might at any time explode in disasters similar to those at Lagos or the Gold Coast. He trusted the attention of Parliament would be aroused to the subject, and that an inquiry would be instituted for the purpose of ascertaining whether an attempt to protect the Native tribes was a wise course, and one likely to extinguish the hateful traffic which had been so long carried on. The case of Lagos showed one of the most remarkable failures of our policy resulting from an attempt to interfere in the quarrels of the Native tribes. That colony was founded for the purpose of extinguishing the slave trade; and no doubt that was a very laudable object, in which the country would sympathize if it could be carried out without an undue sacrifice of life and treasure. But what had been the result? Why, when Abeokuta was invaded, it had to depend on supplies of powder from Porto Novo, which was supplied by French traders in exchange for slaves. So that this colony of Lagos, which was planted for the specific purpose of abolishing the slave trade, became, through the foolish policy of the Governor, the means of carrying it on. How could they expect a proper man for Governor of such a colony as Lagos when the salary was only £500, not enough to tempt a country apothecary in fair practice? The whole question of our protectorate over Native tribes ought to be fairly and impartially discussed. The country did not grudge a moderate expenditure for the suppression of the slave trade, but it did grudge the indefinite expenditure involved in protecting Native tribes.

LORD CLARENCE PAGET said, the hon. and gallant Member for Wakefield (Sir John Hay) had quoted a private letter from a personal friend, in which it was stated that our squadron on the coast of Africa was unable to cope with the slave trade. A similar statement was made the other night, when he (Lord Clarence Paget) stated that he had no knowledge of any slaver having escaped from our squadron after a fair chase.

SIR JOHN HAY said, he should be happy to supply his noble Friend with the information.

LORD CLARENCE PAGET said, the statement of his hon. and gallant Friend was, that in spite of four steamers the slaver got away. All he could say was, that he had heard nothing of such a case, nor had any information to that effect reached the Admiralty. His hon. and gallant Friend said that positive orders had been given to the various ships composing the squadron not to leave their station for the purpose of chasing slavers. But his hon. and gallant Friend knew that if our vessels were to leave their station it would be one of the most advantageous things that could happen for the slave dealers, as they would immediately take the opportunity of despatching slave ships during the temporary absence of the station ship. It was quite possible that a certain number of fast American steamers might be employed in the trade, and no doubt it would be advisable to match them by faster ships; but we wanted fast steamers all over the world, and to send a fresh squadron to the coast of Africa every year because fast American steamers were sent there would be attended with great inconvenience. The Admiralty were perfectly alive to the subject, and would not neglect any opportunity for providing for any contingency.

MR. MONSELL said, the question before the Committee was, whether they should practically pass a Vote of Censure upon the Government by withdrawing this sum of £2,500. Now, it seemed to him most unfair to cast the blame for the present state of things upon the Government, who were simply carrying out a policy inaugurated in 1842 upon the recommendation of a Committee of which Lord Derby was a Member, and adopted by successive Colonial Secretaries. The occasion of this war really was that the King of Ashantee had threatened the extermination of tribes which we were bound to protect, and the Government would have been wanting in their duty, if they had declined to afford their assistance. The loss of life on the occasion was, no doubt, to be deplored; but according to Commodore Wilmot, if Major Cochrane had done his duty our troops would have marched to the capital of the King of Ashantee, and it was impossible for the Government to provide that all their officers serving on distant stations should be as efficient as could be desired.

SIR JOHN HAY said, he had no wish

to put the House to the trouble of dividing upon the Vote. The only reason why he had urged upon the Government the necessity of suspending the Vote, was that the sum of £2,500 altogether inadequately represented the expenses entailed upon the country by this war. He thought the Government ought to have laid a supplementary estimate upon the table, showing the expenses already incurred for this calamitous war. He believed that something like £250,000 had been expended, of which only this small item of £2,500 was to be found in the Votes.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, no statement of the military expenses incurred in this war had been laid on the table by the War Department, because it was quite impossible that such a statement could be made. The war had taken place in this and the last year, and the accounts for the military expenditure of last year were not yet laid upon the table, nor could they be included in this year's Estimates ; but the commissariat charges and field allowances had been taken at an increased amount, in case the war should continue. The expense of organizing a large transport corps had been estimated, but it would be absolutely delusive to attempt to lay on the table an account of the actual expenses incurred. When the Army Expenditure of 1863 was laid before the House, it would be seen what expenditure the war had entailed.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR asked if he was to understand the noble Marquess to say that all the military estimates were two years behindhand ?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Not the Estimates, but the account of the military expenditure.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR said, the Government for some time had been spending £1,200 a month for this war, and an account of the estimated expenditure ought to be laid upon the table, as he believed was done in the case of the China and Crimean wars.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, that the expenses, so far as could be done, had been included in the Estimates which had been laid before the House ; but the war was going on at the time.

SIR FREDERIC SMITH said, it would be quite possible to give an approximate estimate of the expenses from time to time. To get an estimate two years after the event was of no use. It might as well not be printed.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR asked, how it happened that while we were voting £2,000 a year in aid of the Government of the Gold Coast, the magnificent tanks which were in the country had been out of repair, so that no water could be had ? He should move to reduce this Vote by £500, the salary of the Governor of Lagos, unless he should receive an assurance that Mr. Freeman was to be removed.

MR. ADDERLEY asked for an explanation of the circumstance that Governor Pine was adverse to raising any taxes in the colony itself. He said in one of his despatches he had neither the face nor the courage to do so.

MR. CARDWELL said, that owing to the invasion of the King of Ashantee and the extraordinary severity of the season, there had been a great famine and great distress in the colony, and the passage to which his right hon. Friend had referred related to that state of things. It was only when the revenue of the colony was deficient that that House was asked to defray the expense. He had received no information as to why the tanks had been suffered to go out of repair. They ought to have been kept in repair out of the revenue of the colony itself. The salary of Mr. Freeman, at Lagos, was made up in this way — £500 was taken for him as Consul in the Consular Estimate, and £500 for him as Governor in that Vote.

MR. ARTHUR MILLS asked, whether the right hon. Gentleman could give the Committee an estimate of what the revenue of Lagos was ?

MR. CARDWELL said, that in 1862, the last year of which he had any account, it was £7,120. The Estimate for the present year was considerably larger.

LORD HARRY VANE quite agreed with the noble Marquess, that an exact estimate of the war expenses could not be furnished, but he did not see why an approximate estimate could not. It might be right or wrong to pursue the policy which we had adopted on the Gold Coast, but then it had been followed ever since 1842.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, his belief was that in the matter between Lagos and Abbeokuta the former was more sinned against than sinning. He held out hopes last year that Lagos would this year be able to pay its own expenses, and such was his belief at the time. But the reason why they were now obliged to ask a slight assistance for the colony was mainly because the neighbouring tribes had persisted in waging war among themselves, and because Abbeokuta, in spite of our advice, had carried on hostilities against its neighbours. He hoped that people would not be too elated by their recent victory over the King of Dahomey to adopt a policy of peace, that the trade of Lagos would make great advances, and that the colony would become self-supporting.

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR said, it was a personal question with the people of Lagos.

Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, they were not fighting with Mr. Freeman — it was their neighbours that were fighting.

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR said, that the people of Abbeokuta had not been on good terms with them since Mr. Freeman had become Governor.

Sir JOHN HAY said, he understood that the military correspondence was to have been laid upon the table, but it had not as yet been produced.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, he was not aware that the military correspondence had been promised.

Sir JOHN HAY said, he should move for it.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(4.) £220,000, Iron clad ships *El Tousson* and *El Monassir.*

Lord CLARENCE PAGET said, the Committee was perfectly aware of all the circumstances which had led the Government to recommend this purchase to Parliament, and therefore he would not take up time by making any statement upon the subject. He should be very happy, however, to answer any questions which might be put to him.

Vote *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at twelve of the clock.

NEW ZEALAND GUARANTEE OF LOAN BILL—[Bill 150]—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Sir JOHN TRELAWNY said, he hoped they should receive from the Colonial Secretary a more satisfactory statement than had yet been given as to the nature of the security which was to be good enough for that House but was not good enough for the merchants of the City. Unless he could elicit some such statement from the right hon. Gentleman, he felt disposed to move that a Select Committee be now appointed to inquire into the relative financial position of Great Britain and New Zealand, with a view to a final adjustment of any outstanding balance of accounts between them, and to a fair understanding as to how the liabilities of either country were to be borne in future. When a former loan of £500,000 was asked, in 1857, a Committee of Inquiry was appointed; but now, at the end of the Session, when there was little opportunity for discussion, the Government came down with a high-handed proposal, without giving the House a proper account of the security on which that guarantee was to rest. As soon as the guaranteed part of the loan was put upon the market nobody would have anything to do with the unguaranteed part of it; so that this proposal would not really effect its professed object. He must tell the Government frankly that their colonial policy of late years had not been such as to entitle them to the blind confidence of the House of Commons for the next six months. He was prepared to incur the expense of defending New Zealand against any foreign attack; but when such extensive powers of self-government had been placed in the hands of the colonists, he was not ready to consent to undertake the responsibility of internal wars like the present. The House was bound in duty not to leave such a question open for the future; and unless the Government gave some satisfactory explanation of the course they intended to pursue during the next six months he would, by way of precaution, move the appointment of a Select Committee.

Amendment proposed,

> To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire what is the relative financial position of Great Britain and New Zealand, with a view of a definite and final adjustment of any outstanding balance, and coming to an understanding as to the liabilities to be borne in future by the Government of either Country,"—(*Sir John Trelawny,*

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

General PEEL: Sir, before the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Cardwell) answers the hon. Baronet, I wish to put this question to him:—What power has the Government of New Zealand in directing the movement of the British troops in that colony? I ask that question in consequence of having seen a private letter from New Zealand, and which, being private, I cannot read to the House. The first question raised by the writer is—Why were we in Taranga at all? and he says it was because it was so willed by three lawyers, members of the Colonial Government, contrary to the direct wishes of the Governor; because this triumvirate, under the fiction of responsible Government, overrules the representative of the Queen, overrules the commander of 10,000 troops, overrules the expenditure of £1,500,000 of other people's money, and overrules the wishes of the Native race which is not represented at all in the political system. And this is the Colonial self-government which the Duke of Newcastle upholds! The writer then goes on to inquire, how it is that the representatives of 100,000 colonists, consisting of Englishmen, Irishmen, Scotchmen, Germans, and Yankees, have the control over an unlimited expenditure of British money and British blood? He says the war has proceeded from these representatives themselves—that it arose in consequence of their calling upon Colonel Browne in the first instance to use British troops for the purpose of taking the land of the Native British subjects — a measure that roused that rebellion which you are now required to put down. He says in respect to the military operations — and I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he can to answer this—he says that our going to Taranga was the greatest mistake that ever was made. He says this place is distant about 150 miles from Auckland; that it is accessible by sea; and we can easily transport our troops thither; but when they have got there they are separated by 50 miles of bad country, a wood of 12 miles, the Thames river and its swampy valley, and the Waikato river, from our posts at Maungatantari; whereas this 50 miles is a two days' march for a light-armed Native force, and the country between is in their hands. On the contrary our men have to come back 150 miles by sea, 35 to the Waikato, and to ascend 100 miles of the river to get back to Maungatantari; so that while our General with his 3,000 men is practically shut up by woods, hills, and swamps, it is in the power of the Maori General (if they have one) to resume the offensive on the Waikato with a concentrated force. The fact, he says, is that—

> "If the Maories did not make it a point of honour to fight each man for his own land, they might have led the General from Taranga to Waikato and from Waikato to Taranga, as would have exhausted his patience in command, and Mr. Gladstone's in paying the bill. Instead of this they have dug their intrenched camps on the open ground, sometimes without provisions, once even without water, and then they have braved four or five times their own number, and all our Armstrong guns, mortars, howitzers, and hand grenades, when they might have gone into the bush, and from thence cut off our convoys and orderlies without much loss to themselves, but with vast injury to us. Their one feeling is, if the land dies let us die with it."

I wish, therefore, to know what control the Colonial Government have over the movements of the troops in New Zealand, or whether the control rests with the Governor? When we look at the fearful calamity which has taken place—for I can call it by no other name —when we see the prestige of one of the finest regiments in the British service shaken—of that regiment with respect to which Sir William Napier in his *History* says he was congratulated by everybody on being placed in command of such a corps—that regiment which stormed the breech of Badajoz—that regiment, as we are now informed, has retired before the Natives of New Zealand. And what was the reason of that? Why, it was because every commanding officer in the regiment was killed upon the spot. Sir, an hon. Member of this House once told us, that if all our generals, our colonels, and other officers were swallowed up by an earthquake, their places could easily be replaced. I only hope that that hon. Gentleman's constituency will find it much easier to supply his place than it will be to supply the place of the lowest officer who fell on this occasion. I have to ask another question—How is the increased expenditure for the war to be met? The great increase in the Army Estimates was put down to the New Zealand war. We were told that, in consequence of that expense, it was necessary to reduce the expense of the Yeomanry force. The Vote against that reduction was carried by a majority of only one. Then came a demonstration from the noble Viscount at the head of the Government, who suddenly announced that, in consequence of the excellent news that had been received from New Zealand, the Government were enabled to forego their determination of not calling out the Yeomanry for exercise or permanent duty. But when the Estimates were brought forward, every one of the Votes was reduced. How, then, are these expenses to be paid? We have heard that no estimate can be given of the expenditure on the Ashantee war; and I have been trying to impress on the House the necessity of asking some more satisfactory answer than we have yet received. If we cannot have accounts of expenditure within two years, they can be of very little use after. I wish to know from the Colonial Secretary, has the Colonial Government the power of directing the movement of Her Majesty's forces in New Zealand, and how is it proposed to make up for the reduction in the Army Estimates in consequence of the excellent news from New Zealand?

MR. CARDWELL: My right hon. Friend has put to me a Question which I understand to be this—In whom rests the control and command of the Queen's forces in New Zealand?—does it rest with the Colonial Minister or with the Colonial Governor? My right hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State read the other night an extract of the despatch of the Duke of Newcastle, in which the government of Native affairs was given over to the Colonial Minister, but in which the control, command, and management of the Queen's forces was exclusively placed in the Governor of the colony. The Correspondence has been laid on the table. I have stated the views of Her Majesty's Government with reference to the policy that ought to be pursued in reference to the land question, and the feeling of the House appeared to be favourable to those views. But they were already in writing, for it so happened that the post left that very day, and they went by that day's post to New Zealand; and they have been laid on the table of this House. They were intended to obviate the risk and possibility of war arising from a desire of making the forces of the Queen subservient to taking land from the Natives. So much for the general policy; but with regard to the control of the Governor over the troops, I will read an extract from a despatch which I addressed to the Governor, and which is also on the table. It is dated the 26th of May, and is in these words—

> "I entirely anticipate that your Ministers will be animated by a just sense of the exertions and sacrifices which have already been made by the mother country for the colony, and that on colonial grounds they will be as anxious as you will be yourself to terminate the present hostilities. But it is my duty to say to you plainly that if, unfortunately, their opinion should be different from your own as to the terms of peace, Her Majesty's Government expect you to act on your own judgment, and to state to your Ministers explicitly that an army of 10,000 English troops has been placed at your disposal for objects of great Imperial concern, and not for the attainment of any merely local object—that your responsibility to the Crown is paramount, and that you will not continue the expenditure of blood and treasure longer than is absolutely necessary for the establishment of a just and enduring peace."

I do not know how it would be possible for language to express more plainly with whom the control rests, and what is the expectation of the Government with regard to the exercise of that control. But further, by a subsequent mail information reached me of a difference between the Governor and his Ministers with regard to the treatment of 183 prisoners who had been taken in action—not that there was any charge of cruelty in their treatment if they were to be kept as prisoners, but that there was a difference of opinion between the Governor and his Ministers whether they should be treated as prisoners at all. I addressed a despatch to the Governor on the subject. I have not a copy of it with me, but I am quite sure I state it correctly when I say that I told the Governor that I looked to him for determining a question of that kind—that I wished him to obtain the concurrence of his Ministers if he could; but if not, he should decide without their concurrence, and that I should be perfectly prepared to support him if I found from subsequent despatches that he had taken that course. I think I have completely answered the question proposed to me by my right hon. Friend. Now, with regard to the origin of this war. My right hon. Friend read a letter with reference to the origin of the former war, which took place in the time of Governor Browne. I do not mean to say there is no connection between the present and the former war; but this I say—Governor Grey went in 1861 as a governor of peace, and he abstained from insisting on the terms prescribed by Governor Browne. He was regarded by the Natives as their friend—he told them that the King movement would not be the cause of war, and he withdrew by proclamation that fatal blot which had been the cause of the former war. I stated that Governor Grey held the origin of the war to be a conspiracy of chiefs of a particular district, who had been preparing for an attack on Auckland. But it was no part of Governor Grey's policy, and certainly it was no part of the policy of the Government, to maintain an army and continue a war for any purpose of oppression to the Natives of New Zealand. But I was a little surprised to learn from the hon. Member for Tavistock (Sir John Trelawny) that I had given no evidence with regard to the security on which this loan was to be raised. I should have been afraid, sitting in judgment on myself, that I had occupied the time of the House too long on the subject of the security for this loan. I certainly stated what was to be the security pledged—that it was to be all the revenue of which the New Zealand Assembly has the command. I stated the ordinary revenue for the year ending June 30, 1863, as it appears in the papers before the House; I also stated the estimated revenue for the following year. I showed, I thought, to the satisfaction of the House, that there was an adequate, ample security in the ordinary revenue of the colony; but in addition to that there was another considerable revenue arising from land sales. The way in which this loan comes to be proposed is this:—Last year an offer was made by my noble Friend the Duke of Newcastle to ask the House to guarantee a loan of £500,000 for New Zealand—£200,000 for the expenses of the former war, £200,000 for compensation to settlers for losses incurred in that war, and £100,000 for the purposes of the colony. That proposal only passed the first stage last Session, and it fell to me to redeem the pledge in the course of the present Session. But in the meantime a further liability of £300,000 had arisen from the circumstances of the present war, and if the guarantee were limited to £500,000, almost the whole of it would come to the Treasury. There is a great expense incurred by the mother country, but there is also a great expense on the part of the colony. They have to pay the expense of a local force of 10,000 men in arms against the Natives. The payment which the colony makes to this country for the Imperial troops in New Zealand is under an arrangement which terminates at the close of the present year. It is, I must admit, an unsatisfactory arrangement. There is a nominal payment of £5 per head per man, but the larger portion of that sum finds its way back to the Treasury of the colony. It is a part of the present proposal that this arrangement shall terminate, and that the payment by New Zealand should be the same as by the Australian colonies — namely, £40 per man per annum, from the beginning of 1865. All this is given in detail in the papers before the House. It will be seen that, in consideration of the arrangements recited in the letters of Sir Frederick Rogers and the repayment of all the debts due from the colony to the Treasury, it is proposed to guarantee this loan of £1,000,000. I have already stated my belief that the security is quite ample. Of this I am sure, that it is desirable that all running accounts between the Treasury and the colony should be closed, and that a substantial arrangement should be made for the payment of Imperial troops, so that it may be no longer a matter of indifference to the colony whether they provoke a war or not. Considering, however, that the colonists are now engaged in a formidable struggle—that all those of age to bear arms in the province of Auckland are under arms for the defence of their hearths and homes—that they are removed from the productive pursuits of industry—that they are incurring vast expenses, and that this beneficial arrangement has been made between the colony and the mother country, I trust that the hon. Gentleman having fully discharged his public duty, will permit the House to go into Committee on this Bill, on the distinct understanding that the Lords of the Treasury will not advance any money until the Assembly of New Zealand have formally adopted the terms of the arrangement.

Major HAMILTON said, that as the House had been told that a portion of this loan would be employed in compensating the colonists who lost their all in the last war, he trusted that compensation would also be given to those who had lost their property in the present war. There was, for example, the case of Mr. Calvert, who was sitting by his own fireside when his child was murdered by the Natives. He rushed out, was wounded while gallantly fighting, and his property was destroyed. He hoped that a part of the money would be employed in making good these losses.

Colonel SYKES must repeat his objections to this Bill, and to the entire policy of guaranteeing colonial loans. The war was part of a system of continued aggression on the Natives for the ultimate purpose of extermination. Then as to the guarantee, what was it? The revenue of the colony was stated to be £700,000 per annum, but the expense of 10,000 troops at £40 per man would be £400,000. Then there were the items of the payment of local troops, the interest of the debt, compensation to sufferers, and the local government expenses. After these charges had been met, what would become of the security? The revenues of the colony, too, were not in the hands of the Treasury but under the control of local Ministries, which were ephemeral; and although they might have an honest Government now, you might have a democratic one to-morrow and then they would never get their money. [*A laugh!*] Although he was a Liberal himself, he believed that under such democratic Governments as existed there they could never be certain of the Government, and that their guarantee was good for nothing. If any one would divide with him, he would oppose the Bill.

Mr. WHALLEY protested against it being said that this was a war of aggression against the Natives; the war had nothing to do with land, but originated entirely in the massacre of some of our troops. He wished also to say that Sir George Grey had stated in New Zealand that he had traced the origin of this war to the Roman Catholic Missionaries. He put the question on a former occasion three times in one night, and he received for answer that it was too late to discuss the matter. Too late to put such a question! He spent nearly a whole day at the Colonial Office on the subject, and he was told there were floating recollections in the minds of the officials there that some such communication had been received. He then put the question in the House, and cited the Canadian rebellion and other recent cases; but only got for answer that the loyalty of the Canadians was unimpeachable, and that it was absurd to cite them in reference to New Zealand. He wished for a distinct answer, and if he did not receive it he would ask the House to grant him a return of all the communications which had been received from Sir George Grey relative to the origin and progress of the war.

Mr. ARTHUR MILLS said, the right hon. and gallant Gentleman (General Peel) had called attention to the immense mischief likely to arise if the practice prevailing in New Zealand were persisted in, of allowing the responsible Ministers of the Governor to dictate to the Commander of the forces with reference to the movement of the troops in that province. It was said by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Cardwell), that he had written a despatch which, if attended to, would have the effect of preventing the recurrence of such a bad practice in future. But he (Mr. Arthur Mills) wished to call the attention of the House to the very difficult position in which they were placed with regard to the consequences, or rather probable want of consequences, resulting from that despatch. It was the fact, however, as appeared from the papers before the House, that the practice had prevailed, and as long as the present system continued it was likely to prevail — the practice of dictation in these matters by the responsible Ministers of the Governor; and it was questionable how far any despatch from the Colonial Office could put an end to it. As an illustration, he might mention that the Deputy Commissary General remonstrated against an attempt made not very long ago—and which, indeed, was carried out—of advancing lump sums from the Treasury chest, as £100,000 at a time, for the payment of the militia of New Zealand, for which ostensibly it was the duty of the Colonial Government to provide. The Governor referred the matter to these Ministers, who said that it was absolutely necessary the sum should be advanced, considering the exigencies of the colony, and that it should be repaid in three months. That sum had never been repaid. The simple fact was that the Ministers dictated to the Governor, who acted under compulsion. He wanted to know what despatch written from the Colonial Office would prevent the continuance of the practice? The despatch might be sent out, but the responsible Ministers of the Governor would say, "We cannot hold office on these terms — we will resign." Their successors would do the same, a succession of crises would occur, and in the end the Governor would be forced to yield. If such practices were allowed to go on, and the responsible Ministers of the Governor were allowed to spend money voted by Parliament, the result would be indefinitely to prolong the war. Then again, in the time, he believed, of Governor Browne, the Commander of the forces said that in his judgment the troops ought to be sent to a certain part of the province. The Minister of New Zealand said, "Oh, I trust you will do nothing of the kind. I have property there, and I shall have to begin life again if you send them there." The Minister was all powerful, and prevented the arrangement which the Commander of the forces wanted to carry out. Now, as to the origin of the war, the right hon. Gentleman said the Natives were the cause of it, and the colonists had nothing to do with it. He had that morning received a letter from Mr. Gorst—a gentleman who had written a very able and intelligent book on these transactions in New Zealand—in which letter Mr. Gorst, speaking of the allegation that the war was the result of a conspiracy of the Maories, expressed his absolute disbelief of it from the personal knowledge derived from a residence on the spot some time before the war broke out. Tales of such plots, he added, were common during the whole time of his residence in New Zealand, many of them, to his certain knowledge, utterly false. He stated further that he could undertake to disprove the existence of half-a-dozen former plots stated upon evidence as credible as that upon the faith of which Waikato was invaded. This confirmed the opinion which he had formed upon information received from both civil and military authorities; and when distinguished military authorities expressed their opinion that the Queen's troops were being employed in carrying on an unrighteous war, not to protect the lives and property of the people of Auckland, but to enable the colonists to get as much fertile land as they could, and a small knot of persons in Auckland to coin fortunes out of the commissariat, he did think that it behoved the House of Commons to interfere.

Mr. WYKEHAM MARTIN said, he rose at the request of several of his Friends to read an extract from a letter which he had received since the right hon. Gentleman had begun his speech. The writer, who was known to many Members of the House, and for whose shrewdness and ability he could answer, and who, though now within a few miles of the seat of war in New Zealand, till about fifteen months ago knew as little about that country as most hon. Members did now, after describing an engagement in which of 400 Natives 200 had been killed or wounded continued—

> "They are a brave race, and it seems a great shame to take their land from them. We all out here consider the war an unjust one. But the cry of the colonists is still for land. Moreover, the troops are the making of Auckland, as contractors and that kind of people are making large fortunes. So long, therefore, as you are fools enough to supply the needful, so long will they keep on the war. General Cameron has captured millions of acres which a few months ago belonged to the Natives."

He then went on, after expressing an opinion that this winter might starve out the Natives, to give a deplorable account of the repulse which our troops had sustained, and stated that the people of England had no idea how many of the valuable lives of our soldiers were lost in every petty skirmish, and declared his belief that if the colonists and the Maories were left to fight it out, so well had the colonists supplied the latter with arms, that probably the Natives would have the best of it. If the right hon. Gentleman wished to be distinguished as the wisest Minister who ever presided at the Colonial Office, he would by the next mail send out orders to make peace as soon as possible, to wash our hands of an unrighteous and iniquitous war, and leave the colonists to reap the fruit of their own misdeeds.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, that if when the Estimates were passed the Government had foreseen the unfortunate turn which events in New Zealand had subsequently taken, they would not have proposed reduction in any of the votes. At the same time he saw no reason for introducing a supplemental Estimate at the present moment. If the Estimate was exceeded there would be ample time before the close of the financial year to adopt that measure. It, unfortunately, seemed probable that hostilities might continue for some time longer; but, looking at the war from a financial point of view, hon. Members must recollect that the chief source of expense was the cost of transporting commissariat supplies and stores for a large army in the field in the interior of the country. General Cameron had, however, now removed the greater part of his forces from the interior, leaving only a sufficient number of troops to hold the posts from which he had driven the Natives, and had transported them by sea to the eastern shore of the Island, where the operations were likely to be less expensive than those carried on in the interior. Besides this, the Commissariat had, according to the last advices, made arrangements for supplying the troops left in the interior by means of water carriage, which would be much cheaper than the land transport which they had hitherto had to employ. The House would gain no information from any supplemental Estimate which could now be laid upon the table, founded, as it must be, upon no certain *data*, and he still hoped that the Estimate already presented would not be materially exceeded.

Sir JOHN HAY said, that he had received a letter from that distinguished naval officer Sir William Wiseman, commanding on the New Zealand station, in which he described the excellent service rendered by the naval brigade at Tauranga, where he himself directed the operations, and detailed the particulars of the gallant and noble deaths of Captain Hamilton of the *Esk* and Commander Hay of the *Harrier*, and other officers. From the conclusion of his letter he gathered that he was of opinion that the war might be indefinitely prolonged, and that it was totally unjustifiable.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided* :—Ayes 79 ; Noes 32 : Majority 47.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Sums borrowed under recited Act of General Assembly of New Zealand, not exceeding £1,000,000 and Interest, guaranteed under this Act).

Mr. MORRISON moved by way of Amendment the substitution of the words "five hundred thousand pounds" for "one million pounds," observing that the proposed guarantee was an Imperial guarantee and ought to be rendered applicable only to Imperial purposes. He did not at all, he said, mean to doubt that the colony would make good the £1,000,000 which it was sought by the Bill to guarantee ; he objected to the proposal on principle, and thought it ought not to go beyond the £500,000 in which the colony was indebted to this country. He was also, he might add, opposed to our soldiers being sacrificed in wresting their land from the Native population of New Zealand, his belief being that the colonists were in all likelihood led to persevere in that policy by the fact that their imaginations were fired by the idea that large quantities of gold were to be found in the northern part of the Native territory. We were thus led to throw away many valuable lives in the pursuit of an object not in the least of Imperial importance, and he for one objected to our guaranteeing money for that purpose.

Mr. CARDWELL said, that in the despatch he had sent to Sir George Grey he had distinctly stated that no portion of the guaranteed loan was to be applied to the purposes of a military settlement.

Mr. WALPOLE regarded the war as being most unjust, and he hoped that as soon as it was ended an entirely new policy with reference to New Zealand would be initiated, but it was another question what should be done in the present crisis. Our policy had been quite sufficient to provoke the inhabitants of the colony to the acts which they had committed, but we could not conduct ourselves towards a colony when in a crisis in the same manner as we would deal with that colony at the conclusion of the war.

Sir MORTON PETO said, that having engaged in an unjust quarrel, the only course left for us to pursue was to end it as soon as possible. The proper course would be to allow the colony to obtain their loan without the guarantee at an interest of 6 or 7 per cent. Such a course would practically put an end to the war at once ; but if they entered on the course of guaranteeing loans the war would never come to an end.

Sir JOHN TRELAWNY thought it had been shown that the security would not be sufficient for the loan of a million, and he should support the Amendment of his hon. Friend (Mr. Morrison), as he thought it might be good enough for the loan of half that amount.

Mr. WHITE wished to know, whether the colonists intended raising a further sum of £2,000,000 upon the security of colonial debentures, and whether they purposed applying it to their grand scheme of colonization ?

Mr. CARDWELL said, that the £2,000,000 had nothing to do with the present loan, which would have a prior claim upon the revenue.

Mr. ARTHUR MILLS would not vote for the Amendment, for he objected altogether to the principle of a guarantee.

Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE could not sit still and hear the war stigmatized as being unjust. Had the Government concurred in that view, orders would have been issued long since to put an end to it upon any terms. He maintained that any one who would carefully examine the subject could not fail to come to the conclusion that the war was a just and necessary one. The Governor (Sir George Grey) had used every effort to prevent a most warlike, turbulent, and misguided portion of the Natives from renewing hostilities with their neighbours, but had unfortunately failed ; and he had been forced by the perversity and unjust and extravagant suspicions of the Natives into a war which was strictly a war of self-defence.

Colonel SYKES wished to know, if the war had not originated in the objection which some chiefs entertained against the sale of some land by another chief, which they said he had no right to sell without their consent ?

Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, that the hon. and gallant Member referred to the former and not to the present war. The Governor in that instance not unjustly refused to submit to the dictation of a Native chief who had usurped the prerogative of the Crown.

Mr. AYRTON thought the Under Secretary of the Colonies was mistaken as to the origin of the war. Governor Browne had stated that the colonists were determined to get possession of the land of the Natives, rightly if they could, if not by any other mode.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Treasury not to approve of the borrowing of £1,000,000 until certain provision is made).

Mr. AYRTON asked, whether the arrangement that this country was to pay half the expenses of the war was to be permanent?

Mr. CARDWELL said, that in the Correspondence it was stated distinctly that the arrangement was subject to revision hereafter.

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

NAVY & ARMY EXPENDITURE (1862-3).

COMMITTEE.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Lord CLARENCE PAGET said, that as the proceeding which he was about to ask the Committee to take was a novel one, he felt it his duty to say a few words to explain the object of the Resolutions which he had just handed to the Speaker. Up to last year the Reports of the Army and Navy expenditure were laid upon the table soon after the meeting of Parliament, and they passed, so to speak, *sub silentio;* but the Committee on Public Accounts had recommended that those Reports should not only be laid on the table, but should be subjected to a confirmatory Vote of the House. The only question was as to the form in which that Vote should be taken, and the same Committee had recommended the pleasure of Parliament should be taken this year in the form which he now proposed. The advances on certain Votes for the Navy were more than covered by the surplus on other Votes; and he was about to ask the Committee to confirm a decision at which the Treasury had arrived, appropriating the surplus on certain Votes of last year to the payment of the advances on certain other Votes of last year.

Mr. LYGON asked whether the Committee was to understand that the further action was to relieve the Commissioners of Audit or the Treasury, or any other body, from any responsibility?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that the Appropriation Act as framed last year in conformity with the recommendation of the Committee on Public Accounts gave the Treasury to do only provisionally what before last Session it had done as a final act. Up to last year the Treasury had power to sanction the application by the Admiralty of any surplus on Votes passed by that House to meet advances on other Votes, and the effect of that arrangement was to pass the money without the transaction being submitted to the further and final approval of the House, though the transfer was brought under the notice of the House, inasmuch as the correspondence between the Departments was printed; but no Vote of the House was asked which would have enabled hon. Members to agree to dissent from the transfer. Under the new arrangement the appropriation was merely a provisional transaction, to be completed only when it was sanctioned by the subsequent Vote of the House. The main question which had arisen was whether the matter should be brought under the notice of the House by a simple Resolution or by a revoting of the money. This Resolution had nothing to do with the payment of money. The transaction was complete, and all that was wanted was the authority of Parliament. The effect of asking the House to pass this Resolution was simply to give them the opportunity, if they thought fit, of disapproving of any of these transfers from one Vote to another.

Mr. CORRY asked what would be the result if the House refused its sanction to these transfers?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that the reply to this question must be very much like Speaker Onslow's reply when asked what would be the consequence of his naming a Member? This was a class of transactions which followed the same principle as Votes for Civil Contingencies. It was necessary to intrust the Government with certain discretionary powers of spending money, and if these powers were misused, a Vote of Censure might be moved.

Mr. WALPOLE said, the effect of the change had been to give to this House a control which they did not possess before.

Even the Treasury had heretofore no control over the different Departments, which could supply a deficiency in one Vote out of the surplus upon another without check. By the new regulations, however, not a shilling could be so transferred without the sanction of the Treasury. This was a provisional arrangement, and if the House did not approve it they might pass a Vote of Censure.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER thought that the better arrangement would be to repay into the Exchequer the surplus upon any Vote, and then let Parliament revote it next Session.

Resolutions *agreed to.*

(1.) *Resolved,*

That the Expenditure incurred for certain Navy Services in the year ended the 31st day of March, 1863, has fallen short of the sums appropriated to those Services by the sum of £870,100; and that the Expenditure which has been incurred for certain other Navy Services and not provided for in the sums appropriated to those Services for the same year has amounted to the sum of £499,702 7*s.* 9*d.*

(2.) *Resolved,*

That the said Expenditure for Navy Services unprovided for as aforesaid, amounting to £499,702 7*s.* 9*d.*, has been temporarily defrayed, under the authority of the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, out of the Surpluses which have arisen, as aforesaid, upon other Votes for Navy Services, amounting to £870,100.

(3.) *Resolved,*

That the application of so much of the said Surpluses be sanctioned.

(4.) *Resolved,*

That the Expenditure incurred for certain Army Services in the year ended the 31st day of March, 1863, has fallen short of the sums appropriated to those Services by the sum of £1,097,725 12*s.*, and that the Expenditure which has been incurred for certain other Army Services and not provided for in the sums appropriated to those Services for the same year, has amounted to the sum of £336,309 15*s.* 8*d.*

(5.) *Resolved,*

That the said Expenditure for Army Services unprovided for, as aforesaid, amounting to £336,309 15*s.* 8*d.*, has been temporarily defrayed, under the authority of the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, out of the Surpluses which have arisen, as aforesaid, upon other Votes for Army Services, amounting to £1,097,725 12*s.*

(6.) *Resolved,*

That the application of so much of the said Surpluses be sanctioned.

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at Twelve of the clock.

WESTMINSTER BRIDGE TRAFFIC BILL.

[BILL 205.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Power to the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Works to make Bye-laws and Orders).

SIR JOHN SHELLEY asked whether the tramway in the centre would be removed to the side next the curb, and whether the flanges would also be removed?

MR. COWPER stated that if there was no engineering difficulty he should give instructions for the removal of the tramway as suggested. His desire was that the flanges should continue, but in another place.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY understood from Mr. Page that there would be no difficulty in removing the tramway.

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* at Twelve of the clock.

PUBLIC WORKS (MANUFACTURING DISTRICTS)—[ADVANCES.]

COMMITTEE.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER moved a Resolution, authorizing the advance from the Consolidated Fund of a sum not exceeding £350,000 on the security of local rates, to be applied to the same purposes as those specified in the Act of last year.

LORD EDWARD HOWARD thanked the Chancellor of the Exchequer for making this proposition, for the distress in the manufacturing districts had by no means passed away.

Resolved,

That the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorized to make further Advances out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, to an amount not exceeding £350,000, upon security of Local Rates, for facilitating the execution of Works in certain Manufacturing Districts.

House *resumed.*

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow* at Twelve of the clock.

SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CLERGY DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL —[Bill 161.]

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Sir WILLIAM HEATHCOTE proposed the addition of the following words to the end of the Bill, "or in Ireland, in any Court of Common Law, in the name of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners."

Mr. WHALLEY wished to know whether the Bill affected the Act of Settlement. It would enable any one single Bishop to inundate this country with clergymen of the Scotch Episcopal Church, who indulged to a considerable extent in the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

Sir GEORGE GREY said, that no Scotch clergyman would be admitted to a living or curacy in England under this Bill without taking the declaration required of English clergymen on ordination.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Bill to be read 3°, on *Thursday.*

PRIVATE BILL COSTS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Scourfield, Bill for awarding Costs in certain cases to opponents and promoters of Private Bills, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Scourfield and Mr. Massey.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 221.]

POOR REMOVAL BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Villiers, Bill to explain the Statute of Her present Majesty for amending the Laws relating to the removal of the Poor, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. Villiers and Mr. Gilpin.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 222.]

House adjourned at half after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, July 19, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills — *First Reading*— Bleaching and Dyeing Works Act Extension* (No. 213); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* (No. 214); Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* (No. 215); Militia Pay*; Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* (No. 216); Bank Notes, &c., Signature* (No. 217); Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* (No. 218); Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c.* (No. 219); Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex)* (No. 220).

Second Reading—Sale of Gas (Scotland)* (No. 152); Naval Discipline (No. 205) [h.l.]; Local Government Act (1858) Amendment* (No. 190).

Committee — Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia) (No. 204) [h.l.]; Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans)* (No. 206); Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* (No. 209); Militia Ballots Suspension*.

Report — Accidents Compensation Act Amendment* (No. 158); Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia) [h.l.] (No. 204); Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans)* (No. 206); Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* (No. 209); Militia Ballots Suspension*.

SLAVE TRADE IN THE PACIFIC.

PETITION FROM NEW SOUTH WALES.

Lord BROUGHAM *presented* a Petition from inhabitants of Sydney, New South Wales, in public meeting assembled, praying for measures to suppress the Slave Trade amongst the Islands of the Pacific. The petitioners expressed great indignation at finding a slave trade established in that part of the world by vessels frequenting the neighbouring islands, and inveigling on board or carrying off by main force several hundreds of the poor natives. One vessel had got 700 of the natives on board, and the master complained that he was not allowed to complete his cargo to the full amount by decoying on board or seizing 400 more. So that 1,100 human beings were to be put on board a vessel not capable of holding half the number. The Petitioners prayed that some remedy might be devised for that state of things.

Petition to lie on the table.

NAVAL DISCIPLINE BILL—(No. 205.)

SECOND READING.

The Duke of SOMERSET said, that a few Amendments had been found necessary in this Act. Instead, however, of bringing in a separate Bill, he proposed to reproduce the whole Act, and to move certain amended clauses in Committee.

After a short conversation,

Bill read 2ª, and *committed* to a Committee of the whole House on *Thursday* next.

THE MUTUAL SURRENDER OF CRIMINALS (PRUSSIA) BILL—(No. 204.)

COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Lord BROUGHAM expressed his approval of the convention on which the measure was founded, and said that he trusted the time would soon come when we should have similar conventions with all other countries, and when all countries would have similar conventions with each other.

Bill *reported,* without Amendment.

House adjourned at a quarter before Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, July 19, 1864.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — *Report*— Patent Office Library and Museum * (No. 504).

SUPPLY—*Resolutions* [July 18] *reported**—Army and Navy Expenditure (1862-3); Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) [Advances].

WAYS AND MEANS—*Resolutions* [July 18] *reported.*

PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered* — Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Bribery at Elections*; Poor Relief (Metropolis); Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment*.

First Reading—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment * [Bill 225]; Poor Relief (Metropolis)* [Bill 224]; Bribery at Elections* [Bill 227].

Second Reading—Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* [Bill 211]; Cathedral Minor Corporations* [Bill 220]; Poor Removal* [Bill 222].

Committee—Improvement of Land Act (1864)* [Bill 187]; Contagious Diseases* [Bill 212] *re-committed;* Indian Medical Service [Bill 213]—R.P.; Criminal Justice Act (1865) Extension * [Bill 201] *re-committed;* Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* [Bill 204]; West Indian Incumbered Estates Act Amendment * [Bill 215]; Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000)* [Bill 217]; Clerks of the Peace Removal* [Bill 209]; Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues* [Bill 202].

Report—Improvement of Land Act (1864)* [Bill 187]; Contagious Diseases * [Bill 212]; Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)* [Bill 184]; Criminal Justice Act (1865) Extension * [Bill 201]; Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* [Bill 204]; West Indian Incumbered Estates Act Amendment * [Bill 215]; Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000)* [Bill 217]; Clerks of the Peace Removal* [Bill 209]; Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues* [Bill 202].

Considered as amended—New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan)* [Bill 150]; Westminster Bridge Traffic* [Bill 205].

Third Reading—Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental * [Bill 207].

Withdrawn—Forfeiture of Lands and Goods* [Bill 21]; Church of England Estates* [Bill 127]; Costs Security* [Bill 58]; Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers)* [Bill 198]; Justices of the Peace Procedure * [Bill 138].

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

SUPPLY—REPORT.

Resolutions [July 18] *reported.*

SIR HENRY WILLOUGHBY said, he wished to know, whether the Vote for £2,000 for the Ashantee war was merely an estimate, or represented money already expended? He also wished to know in what position the Government stood with regard to the general expenses of the Ashantee war, and more particularly the power lodged in the hands of Governor Pine, of meeting his necessities by a recourse to the Treasury chest. He thought that some more stringent Resolutions ought to be passed to prevent Colonial Governors from resorting to the Treasury chest without the previous sanction of the Government at home.

MR. PEEL said, that in the absence of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and also of the Under Secretary, it was difficult to give the hon. Baronet the information for which he asked. His (Mr. Peel's) recollection of the particular item was, that it was an expenditure which had already been incurred. Money was advanced out of the Treasury chest during the last year which had been repaid from the Vote. That had necessarily caused an excess on the Vote, which had now to be made good. The Governors of colonies were not permitted, except in extreme cases, to pay advances out of the Treasury chest. In emergencies, however, they had authority under the standing regulations to obtain that money.

SIR JOHN TRELAWNY said, he believed the result of such a regulation would be that Colonial Governors could avail themselves of the aid which they could obtain from the Treasury chest whenever they pleased without this country knowing anything of it for two years.

Resolutions *agreed to.*

INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE BILL.

[BILL 213.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (The Secretary of State for India in Council empowered to make Regulations for the Medical Service of Her Majesty's Forces in India, and to empower the Authorities in India to make similar Regulations).

MR. HENNESSY said, he thought that

a certain number of appointments should be given as the result of competitive examinations. He did not wish to oppose the Bill in a factious spirit, but he should feel himself compelled to oppose it unless the right hon. Baronet would consent to give some assurance that the competitive system would not be entirely abandoned.

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, he had no wish to abolish the competitive examinations, but he desired to extend to the medical service in India the same advantages as those enjoyed by the Queen's service, and the proposal of the Bill was that any assistant-surgeon in the Queen's army —all of whom had obtained their appointments by competition—might, if he so pleased, volunteer into the Indian army.

Colonel NORTH said, that the deficiency of medical officers in the army was so great that acting assistant-surgeons had lately been introduced—a class of medical officers never before heard of.

Mr. LONGFIELD said, he thought that the competitive system could only have failed from the standard of examination being too high, or the pay too low, and the Bill did not do anything to effect improvements in either of these directions.

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, that the position of the officers had been bettered both as to rank and pay.

Colonel SYKES complained that many of the Natives of India who were in every respect well qualified for the posts were prevented from entering the service from the prejudice which existed against the colour of their skins.

Mr. HENNESSY said, he regarded the Bill as substituting the old system of patronage for the competitive examination, which had been found to work so admirably, and he should therefore move that the House report Progress.

Colonel DICKSON said, he did not see how the difficulty in filling up the vacancies in the Queen's army would be remedied by allowing officers to volunteer into the Indian service.

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, he would consent to insert a proviso in the Bill enacting that all the regulations referring to the appointment of medical officers should be submitted to Parliament.

Mr. COLLINS said, he thought that no action should be taken upon the regulations until they had been before the House one month.

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, he could not agree to the proposition of the hon.

Member. The regulations should be submitted to the House after they had come into operation.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Hennessy.*)

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 6; Noes 43: Majority 37.

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, he proposed to submit the regulations to Parliament within fourteen days after they were made, provided Parliament were sitting, and if not, within fourteen days after the next meeting of Parliament.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Clause, to add the words "Provided always, That all such regulations shall be laid before Parliament within fourteen days after the meeting thereof, if Parliament be sitting, and if Parliament be not sitting, then within fourteen days after the next meeting thereof."—(*Sir Charles Wood.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. HENNESSY moved as an Amendment the insertion of words suspending the operation of the regulations until they had been a fortnight before the House.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, to leave out the word "all," and insert the word "no,"—(*Mr. Hennessy,*)—instead thereof.

Question put, "That the word 'all' stand part of the said proposed Amendment."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 24; Noes 7: Majority 17.

And it appearing that 40 Members were not present, the Chairman left the Chair.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

House counted, and 40 Members being present,

Bill *further considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Question again put, "That the word 'all' stand part of the said proposed Amendment."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 34; Noes 11: Majority 23.

Mr. HENNESSY complained that the majority of those who had heard the discussion had voted with him, but that his Amendment had been lost in consequence of a number of hon. Members having come down from the Committee-rooms. The

Bill was passed at one o'clock that morning, and was now hurried through Committee. It proposed entirely to abolish competitive examination, and, knowing how many of his young countrymen obtained the appointments under the present system, he believed he was only doing his duty in resisting it to the utmost.

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, he would stand by his Motion.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 30; Noes 6: Majority 24.

Question proposed, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *this day.*

COMPLAINTS OF THE CUSTOMS OFFICERS.—QUESTION.

Mr. C. TURNER said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take into consideration the various Petitions presented to this House by the Customs Employés, with a view to the removal of the grievances complained of by assimilating the pay and classification of the Customs to the pay and classification of the Inland Revenue and other similar Departments of the Public Service?

Mr. PEEL replied that there was no standard of pay and classification in the Public Service which could be applied to all offices indiscriminately without reference to the nature and the responsibility of the duties to be performed. The practice was to grant to each office a number of clerks and rates of pay, which were considered adequate to obtain an efficient body of servants. He thought it far better that such office should have the salaries of the clerks it required fixed with reference to its own particular requirements rather than with reference to the practice adopted in any other public Department. During the last year the officers of the Customs had memorialised the Treasury for an improvement in their condition; and while in some cases the Lords of the Treasury had not seen their way to comply with the application, in other cases they had not only added to the emoluments of the officers but accelerated their promotion, and he hoped very considerably ameliorated their position.

THE YORKSHIRE RESERVOIRS.

QUESTION.

Mr. FERRAND said, he rose to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he did not communicate with the Mayor of Bradford, two years ago, on the dangerous state of the Doe Park Reservoir, who replied that it had been emptied, and should not be again filled until the embankment was secure; whether Mr. Rawlinson, the Government Inspector, has not reported to the Home Office that "this Reservoir has been full and overflowing several times; on some occasions it has been full, or nearly full, for several successive weeks; and there is a dangerous leak beneath the main embankment, and that the Reservoir is in a dangerous state;" whether he has not also reported that "the bye-wash space should be increased at the several Bradford Reservoirs, and that such floods as occurred in July, 1855, ought to be guarded against in future;" and whether, after this Government Report, and the danger to which hundreds of persons have been exposed by the non-fulfilled pledge of the Mayor of Bradford, it is not the official duty of the Secretary of State for the Home Department to exercise his authority to protect them from danger in future; and whether he will not incur grave responsibility if he fails to do so?

Sir GEORGE GREY, in reply, said, he had communicated with the Mayor of Bradford in March, 1862, with reference to the Doe Park Reservoir, who informed him that the water was let off, and that the Waterworks Committee proposed to examine the reservoir on the next day, accompanied by their engineer; and that every precaution would be taken to secure the safety of the public. He afterwards received the Report of the engineer, who stated the instructions he had given to the contractor as to some alterations, which he trusted would prove entirely effective. The engineer did not say that the reservoir would not again be filled till the embankment was secure, but it was obvious that it could not be so filled until the alterations in progress were completed. No further complaint of this reservoir was made until March in the present year, when Mr. Rawlinson was directed to inspect it. His Report was on the table of the House and could be referred to by any hon. Member. A copy was sent to the Mayor of Bradford. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Ferrand) was mistaken in supposing that the Secretary of State had any official authority to insure the safety of reservoirs. He could only, as in this case, call the attention of the persons under whose charge they were to any alleged defects in their construction, and on those persons alone rested the responsibility of making them secure. At the time of Mr. Rawlinson's inspection of the Doe Park Reservoir it was empty. He reported that both at Doe Park and Barden there was a leakage, that the work of repair would be heavy in both instances, but that he was assured that it should be complete. With those exceptions he reported that the Bradford Reservoirs and works had been well devised, and appeared to be well executed.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER asked, Whether the right hon. Gentleman did not think it would be desirable to appoint a Commission, composed of engineers, to inquire into the best mode of constructing reservoirs in future?

Sir GEORGE GREY said, he had not lost sight of the suggestions which had been made on the subject; but the Government had not come to any decision with respect to it.

MR. ARNOLD AND THE POLICE.

QUESTION.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether Police Constable 244 B, as to whom Mr. Arnold, the Magistrate at Westminster Police Court, publicly stated on two several occasions in the month of May last, that he would not believe him on his oath, was still continued in the Force?

Sir GEORGE GREY said, in reply, that that police constable was still in the force, and that he thought it would be a gross injustice to dismiss him. No reason had been assigned by Mr. Arnold for the opinion he was said to have expressed, and he (Sir George Grey) could see no good ground for that opinion.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he wished to know, Whether any further inquiry was to be made in regard to Mr. Arnold?

Sir GEORGE GREY said, he did not think there was any ground for inquiry. He had notified to Mr. Arnold that if he or any other magistrate desired to bring any misconduct on the part of a constable under the notice of the Commissioners, he should enter it in the charge-sheet expressly provided for the purpose.

DENMARK AND GERMANY—THE PRUSSIANS AND THE NORWEGIAN MAIL STEAMER "VIKEN."—QUESTION.

Mr. WYLD said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If Her Majesty's Government have received any information of an attack made by the Prussian troops upon the Norwegian Royal Mail steamer *Viken* (sailing from Christiania to Lubeck) whilst landing passengers at Frederickshaven in Jutland on the morning of the 13th of July, on which occasion the lives of some British subjects who were on board were seriously endangered?

Mr. LAYARD said, in reply, that the Government had received information that some Prussian troops had fired upon this mail steamer; but he had not heard that there were any English passengers on board, or that she was landing any passengers. The fact appeared to be that the Prussian troops had mistaken the vessel, and thought she was a Danish vessel carrying troops. But the Swedish Minister had addressed a Note to the Prussian Government on the subject, and they had promised that an inquiry should be made into the case.

Mr. WYLD said, it was quite a mistake to suppose there were no English passengers on board the steamer. There were several English passengers, and one of them was nearly wounded by a bullet which was fired from the Prussian vessel.

CANADA—THE NORTH AMERICAN COLONIES.—QUESTION.

Sir JOHN WALSH said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether he will have any objection to lay upon the table of the House the Despatches recently received from the Governor General of Canada, and the other Governors of our North American Colonies, relative to the recent Ministerial Changes and the project of a Federal Union of those Colonies; and whether it is his intention, before the close of the Session, to make any statement, or to afford any information to the House on the important legislative crisis which appears to be impending in the constitution of those Colonies?

Mr. CARDWELL said, in reply, that a new Government having been formed in Canada by a union between the two parties into which the Assembly was divided, the intention of the new Government to mature, during the recess, measures for an important purpose, namely, for settling the constitutional difficulties which had prevailed in the Upper and Lower Provinces, by what they called the federative principle, applied to Canada itself, with a provision for the future reception into the Union of the maritime provinces of the North Western territory. He understood it was their intention, after maturing those measures, to communicate with the Home Government on the subject; but as those measures had not yet been framed, it was manifestly not in his (Mr. Cardwell's) power to give any information on the subject.

LUNATIC ASYLUMS (IRELAND).

QUESTION.

MR. BLAKE said, he rose to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the fact that, in the month of April last, a lunatic named Alexander Eiffe, committed on the usual certificates to the public and private Lunatic Asylum of Lucan, county of Dublin, was forcibly removed by two bailiffs from thence for debt to Kilmainham Gaol, which caused his death within six weeks after his arrest; and whether he will consult with the Law Officers of the Crown as to the desirability of having such a change made in the Law as would prevent, under similar circumstances, a person from being removed from a Lunatic Asylum to a prison?

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, in reply, that as the Lucan Asylum was a private establishment, the Government could not interfere under the circumstances. He would, however, consult with the Law Officers of the Crown, as to whether any steps could be taken on the subject in regard to the future.

FORTS ON THE GOLD COAST.

QUESTION.

MR. C. P. BERKELEY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, If any account can be given of the sum of £4,000, which has been annually voted for fifty years for the repairs and maintenance of Forts and Establishments on the Gold Coast, which Forts are now reported by Commodore Wilmot to be in a "dilapidated condition, and to require great repairs," very little attention seeming to have been paid to them for years past?

MR. CARDWELL replied, that the £4,000, which had long been contributed for the purpose stated, had been carried to the receipt side of the financial accounts of the Gold Coast, and formed part of the general revenue of the settlement.

TROOPS FOR JAPAN.

QUESTION.

MR. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD said, he rose to ask the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether it is the case that a regiment has been ordered from Hong Kong to Japan on the requisition of Sir Rutherford Alcock; and, if so, whether he can explain for what purpose these troops are required?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON, in reply, said, a despatch had been received from General Brown at Hong Kong, stating that a requisition had arrived from Sir Rutherford Alcock for the remaining companies of the 2nd battalion of the 20th regiment, then stationed at Hong Kong, to be sent to him at Yokohama. General Brown said that the requisition would be complied with as soon as transports could be obtained.

MR. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD said, he wished to know whether there is any statement in the despatch as to the object for which the troops are required in Japan?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, that Sir Rutherford Alcock spoke only in general terms of the state of affairs at present existing in Japan.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON: How many men are going?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Six companies.

LORD NAAS said, he would beg to give notice that on the Motion for Adjournment next Friday, he would call the attention of the House to this expedition to Japan, and ask the Government what is the precise object in view?

MR. COBDEN said, he did not understand how many men were to be sent to Yokohama.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, he could not speak exactly as to the number of men, but he believed that there were two companies already at Yokohama, and the remainder of the troops would be six companies, or probably about 800 men.

Mr. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, whether it is true that a considerable force of marines was also under orders for Japan?

Lord CLARENCE PAGET said, he was not then in a position to answer the question. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman would repeat it on Thursday.

CONVENT SCHOOLS (IRELAND).

QUESTION.

Mr. HENNESSY said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether he has re-considered the statement he made the other night, that there was a convent school in the King's County which had been reported on unfavourably?

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, that since the hon. Gentleman's question had been last put to him he had looked more carefully into the matter, and had found that the school of which the Inspector had reported unfavourably was situated, not in the county which the hon. Gentleman represented, but in the Queen's County.

PAPER MANUFACTURE.

SELECT COMMITTEE MOVED FOR.

Mr. MAGUIRE* rose to move for a Select Committee to inquire into the position of the paper manufacture of Great Britain and Ireland with respect to foreign taxation. A great and grievous wrong had, he said, been done by the Government and Parliament to an important branch of British industry, and that industry now appealed through him to the Government and to Parliament for consideration, and, if possible, for redress. The importance of the interest which he represented might be indicated by a few facts and figures. The capital embarked in the paper trade was no less than £7,000,000; it employed directly or indirectly about 100,000 persons, and at least 200,000 persons were, through the workmen and their families, dependent on its continuance and prosperity. If he judged of the wages by the annual production of the trade, he found that from £1,000,000 to £1,500,000 was diffused throughout the rural districts of the country in wages to operatives. Such, then, was the trade which had been sacrificed, not to free trade, but to the mere claptrap-cry of free trade, and, indeed, to what seemed to be rather exceptional and aggressive protection than to real free trade. In the year 1860, or previous to the Government proposal of that year, paper was liable to two duties, the Excise duty and the Customs duty. Threehalfpence in the pound represented the Excise duty, and 1*d.* the Customs duty. The Customs duty was a duty wisely imposed, not as a protection to the British trader, but as an equivalent for the tax imposed by foreigners on rags imported into this country from foreign countries. That duty was revised in 1853, when the present Chancellor of the Exchequer held the office which he now filled; and Mr. Wilson, one of the most determined free traders that ever held office under any free trade Government, considered that 1*d.* in the pound was only a fair equivalent for the rag duty. Hon. Members who knew anything of the paper trade knew that rags were an essential necessity to the paper manufacturer. In fact, good paper could not be manufactured without rags. Paper could be made from various fibres and other articles, but, to use the words of Mr. Wrigley, "Rags will always be the sheet-anchor of the paper manufacturer." They were the raw material which the manufacturers could most readily obtain, and so long as they continued to be used, so long would a certain quantity or proportion of that material be introduced from other countries to supply the wants of the British paper manufacturers. It took a ton and a half of rags of the best quality to make a ton of fine paper, and it required two tons of the lowest description of rags to make a ton of an inferior class of paper. Therefore, when a duty of £5, £6, or even £9 was imposed on a ton of rags, such a duty must have a considerable effect upon a ton of paper. If a foreigner was able to buy his rags from £5 to £9 a ton lower than the British manufacturer, he must always have an advantage over the British manufacturer which no amount of skill, energy, or capital could overcome. The anticipations of the trade with regard to the disastrous effect of the policy of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, by which they were recklessly exposed to this unfair competition, had been more than fully realized. The rag duty levied at the present moment on the export of rags in Russia was £6 5*s.* a ton; in Sweden the exportation was free; in Prussia and all through the Zollverein the duty was £9 3*s.*; in Holland, £4 18*s.*; in Austria, £7 5*s.*; in Italy, £3 5*s.*, although formerly only £1 12*s.* 8*d.* In France, where the exportation was formerly prohibited, the duty was now £5 per ton; in Belgium, £5; and in Portugal, £6. Therefore, he was quite correct in saying that the rag duty now ranged from £4 to £9, and upon a ton of paper it necessarily operated as a duty ranging from £6 to £14. In 1860 the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to abolish the Excise duty on paper. He (Mr. Maguire) went with the right hon. Gentleman in that proposal. The only question to be considered at that time was one of revenue—whether it was wise, under the circumstances, to take so much from the taxes or revenue of the country as the right hon. Gentleman proposed to take? It was generally admitted that the question resolved itself into that one narrow point; indeed, the House had on two previous occasions passed a Resolution in favour of the abolition of the duty. He (Mr. Maguire) supported the right hon. Gentleman, because he considered his proposal to be a wise one, and that it would be not only beneficial to the manufacturer but advantageous to the consumer. Circumstances which had occurred since then proved that there had been no loss to the revenue which had not been more than made up by the expanding industry of the country, and it was also proved that the consumer had had the full advantage of the reduction. If the right hon. Gentleman had been wise at that time, there was not one of his prophecies which might not have been realized. But the right hon. Gentleman, by dealing as he did with the question of the Customs duty as against the foreign rag tax, prevented the prophecies he had made from being realized; and so far from doing a benefit to the trade, he inflicted upon it — no doubt unconsciously and in ignorance — one of the greatest evils which was ever inflicted by a British minister upon any branch of native industry. The right hon. Gentleman made an eloquent speech on the occasion of his proposing the abolition of the Excise duty, in the course of which he said that one of the advantages would be that

> "We should not merely stimulate the process of massing people in the great centres of industry, but should create a demand for labour all over the country. Where there are streams, villages, pure air, and tolerable access, there are the places where the paper manufacture tends to establish itself. I want to see, and I do not despair of seeing, these village mills spring up again and flourish."

The right hon. Gentleman at that time expressed the greatest sympathy for the smaller class of millowners, for he complained that the trade was gradually being absorbed into the hands of those who were possessed of large capital. It was for the House to say whether the anticipations of the right hon. Gentleman had been realized. When the right hon. Gentleman made that speech, and when it became known afterwards that he was going to abolish the Customs duty, and to leave the British manufacturers at the mercy of foreigners who taxed British manufactures for the benefit of their own people, great alarm was felt in the trade. From that moment the lobby became crowded with persons interested in the trade, whose interests were endangered by the policy of the right hon. Gentleman. They said that they were no enemies to free trade, and he (Mr. Maguire) asserted that they were not. They asked for nothing that would be a violation of the principles of free trade. Without going to Mr. M'Culloch or Mr. Mill, or any of those great authorities, he would simply appeal to his hon. Friend the Member for Rochdale (Mr. Cobden), who might be called the father of free trade in that House, and who in speaking upon the question of the malt tax used these words—

> "I am bound to say that we have never lost sight of the producer in the great changes of the last twenty years. We know Sir Robert Peel held that before we exposed the manufacturers of this country to competition with other nations, we should relieve them from every disadvantage with respect to the articles they require for their raw materials."

That was the very principle which the paper manufacturers declared to have been violated in their case. There was this foreign tax imposed upon their raw material, which tax was adverse to their interests, and in favour of the foreign manufacturer, and yet the right hon. Gentleman deliberately did away with the equivalent, which was not a protection, but a compensation for the injury which Foreign Governments inflicted upon British industry. Probably the hon. Member for Rochdale would favour the House with his opinion upon the subject later in the debate, and would be able to say whether the policy of the right hon. Gentleman was not a direct violation of all that he had declared to be necessary. When the right hon. Gentleman addressed himself to the Customs question on the 6th of August, 1860, and also previously to that date, promises were held out, as perhaps they would be held out that night to the paper makers, that the rag duty was to be abolished.

Lord John Russell said in that House that, according to his reading of the treaty, there would be no further duty on rags, and the paper manufacturers were told by their friends, who went out into the lobby to see them, and to bring them the welcome intelligence, "Now you may go home; you are all right." The right hon. Gentleman also held out the same promise of redress. The paper makers endeavoured to impress on Members of that House, without distinction of party, that their case was a hard one, that they were treated exceptionally, and that if the country derived benefit from the French Treaty, they at least would be injured. Now, he charged the right hon. Gentleman with not having availed himself of the offer of the French Government, and not maintaining, even for one year longer, the Customs duty, which would have been the means of compelling Foreign Governments to do away with the obnoxious rag tax. In his speech on the 6th of August, 1860, the Chancellor of the Exchequer said—

> "The French Government have made known to us that they will not, if it is our desire, press upon us the immediate fulfilment of the stipulation in regard to paper."—[3 *Hansard*, clx. 709.]

But the Chancellor was apprehensive the "paper makers would suffer if this were delayed," and he added—

> "It is true humanity to let a man loose from being the victim of his own groundless alarms."—[*Ibid.* 711.]

The right hon. Gentleman said he was so confident in the energy, skill, and industry of the British trader that he would not accept the offer of the Emperor of the French. He scoffed at what he called the exaggerated fears and dismal forebodings of the paper makers, and said it was true humanity and the most merciful relief to free men from their mere fanciful chimeras. Statements were then made on the part of the trade in order to show the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the withdrawal of the Customs duty and the flooding of the British market with paper that was artificially cheapened, while paper manufactured here was made artificially dear, would be attended with fatal consequences. The Chancellor of the Exchequer would not believe the trade. At length, in 1861, the pressure was put so strongly on the right hon. Gentleman, that he yielded a Committee, which sat on the 2nd of July, and reported to the House on the 25th of the same month. That Committee reported to the following effect: they said—

> "That, under the circumstances under which the British manufacturer was placed, the most disastrous consequences would ensue, unless some steps were speedily taken to place him on terms of fair competition with those of the Continent. That the removal of the Excise duty will not place the English manufacturer in a position of equity with his Continental rivals so long as the export duties on rags remain in force. That the Committee therefore recommend that the British Government should continue strenuous exertions to effect the removal of all restrictions upon the exports of all paper makers' materials."

That was the recommendation of the Committee of that House, and up to this moment nothing had been done; or, if the Government had made any real efforts, no practical result had followed. The anticipations which were expressed in the strongest possible manner before that Committee, and which were also then supported by facts, had been realized up to this time to a most deplorable extent. The right hon. Gentleman made a speech in the present year, and in the course of that speech he referred to the paper trade, and to their alleged sufferings and fancied grievances. His conscience evidently was not easy; he felt that he had done a grievous wrong to a particular branch of industry; and so nervous was he about the matter, that although there was no actual necessity for introducing the question of the paper duty in his financial statement this year, the right hon. Gentleman referred on that occasion at great length to the paper trade. The right hon. Gentleman had, he believed, two letters in his pocket at that time. One of them was from a British paper maker, showing him, by facts and figures, what the deplorable result of his policy had been. The other was a communication from a gentleman whose statement he quoted to the House, and which excited the most extraordinary wonder among the trade. The right hon. Gentleman impressed upon the House that the paper makers did not understand their business; that they did not know what was good for them; that they were like all other men who had grown up under the enervating shadow of protection; that they were foolishly apprehensive of the struggle and competition of free trade; but that the very moment their energies were braced by a healthier atmosphere they conquered every difficulty, and succeeded in acquiring prosperity and independence. "And now," said the right hon. Gentleman, "to prove my case, I will give one important fact." That "important fact" rested on the authority of a gentleman whom he now knew, and about whom he would tell the House something—a gentleman who really did not understand practically what he was dealing with, and who, carried away by his own ideas of his wonderful discovery, had deluded himself and deceived the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The right hon. Gentleman, on the 7th of April, said—

> "His statement is this:—His mill [the mill of this gentleman or the company to which he belonged] is almost a new one. For the four months ending the 31st of October, 1863, he found that he made his paper at a cost of £57 per ton, and that commodity, made at such a cost, did not pay him. He did not complain; he joined in no agitation for the reimposition of the paper duty, or for other purposes, equally unattainable; but he and his partners set themselves to work to see what could be done by improvements in the processes of manufacture and by the more skilful and economical use of chemical agents, so essential in the manufacture of paper. The results, as they have been told me, were surprising indeed. In October, 1863, the firm had produced paper, as I have said, at a cost of £57 per ton; in December they produced at a cost of only £47, and at the present moment they were producing at a cost of £39 per ton; and this gentleman declares to me that the article now produced is better than what he produced last summer for £57 per ton. For my own part I cannot say I believe that the condition of the paper trade essentially depends upon the laws of foreign countries with regard to the export of rags. Those laws, no doubt, form an element, and no unimportant element, in the case of the paper makers, but I am convinced they would be ill-advised if they were taught to depend upon anything but their own energies."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxiv. 554-5.]

[The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Hear, hear!] The right hon. Gentleman cheered. Now he held in his hand an advertisement inserted in "Mr. Marsh's periodical sale, Thursday, the 5th of May, 1864." The right hon. Gentleman, it should be remembered, told the paper makers that in order to realize immediate fortunes, all they had to do was to follow the example of that wonderful discoverer. Well, if that gentleman had gone on as he said he had been doing, what would have been the result? Why, the shares of his company would have sold for 200 per cent premium; but what was the fact? They had been sold at 60 per cent discount. The glowing statement was made by the right hon. Gentleman on the 7th of April, and on the 5th of May the shares in that company were sold at over 60 per cent discount by public auction; and, more than that, they were not bought by the public, but by a member of the company. He held in his hand the prospectus of the company; but he did not think it necessary to mention names, either in the present case or in any other. However, he might say that the gentleman in question was known to some hon. Members. The prospectus stated that the object of the company was to take advantage of the repeal of the Excise duty on paper under circumstances that were peculiarly favourable. The capital of the company was £150,000, the whole of which, except £15,000 held in reserve, was paid up; thus £9 out of every £10 share had been called and paid. He had in his hand a copy of a note of the sale of fifteen shares in that company. The fifteen shares, at £9 each, had cost £135, and at the sale they fetched only £3 15*s.* each, and produced altogether but £55. What, then, did the House think of the statement paraded there at that table by the right hon. Gentleman, and sent forth throughout the United Kingdom—a statement, the object of which was, to dry up in the breast of every hon. Gentleman any sympathy he might have for an oppressed class of his fellow-subjects? He said that statement was a melancholy delusion; he would not go further than that. Four companies had been started under the auspices of the right hon. Gentleman. One of them was dead, another was in difficulties, a third had its shares sold at 60 per cent discount, and here were the facts relative to another. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman might have access to that document as well as he had. Here was a pretty state of things? A new mill, new energy, ample capital; and what was the result? Disappointment and disaster. This was what the directors stated. He belonged himself to some companies in his own city, and if, as chairman, he had to make such a statement, he should be inclined to leave his city as soon as he possibly could. Thank Heaven, it had never been his lot to read such a Report as that which he was now about to quote. This company was incorporated and started under the auspices of the right hon. Gentleman in March, 1860. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Under my auspices?] Mr. Maguire did not mean to say that the right hon. Gentleman contributed any solid coin to the company; he only meant that the right hon. Gentleman had invested in it in an imaginary—in a Parliamentary sense. The right hon. Gentleman had deluded, bewildered, and disappointed many, many in England, as he should prove, and he was sure the right hon. Gentleman was anxious to know the exact state of one of his pet companies. Here was the Report:—The company was called the East Lancashire Paper Mill Company, and

> "The Directors in presenting their Report for the half-year ending December 31, 1863, beg to state that, although in reference to the statement of accounts there appears to be a considerable loss in the working of your concern, yet, at the same time, the shareholders must bear in mind the increasing price of materials, without a corresponding increase in the price of paper, and which has necessarily been a cause of the amount of loss during the past half-year."

To commercial men it would appear rather strange that nothing was allowed for depreciation, or for bad debts. Here was the balance sheet: The first half-year there appeared a balance on the wrong side of £301 6*s.* 3*d.*, and the second half-year there was a balance also on the wrong side of £587 5*s.* 7½*d.*, making in one year, in consequence of the rag tax—in a case where there was ample capital, new machinery, and every modern improvement —a loss of £888 11*s.* 10½*d.* So much for this company. And now, as a matter not of justice to himself, a feeble advocate of a great cause, but to the paper makers of England, he earnestly implored attention to a few extracts from letters written by men smarting under a sense of wrong, and representing the disasters and misery that had overtaken them. He had the original documents in his possession, and would place them, in confidence, at the disposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, if he desired to verify the statements which he made. There were nearly forty letters in all, but he would only quote a few of them, without, of course, mentioning names, or even the county where the parties carried on their trade, for he did not wish to destroy the credit of men, many of whom were still struggling under desperate difficulties. He would only observe that nearly every county in England and in Scotland was represented in this appeal to the sympathy of the House. The paper trade had no alternative but to make an appeal to the House. [Mr. COBDEN dissented.] He begged the hon. Member for Rochdale to attend to the statements he was about to read, and then he would ask him to defend his policy, if he adhered to the principles of free trade, which he denied he had done in the case of the paper makers. The hon. Member would find that the case was, at least, deserving of his very deepest sympathy. The right hon. Gentleman up to the present moment

had denied the facts stated by the trade. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said there was no distress. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: No!] The right hon. Gentleman made a statement the other day which could have no other meaning. He said everything depended on themselves—that the foreign rag tax was nothing; all that was required was that they should be industrious and energetic. Did he not talk of imaginary grievances, of dismal pictures of fancied ruin? By every word that came from his lips the right hon. Gentleman had practically denied the existing state of things. Well, then, he asked the House of Commons, when were they to have an inquiry into the operation and result of the Chancellor's fatal policy? The paper trade was told to keep quiet and all would be right. Were they to make no movement till they were crushed to the very earth? Were they to make no demand on the sympathy of the House till forty or fifty of these respectable men were in the *Gazette*, and thousands of those whom they employed were beggars scattered over the face of the world? When were they to make their appeal if not now? No good had up to the present time resulted from the policy which had been sanctioned by the House; and were not those who suffered from that policy to proclaim their sufferings to the Government and to the country? Here was one statement—

> "Besides paper, we were the largest millboard makers in the —— of England, but in consequence of the free import of foreign millboards, while the foreign duty was kept on materials, we have been driven completely out of the market, so that this year we have not made a sheet. The foreign boards are much inferior to our make, but our customers say they cannot give our price when they can make the foreign boards answer the purpose at about half the price. To show that we are not alone in this department, we have just had a letter from a firm who made millboards, offering us their whole stock of utensils. Our net profits, after deducting interest on capital employed, were, in 1859, £1,000; capital employed, £17,000. During the next two years—in consequence of Mr. Gladstone's high eulogiums and our own expectations of the future prosperity of the paper trade, to be caused by the extra demand consequent on the abolition of the Excise duty—we could only work part of our own mill, owing to our making considerable alterations and additions in the building and machinery, so that our profits were necessarily smaller. When at full work with our extra new machinery and buildings we had this result: In 1861-2, profits, £40, capital employed, £31,000; 1862-3, loss, £1,375, 8*s.* 8*d.* Since then we have tried all in our power, by increasing our turn-out, and running day and night, to lessen our working expenses per ton of paper produced, and we are sorry to state with very little better success. If

these are not proofs enough for any man that the foreign treaty is an abominable curse to the trade, we are at a loss to know what could be. If we were put on a free trade level with the foreigners, we should not be the least afraid to meet all the Continent in the market; but under this vile protection to the foreigner we can see nothing at all before us but utter ruin, or to sell our works at any sacrifice, while we have the mortification of knowing that our opponents are getting rich at our expense."

Here was another letter, in which two cases were stated—

"I am very sorry to have to mention that my own mill, which I have had for thirty-nine years, is closed. My reason for closing it is, the utter impossibility of making a profit while foreign paper is allowed to be sent to this country, free of all restrictions, to compete with ours. My mill, which was engaged in the manufacture of printing papers, and upon which I had only just laid out £5,000, has been closed three years, and I have sustained a great loss thereby. I am sorry for the poor people I was compelled to dismiss, for they had very hard work to get occupation, and the tradespeople here suffered through the closing of the mill. You will be sorry to learn that the men at ——mill are under notice to leave. The proprietors find it useless to keep on, foreign paper driving them out of the market. I hope that the Government will really do us justice. Three years must surely be a sufficient time to show that the Government measure respecting our trade has totally failed, and that it is exceedingly unjust and impolitic that our property should be sacrificed and many driven to a state of absolute ruin."

Here was another most important statement—

"At the beginning of last year I found trade exceedingly bad, and I determined to stop one of my mills for a time (finding other employment for my principal hands); and during a stoppage of four months I had the mill put into thorough repair, introducing several modern improvements to economize labour, facilitate the process, and generally to cheapen the production, and as a practical man, I am justified in saying these objects were carried out. I then started the mill again, and up to the end of the year—eight months—I made weekly an increased quantity of better paper, and, therefore, cheapened the production; but my eight months' balance showed a loss of £88. In bringing out that result I have carried to capital account all new machinery and improvements that cannot fairly be placed to working expenses. Now, the entire cause of this ruinous state of things is the high price I have to pay for material, and the low price I am compelled to sell my manufacture at. It is my intention to persevere for another year, in the hope that justice will be done us by the Government; if not, I will have no alternative but close the mill and discharge the workpeople. The paper I have made is for the cheap press."

Here was another case—

"This is a brief statement of my case:—In the year 1862 my actual loss was £100; the year ending 1863 it was £130. The current year, I fear, will be much worse than the two preceding ones. . . . I have been a good deal on short time during the last two years for want of orders. My rent is £260 per annum, and as soon as my actual loss amounts to that sum I will be compelled to shut down altogether."

Here is another case—

"Mine is a very small concern, but it has been all that I wanted up to the time of the repeal of the duty; since then I have not been able to live by my trade, and if something is not done at once to put us in a fair position with the makers on the Continent I must give up altogether, as the little capital I had to work with is gone."

In a letter dated June 4, another gentleman said—

"Finding in the practical working of paper making under the removal of the home duty and the continuance of the foreign duty on rags that a most severe loss would attend our continuance of the manufacture, we relinquish the trade, submitting to the loss entailed upon premises and plant rather than carry it on to our ruin."

Another writer says—

"In reply to the inclosed letter, received this morning, I beg to say that I have given up the paper trade for the last twelve months, as the trade was so bad it was not worth my notice."

Again, another—

"I am one that is nearly ruined with what Mr. Cobden calls 'free trade.' I only want free trade, if I knew how to get it. My mill is now standing, and has been so ten days. I cannot make printing paper pay, and in a new mill, too, only four years built, to be ready by the time the duty was taken off; but I expected free trade in rags as well as in paper. I did not expect all on one side. The old mill was paying here five years ago, but the duty on rags cost me £120 per week more than the same material costs the foreigner, and I have to sell paper against him in this market: The kind I make is now 2¼*d.* to 2½*d.* per lb. less than when the duty was on, or say a disadvantage to me of ¾*d.* or 1*d.* per lb., and rags higher. My last stock-taking showed a loss of nearly £400 in three months, in addition to the rent, interest, and use of £15,000 worth of machinery; and still I am told to work on until it gets right. If something is not done it will work me out of my mill, and all I have been working for for the last eighteen years, and all will be lost in what is called free trade. I only want real free trade, and if I have that I will not complain. If nothing is done in the House to give us fair or free trade, I would be glad to take half the cost of my mill, and to get out of the paper trade."

All these letters, with one exception, were written in the present year. He had another letter, which he would condense into the following facts. The writer had two mills, one of which was entirely idle, and the other, with two machines, only working half time. He was a loser of several thousands of pounds, in consequence of the present state of things, but he was holding on in the delusive hope that something would be done by the Government in the shape of a correcting and mitigating measure. There were in the paper trade enthusiastic free traders, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer relied upon the evidence of such men, when he asserted that Mr. Wrigley, Mr. Evans, and Mr. Bruce, and other princes of paper manufacture, did not really represent the trade—that these gentlemen were only making political capital for themselves. But he fully relied upon the men who gave opinions contrary to the assertions which had been put forth by those Gentlemen to whom he had alluded. He (Mr. Maguire) had evidence from that quarter. He found it stated by a firm of enthusiastic free traders—

> "That having no fear of the repeal of the duties, they expended in new works from £20,000 to £30,000 'with every newest invention and plant known to the world,' are 'woefully disappointed,' the result being the very opposite of their sanguine anticipations. They now think that 'Free Trade has its limits.'"

Another firm wrote in somewhat the same spirit. They also had been the victims of the Chancellor's eloquent imaginings.

> "They go on to say that 'yielding to the impulse,' they laid out £6,000 in extensions and improvements; no result but disappointment, materials dearer, and prices lower.' Are 'now fairly at a standstill, not knowing how to live.'"

He could show that this was a question affecting country gentlemen who were owners of mill property, and to prove that he would read a few lines from a letter dated from a London club—

> "Although not a paper manufacturer I am a sufferer from having paper-mill property—namely, two mills unlet, entirely from the unsatisfactory state of the trade. They are eligibly situated both as regards situation for carriage and supply of the purest spring water. I had made all preliminary arrangements with a firm of substance for manufacturing fine paper, but on account of the unsatisfactory state of the law respecting rags they declined embarking in the business."

He would only quote one other English authority, and that was a letter which did credit to the gentleman who wrote it. He could not give the name, but it was one which might be proclaimed upon the housetop with honour to the writer of it. The letter, dated on the previous day, said—

> "Without giving names, you are at liberty to state that a (my) paper mill, having therein invested capital to the amount of between £40,000 and £50,000, has for the last twelve months been quite unremunerative—not made one penny of profits—and that the said mills would have been closed in the spring of 1863 had not the proprietors been desirous to prevent some 300 workpeople from being thrown out of employment in the midst of a town whose inhabitants were out of work and in distress owing to the then existing cotton famine."

He would next quote one or two cases from Scotland, a land where energy and industry were known to exist, and where economy and prudence in business was as distinguishing a feature in the national character as was hospitality in social intercourse. One Scotch manufacturer wrote—

> ". . . . I am a maker of wrapping papers, and, prior to 1861, was kept in full and regular work at fair prices, leaving me a profit at from 10 to 12½ per cent. Since 1861, though using great personal exertion to keep my trade, I have been necessitated to put my mill on half-time, and can with much difficulty, and at unremunerative prices, keep on even at this reduced make. From various causes our material has got scarce and very dear, while competition from home and from abroad has reduced the value of paper. When in London, three weeks ago, an old customer of mine showed me a paper he was buying from a Dutch mill at £19 a ton free in London. This is a sort I used to make in considerable quantity and to profit, but cannot now touch without serious loss, not mere absence of profit. Yet give me free access to some market for material, and I know I could beat the Dutchman in his paper and price by 50*s*. and have a fair profit. He, however, has advantage over me of £5 per ton export duty on the material, being, on the 30 to 33 cwt. necessary to produce a ton of paper, some £8. No skill will avail to overcome such a difference."

This was from one of those self-reliant men who had been spoken of, and he recommended the succeeding words to the consideration of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The writer went on to say—

> "For myself, I have not called out till I was hurt, and that most severely. I do not ask more than full and fair free trade in the material as well as in the paper produced, and I am content to compete with any; with full confidence I can keep my former customers from continuing to go abroad for cheap paper, while I shall employ more hands, and be more prosperous and contented, which at present I am not."

Another Scotch manufacturer, who paid a rental of £1,000 a year, said—

> "He could not work half-time, or shut for a time, as great loss would be the result. When his loss reaches £2,000 a year he will shut up. On the production of one machine he made some years ago £937. Last year the produce of the same machine sold at a dead loss of £836. The pressure every day becomes worse."

The only other Scotch case which he would mention was one that was described in the following terms:—

> "In 1856 they purchased a mill that produced an average of eighteen to twenty tons a week. In 1859 and 1860 had overcome the first difficulties, and were beginning to prosper, but the Repeal of the Customs duty and the retention of the duty on the export of rags were too much to con-

tend against, and in 1862 the firm was in the *Gazette*. The hard and long struggle ended in utter ruin to the proprietors, and 250 people were thrown out of employment, many of whom are still suffering. The property (in 1856) was worth £50,000, and remains unsold to this day."

It would be rather a queer thing if, being an Irishman, he neglected to speak of the wrongs of his own country. He would assure the right hon. Gentleman that he had himself entertained the most sanguine hopes that the repeal of the Excise duty upon paper, of course retaining the Customs duty, would have resulted in advantage to Ireland, where labour was plentiful, and where beautiful sites and sweet water abounded. He had been so carried away by the prospects that he saw opened up for the trade, which was so peculiarly suited to Ireland, that he would at that time have undertaken the responsibility of inducing his friends to join him in starting a company to compete with Englishmen in manufacture of paper. Thank God he had not touched it. Belfast was the seat of a great and flourishing industry. The men of Belfast were equal in energy and enterprize to the men of Manchester or the men of any part in England or Scotland. He had a letter from Mr. Archer, of Belfast, whose name he had no delicacy in mentioning, because that gentleman had left the trade. Mr. Archer said—

> "We were in hopes of being able to dispose of the concern, but had no offer from a purchaser, as no one seems inclined to go into the trade in its present state. We had, therefore, no alternative but to shut down our mill and dismiss our hands, of whom we used to employ about 140. We have closed for about six months, and the sorts of paper we made were 'long elephant' for room paper and printings. Although we had every advantage of cheap labour and an excellent concern, we found ourselves totally unable to compete in the London market with the Belgian and French paper manufactured of rags, bought at a price made artificially so much lower than ours, by the heavy export duties which Foreign Governments impose for the benefit of their own paper makers. Two other paper makers in our neighbourhood gave up the business—one of them having been made a bankrupt. It is most galling to us to be obliged to keep our mill idle, and pay the rent of the water-power, besides losing all benefit from the capital we had expended in buildings and machinery."

An unfortunate gentleman wrote to say that his father was now out of the paper trade, having lost his reason owing to a failure in business consequent on the repeal of the paper duties. Early in the Session the right hon. Member for the University of Dublin referred to a letter from Mr. Greer, who was a Protestant gentleman from the North of Ireland, who had established himself within some miles of Cork. Mr. Greer was a model of energy, ability, and industry. At one time — that was before the repeal of the Customs duty on foreign paper—he employed 300 hands in two mills, and competed on fair terms with the English manufacturers, so that even during the fearful years of famine the district round his works was like an oasis in the desert. The people employed in these mills were happy, healthy, and contented, while around them on every side there was nothing but misery and despair. Now, however, Mr. Greer had been obliged to dismiss half his people, many of whom had relapsed into abject poverty, while others had emigrated. This, then, was the present actual condition of the paper trade as it was affected by foreign taxation. So far, at all events, he (Mr. Maguire) had not indulged in mere fanciful declamation, but had given facts enough, he hoped, to arrest the attention of the British Parliament. If they waited for ten years more, there would be a larger list of casualties, a longer list of killed and wounded. But Government should bestir themselves at once, for Parliament would never see a meritorious body of men and a large industry sacrificed to carry out what was a hollow mockery of the great principle of free trade. It might be said, and had been said by the right hon. Gentleman, "The British manufacturers have exported largely; how, then, can they be suffering?" But what did the right hon. Gentleman call a large export? Was one-fourteenth of their produce a large export? The paper manufacturers produced paper to the value of £7,000,000 a year, and, according to the Board of Trade, they exported £500,000 worth of that produce. Mr. Wrigley said he was exporting scores and scores of tons of paper, in order to find a new market and break new ground. Men of large capital were obliged to keep their hands and their mills at full work. At present they would not give in, but he had heard men with £200,000 or £300,000 embarked in the trade say, "The time must come when we also must be crushed." The right hon. Gentleman would say, "Oh, but you now have new materials." And an hon. and gallant Friend of his had said to him, "Why, you can get any amount of raw material in India." No doubt of it; but if large quantities of new material were introduced, the result would be to reduce the price of rags; and if the price of rags was reduced, the British manufacturer got no benefit, standing then in exactly the same relative position as before with his rivals in foreign countries. The existing engine of tyranny was so admirably constructed that neither the rise nor the fall in the price of rags was of advantage to the British manufacturer. As a homely illustration, he would take the four wheels in a carriage. Did the House ever see the hind wheel overtake the fore wheel? If the price of rags was low here, it was proportionally low in Belgium, France, and Prussia, with this advantage to the foreign manufacturers — that, behind the protection hedge afforded by their custom-houses, the price was lower to them by the amount of the export duty than it stood at in the English market. High or low, it was all the same benefit to the protected foreigner, and all the same injury to the British victim of so-called free trade. Where, then, was the special benefit to the British maker — so far as regarded price — of introducing new raw materials? Another question asked was, "Why cannot rags be as low here as they are in countries where this protective system exists?" The answer, of course, was, "Because we have an open market." When the Americans could buy here to advantage, they took large quantities of rags from this country; at other times they purchased in the continental markets. Thus the price here was kept up to the price of foreign rags *plus* the duty. Take the waste from jute as an instance how the system worked. Jute was imported here from India free of duty. A Frenchman came here and took away his jute free of duty. In France it was spun, and sent to Dundee free of duty. But the paper manufacturer at Dundee, who wanted the refuse of this jute from France in order to make his paper, must pay duty upon it at the French custom house. This was our free trade. And what was the opinion of foreigners respecting what we had done for our paper makers? Mr. Potter, a large manufacturer, was travelling some time since in the North of Spain, and fell in with a French gentleman, who said to him, "Your new British legislation seems very favourable to us foreigners." He said that he was going to join two relatives, one of whom knew something about paper making, and that they meant to embark £20,000 apiece in establishing a mill in the South of France; and he added, "We always thought you a clever people, but now our wonder is that you can be such utter fools." This was the opinion of foreigners, who, being themselves protected, were taking every advantage of our blunders, were adopting every improvement in mills and machinery which they could find in this country, and were then sending their paper here to deprive our paper makers of their legitimate profits. The Chancellor of the Exchequer boasted that not only were the six farthings of the abolished Excise duty given to the consumer, but three farthings additional. Whence, then, did these three farthings come? They came out of the trade—out of the capital, the industry, the brain, the energies of these men; but this was not a thing of which a British Government ought to boast. The right hon. Gentleman denied that the manufacturers had suffered. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I never denied it.] Did not the right hon. Gentleman say that no harm would result to them from his measures? Did he not say that they were like all the men who fancied that they would become victims to free trade, and that they would be all right by-and-bye? Did he not practically deny that they had suffered when he said in effect some time back that their complaints were not justified by the facts? Well, if the House was still incredulous about the facts, let them grant a Committee. The paper manufacturers had been mocked at in the House of Commons, and derided in Downing Street, and the country was under the belief, which had been expressed by the President of the Board of Trade, that they were manufacturing such large quantities of paper, and were sending such large quantities out of the country, that they could not be badly off. The fact was, however, that all classes of the trade were suffering—that the small manufacturers were being driven into bankruptcy, and that large men were working without profit, or at a loss; and if the same policy were persisted in for the next half-dozen years, very little would be heard of the paper trade in England, and the Government might then make the noble and patriotic boast that they had handed over a large and valuable native industry to foreigners, who had grown rich at our expense. The right hon. Gentleman might say, "What is your policy?" He admitted that this was a very embarrassing question when asked a short time ago; but it was not his business to point out a remedy, for he was only a private Member, not an organized Opposition. The injury done to the trade had not been inflicted by him, but against his earnest and repeated remonstrances. It was the Government who had done the wrong—it was for the Government to find the remedy. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had no more zealous supporter of his treaty policy than he was. He gave the right hon. Gentleman the fullest credit for what he had accomplished in concert with the hon. Member for Rochdale. They had linked the two nations by bonds which were stronger than any other bonds could be; and as long as France and England were united by that mutual interest which sprang from a free interchange of trade, we might diminish our war expenditure, and lessen the number of our iron-clads. The Chancellor of the Exchequer might afford to stand up in that House and admit he had made a blunder in this case. The hon. Member for Rochdale might also afford to stand up and say, "I am the author of free trade; I have conferred blessings on millions of my fellow-countrymen, but I have made a serious mistake in this individual case." The paper manufacturers asked for some redress for their wrongs. He was not in a position to say what the remedy ought to be; but the Government had done them the wrong, and the Government ought to give them an opportunity of proving their case, and ought then to provide a remedy. If the Government did not do this, the evil would grow to such gigantic and appalling dimensions that the time would come when that House would either hurl the present Administration from office, or compel them to obey the will of a generous and just Parliament. He had concluded his task. He asked in the name of those men to be heard before a Committee of that House, in order that they might vindicate their honour and character in the face of Parliament and the country, and prove they had a case which entitled them to redress from the Legislature.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the present position of the Paper Manufacture of Great Britain and Ireland, with respect to Foreign Taxation."—(*Mr. Maguire.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, the Question of the paper trade has for a considerable time passed out of my hands, and is in the Department of my right hon. Friend near me (Mr. M. Gibson), who will be prepared to state his views on the subject. But the House will not be surprised if I rise to make a few observations on the speech of the hon. Gentleman. Considering that so much of that speech has been addressed to myself, I should hardly have thought it consistent with due respect to the hon. Gentleman to have remained silent after his remarks. I am, however, bound to say that I cannot enter into a discussion of this question, even on a limited scale, without stating that the hon. Gentleman must be responsible for the result of this debate. As far as Her Majesty's Government are concerned, they have no objection to any inquiry which the House may think fit to direct; but it is my duty to state what I think of the nature, tendency, and result of discussions such as this, and at present I wish, in the interest of the paper makers, to enter on this discussion under a protest. The discussion of this question is raised by themselves, and therefore the Government will not be responsible for any bad results which on their showing may arise from having their affairs debated here. The period at which the hon. Gentleman makes this Motion renders it difficult for one to understand what it is he wishes to do. He speaks on the 19th of July, after the Appropriation Bill has been introduced, and, of course, he cannot expect that a Select Committee can be appointed to undertake such an inquiry as he proposes and report during the present Session.

MR. MAGUIRE: I shall be quite satisfied if the Government will state that, at the opening of next Session, they will accede to the appointment of a Committee without one word of discussion.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: That is an explicit statement, and I will endeavour to meet it in a manner that will, I trust, be satisfactory to the hon. Gentleman. I do not think it right that any pledge should be given as to the particular course to be taken at a future and somewhat distant time, because, in the meantime, circumstances may occur to render such a course unnecessary; but I have distinctly stated that, whether at that time, at this time, or at any other time, the Government have no wish or desire to prevent any inquiry which the House may think fit to direct; and it is in that spirit, next Session, we shall meet the proposal of the hon. Gentleman. And he makes a stipulation—that the Committee should be appointed without any discussion whatever—to which I have no objection whatever. I think it will be much better for the truth of the case, and for the interests of the parties concerned, that it should be so; and if it should be the wish of the House to have an inquiry they will not find the Government setting themselves against it. Having said so much as to an inquiry, I proceed to notice the remarks of the hon. Gentleman. He says that in 1853 Mr. James Wilson defined the penny Customs duty not as a protection to the paper manufacturer but as an equivalent for the duty on rags; and he says I endorsed that definition. It is difficult to speak from memory of an occurrence which took place eleven years ago; but subject to that reservation, I beg to say that the penny Customs duty proposed by me as Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Earl of Aberdeen's Government was proposed not because we thought it a just compensation for the duty on rags, but because we thought it right to proceed step by step downwards in our transition from a high rate of duty to a state of free trade, and because we thought there was a plea at that time for a reduction of the duty as long as the principle of a Customs duty was not brought in question. But do not let it be supposed that ever there was any recognition of the proposition which has been advanced by the hon. Gentleman. Mr. James Wilson is not here to speak for himself, but I am, and I state that the duty of a penny was proposed entirely on grounds of policy, and without any pledge such as the hon. Gentleman imagines being given in 1853. Then the hon. Gentleman says we have departed from the principle of free trade and of Sir Robert Peel—that principle being that you should not seek to abolish protection for the British manufacturer, and expose him to competition without giving him a free use of the raw material of his manufacture. Now, the hon. Gentleman has fallen into and used language here which is calculated grossly to mislead. What does he mean by free trade? Does he mean to say that we in this country are to base our policy on the principle of free trade, leaving other nations to follow our example as soon as they may see the advantages of doing so, but not depriving our own people of the advantages of free trade because the people of other countries are not sufficiently advanced in the principles of economical science to follow the same policy? Are we to do that, or are we to remain inactive till every other Government abolishes protective duties, and every other country comes up to the same standard of economical knowledge? The principle of Sir Robert Peel was that, as far as the Government could do so, in subjecting the British manufacturer to competition with the manufactures of other nations, they should give them every advantage of raw material; but I challenge the hon. Member to produce from Sir Robert Peel's speeches any statement that free trade in this country was to wait for the halting advances of other countries. Are our people to be deprived of the advantages of free trade, and subject to the evils of protection, because other Governments wont do justice to the people whose affairs they manage? The hon. Gentleman states that I informed the House the duty on rags had been repealed in Italy. That is not quite correct. What I did on the occasion to which the hon. Member refers was to quote from a Parliamentary paper a document in the possession of the House. I believe the inference drawn from that paper was incorrect; but I never pretended to give information not in the possession of the House.

MR. MAGUIRE: You first expressed a doubt; but subsequently, when answering questions, you said, "I had a doubt earlier in the evening, but now I have no doubt. I state it as a fact."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: No, I did not.

MR. MAGUIRE: I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I made the statement from reference to a document in the possession of the House. No information on the subject was given by me as a Minister. The hon. Gentleman has also referred to certain figures which I quoted as supplied to me by a gentleman in the paper trade. Those figures went to show a diminution in the cost of manufacture, which I myself described as surprising; but, when I gave those figures to the House, I stated that they were open to others to examine, because the gentleman had kindly allowed me to make use of his name. I am sure the hon. Gentleman will do me the justice to say I quoted those figures as they were given to me. [Mr. MAGUIRE: Hear!] And that they were not presented on my authority; but I must be permitted to observe that, whether they were good or whether they were bad, he has not met them. He only says that in the month of May the shares of the company were at a discount of 61 per cent; but he has not stated what they were at before those figures were made up.

MR. MAGUIRE: The company had not begun then.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: When did the first sale of shares begin, and at what price? The hon. Gentleman has overlooked the fact that though they might have been at a discount of 60 per cent in May, before then they might have been at a greater discount still.

MR. MAGUIRE: Why, it was a new company.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Is there no such thing in this country as the shares of a company being at 60 per cent discount?

MR. BUXTON: It cannot be a very flourishing company.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I never said it was very flourishing. Let the matter be examined on its merits, but I only say that the hon. Gentleman has not disposed of the case made out by those figures. The hon. Gentleman said he had given us a great many facts. I may divide the hon. Gentleman's speech into particular statements in the nature of facts—which I do not question, proceeding as they do from him — and general descriptions of the state of the paper trade; but particular statements of facts are one thing, and general descriptions are another. If I complain of anything in the speech of the hon. Member, it is of his repeated and pertinacious assertions that I have always denied the existence of distress in the paper trade. I will take the liberty of quoting what I really did say in my Financial Statement on this point. The language I then used was this—

> "I am very far from representing that the state of the paper making trade is at present one of the prosperity in which we should all desire to see it, because it is affected—I think and hope for the time only—by very serious drawbacks."

The hon. Gentleman, therefore, has done me injustice by his repeated assertion that I denied that the paper makers had suffered. But that is only a secondary matter. The statements of the hon. Member which are material refer entirely, not to the condition of the trade generally, but to that of a particular class or particular persons in the trade. That is no proof of the languishing condition of the trade generally. [Mr. MAGUIRE: I might have quoted fifty or sixty cases.] Well, but they are not the whole trade. As far as I was able to follow him, it appears to me that the statements of the hon. Gentleman referred to one particular class of paper makers—the makers of printing papers of middle and ordinary descriptions, which are the papers, undoubtedly, that have been brought into sharp competition with the foreign article. The hon. Gentleman jumps a great deal too fast to his conclusion when he shows a distress among certain paper makers in one particular department of the trade, and then thinks he has proved that the paper trade generally is in a ruinous condition. The hon. Gentleman says, that if we go on as we are for half-a-dozen years we shall have nothing to do except to lament over the ruin of a once flourishing trade. Is that statement borne out by the facts? I do not deny that there exists great distress in the trade; I do not deny that particular branches of the trade are suffering from severe pressure; but it is what happens to all trades in the stage of transition from a state of high protection to that of unrestricted competition with the foreigner. As regards the foreign duty on the export of rags, though it has been enormously and mischievously—for the interests of the paper makers—exaggerated, yet I do not deny that their case is a hard one, and that it is the duty of the Government to endeavour to obtain a remedy, if possible. The hon. Gentleman says that the ruin of the paper trade is that to which we are proceeding, but I say that, though our information is limited and imperfect at present, and though the Government have not the means of stating the case so well as the paper makers, that statement is confuted by the figures on our table. If the paper trade, as a whole, is a dying trade, how can the hon. Gentleman account for the fact that the number of paper makers has ceased to diminish? He says that the paper makers are becoming bankrupt, but if that general statement be a true one it must be represented in the returns we have before us of the number of paper makers. Why has not the hon. Gentleman met the figures I gave in my Financial Statement? Why has he not met the statement that whereas before the repeal of the paper duty the number of paper makers in this country appears to have been steadily and rather rapidly diminishing, the repeal has arrested that diminution. In 1838 there were 525 paper makers in this country, and in 1860 that number had fallen to 384. If the paper trade is on its road to ruin, I ask the hon. Gentleman to explain how it is that rapid diminution in the number of paper makers has been arrested? The hon. Gentleman then referred to the exports, and he says that a fourteenth part of the whole production is no great amount to be exported. But is it not somewhat remarkable that that fourteenth part is sent by the British manufacturer into neutral markets, where it has to meet the Belgian, German, French, and other manufacturers, and yet, notwithstanding that the trade, as we are told, is in a ruinous condition, the hon. Gentleman himself admits that this proportion is exported? He omits, however, altogether the strong point of the case. What is material is not merely the assertion that some portion of the paper manufactured here is exported into neutral markets, but that since the repeal of the duty that portion has greatly increased. In 1859 we exported of paper and paperhangings 115,000 cwt., and in 1864 190,000 cwt. That increase must mean something. Does it mean bankrupt makers, mills deserted, trade going to ruin, or does it mean more hands employed, more capital invested, more mills, or larger mills at work? That is the second question I propose to the hon. Gentleman for his consideration. Another point which the hon. Gentleman has not met is the immense increase in the importation of materials for paper making. His ingenious argument that the British paper maker stands between the American on one side and the foreigner on the other is no answer at all to the figures which I have given before, and which I will repeat. In 1859 we imported of materials for paper making 115,000 cwt., and in 1864 731,000 cwt. Does the hon. Gentleman think he has stated the case of the paper makers when he has overlooked a state of facts such as this? What has become of those 600,000 tons of new material? Have they been kept in warehouses, or have they not been sent into the market and made up, causing the employment of additional industry and increased capital? [Mr. MAGUIRE: But without a profit.] There, the hon. Gentleman goes on chanting the same ancient strain we have heard in all these cases of the removal of protection. It was just the same with shipbuilding when we repealed the Navigation Laws. When we pointed out that shipbuilding did not diminish we were told that it was done without a profit, that there were continual bankruptcies, but that new men came in so ignorant and so foolish as to go on wasting their money on business which yielded them no profit. I must say, therefore, that I am not at all prepared to join with the hon. Member in the dismal anticipations he has raised of the ruin of the paper trade. I submit myself to further information and correction when further information may be forthcoming; but I say that the figures which I have quoted—though not absolutely demonstrative—are a great deal more powerful, and to the purpose, as regards the general state of the trade than anything he has produced on the other side. The hon. Gentleman says that it belongs to the Government to propose a policy in this case, and to discover a remedy for the condition of the paper trade. If we say anything about improvement of processes and about the trade adapting itself to altered circumstances, and endeavouring to meet increased competition by cheaper methods, and by the more effectual application of labour and skill, we are always told that we are heartlessly exulting in the miseries of our fellow-countrymen. I will not, therefore, enter into that line of discussion, but I will enter into the remedies which have been proposed by the paper makers themselves. One was that there should be paid out of the Consolidated Fund to the paper makers a sum equal to the estimated sum they have had to pay in the price of rags brought into this country from abroad. That is a proposal, I think, which will never be made from the place in which I stand, either by myself or any other person who may succeed me; and if any Government were bold enough to make it, I do not think the House of Commons would entertain it. Another proposition was to reimpose the Customs duties on the importation of paper to the extent of 1*d.* per lb. In my opinion, that measure would be in the long run probably mischievous to the paper makers themselves, and inevitably unjust to the consumer, and therefore I do not think it is a remedy which will ever be applied. The third remedy is to make appeals to Foreign Governments to remove the export duty on rags. Practically that may be taken to mean appeals to the Government of France. Undoubtedly it is the duty of the Government to endeavour to induce Foreign Governments to remove, if possible, if not to reduce, their duty on the export of rags, and we have at all times endeavoured to obtain such a concession. The hon. Gentleman says that we have had no success; and if that were the fact, it is probable that the barren and fruitless agitation constantly carried on in this country by a large number of paper makers has been the main cause of that want of success. The hon. Member thinks himself entitled to assume that those who sit on these Benches are no friends of the paper makers. But I must say that the hon. Gentleman has no right to make any such assumption. I entirely repudiate the accusations which he has brought against us; and while admitting that he is doing what he thinks best for the paper makers, while doing him that justice which he refuses to do to us, I tell him that it is he that is their enemy, and that he is taking a course which is most injurious to the paper manufacturers of this country. The hon. Gentleman says that the foreigner reads what takes place here. What does the foreign paper maker read? Why, he reads that men of high character in this House say that the English manufacturers are beaten out of the market by the high export duty on rags. But the foreign paper makers are not so blind as not to see what their interest is, and the natural result is to induce them to form a combination for the purpose of maintaining the export duty. I think, therefore, that it is their friends—sincere, no doubt, but mistaken — who have been the greatest enemies to the home paper makers. I think the language which the British Government, in dealing with this export duty, would naturally use towards a Foreign Government would be, "If we are going to have a real interchange of advantages, justice demands that you should take off this duty." But the argument of justice does not always in this wicked world carry that force which ought to belong to it, and, consequently, we must say that the argument as to the effect of the export duty has been monstrously exaggerated. No doubt the success of the trade depends in a considerable degree, but for all that in a diminishing degree, on the price of rags. In many cases paper is made without any admixture of rags whatever. In point of fact this cry of the paper makers has about it a good deal of the character of a factitious cry, and is almost suggestive of some policy which is not on the surface. How that is I am not going to say, but I am bound to state that the importance of the question has been immensely exaggerated. At the same time we admit that there is a hardship upon the British paper makers which, in common justice, ought to be removed. The hon. Member says that I made promises; but I did so in strictly limited and cautious words in the financial statement of the present year to this effect — that we were expressly authorized to hope that concessions would be made by the Government of France with regard to the export duty upon rags. Well, on that point, great progress has been made, and I am bound to say that even within two or three weeks a measure on the subject might have been adopted but for the Motion of the hon. Gentleman. Whether that Motion will admit of such a measure being adopted or not I cannot say; but the hon. Member must see that what is good for the goose is good for the gander. If the export duty on rags from France be a disadvantage to the British manufacturer, it must be a corresponding advantage to the French paper maker, and all those speeches and debates which tend to give a factitious importance to the subject tend also to encourage the protected trades in foreign countries to band themselves together for the purpose of maintaining the duty. I do not wish to enter into that subject because I am afraid that by so doing I should only be increasing and not diminishing the obstacles in the way of a reasonable arrangement; nor is it necessary to do so, as we have no practical issue at present before the House. I have frankly contested the statements of the hon. Member. I have frankly admitted that there is considerable distress in particular branches of the trade. I have stated distinctly that there is no disposition on the part of the Government to oppose themselves to any general wish for inquiry which may be entertained by the House — not now, for that is out of the question, but at some future time. At the same time I have thought it but fair, candid, and honest, to say with regard to the parties interested, that I am firmly convinced it would be much better for them to let this matter remain for a while in silence, inasmuch as I do not think the result of this Motion can be anything else than that Her Majesty's Government should make renewed representations to Foreign Governments—representations which it would have been our duty to have made of ourselves, and in that case perhaps with as much probability of success.

Mr. SURTEES said, that after the statement made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, which he had heard with much pleasure, he did not think it necessary to offer any remarks upon the question.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he did not see much good in fighting over again battles which had been already fought on a much larger scale; nor did he think it wise to ask for a Committee of this kind unless there were good grounds for believing that the decision to which the House had come, after long debate and minute consideration, had been erroneous. Moreover he did not think that the hon. Gentleman had made out his case. He rested it very much on the failure of a particular company, the prospectus of which he had exhibited to the House. He had, moreover, read letters written in this year, to prove the destitution of the trade. Yet the company, to which he had alluded, had been formed in 1863. This was a year after the change had been made, and nearly two years after the country were pretty well aware that such a change was imminent. The promoters said their object was to "take advantage of the impulse given to the paper manufacture by the new legislation," and that they were about to "commence operations under circumstances peculiarly favourable." This then was the opinion of the paper makers in June, 1863. Had the trade been utterly ruined in one year? The hon. Gentleman said that this company had failed. But they were not merely a company for making paper, but also for manufacturing manure, for which object they had increased their capital and erected large works. With two such different objects they had very little chance of success. The hon. Gentleman was favourable to the removal of the Excise duty, but held that the Customs duties should have been retained in order to prevent foreign competition. But the effect of that would be to put money into the pocket of the British manufacturer at the expense of the consumer, so that the hon. Gentleman was not fighting the battle of the nation, but of a small fraction of the community. When the manufacturers had to pay an Excise duty, as well as the equivalent Customs duty, they admitted (in the prospectus) that "large fortunes had been made. When both Excise and Customs duties had been removed the balance was not disturbed, and large fortunes might still be expected to be realized. But there was a duty on the export of foreign rags. The effect of that was that rags were increased in price to the British manufacturer, above what they would be if there were no such duty; but it was found that though there was an increase in the price of rags still there was a large margin of profit. Notwithstanding that export duty, our manufacturers had shown that paper could be exported from England with profit, and that they could compete successfully in foreign markets. Under these circumstances he was astonished that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had promised to agree to the nomination of a Select Committee. He was still more astonished that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should have pledged himself to do so next year, when perhaps the same Parliament would not be assembled within these walls.

Colonel DICKSON said, he thought that no one who had given an unprejudiced attention to the subject would agree with the noble Lord, for if ever a case for inquiry and redress had been made out it was by the temperate and able speech of the hon. Member for Dungarvan. He regretted that only one Irish representative had hitherto spoken a word for the distressed class whose claims had been urged by the hon. Member. The Chancellor of the Exchequer claimed credit for his frankness in dealing with the subject; but he thought he had never heard a case argued with less frankness. The right hon. Gentleman said that the hon. Member was inflicting injury on the paper maker by proclaiming abroad the knowledge of the injury of which he complained. But any injury done by the hon. Member for Dungarvan could not approach to that inflicted by the right hon. Gentleman in showing the foreign paper maker, as he had done that night, how to utilize the complaints of the English paper makers and turn them to the greatest advantage. The great principle of the late Sir Robert Peel, as was admitted by the right hon. Gentleman, was to secure for the people access to the raw material. That was all that was asked for in that case. The right hon. Gentleman said that only one class of paper makers suffered, but all must be more or less injured by the present state of things, and all would be benefited if they could get their rags from other countries on the same terms as the foreigner. The right hon. Gentleman charged the hon. Member with having embarked in a barren and fruitless agitation. The complaints of the paper makers, however, had been on more than one occasion brought under the notice of the right hon. Gentleman, yet he had never until that night told them that their grievances would probably shortly be redressed. It was true that Parliament could not compel foreign countries to reduce the export duties on their rags, but the Government could introduce a system of give and take in a commercial treaty, and it would be very easy to induce Foreign Governments to adopt a system of reciprocity and of really free trade.

MR. NORRIS said, that as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had given a promise of a Committee in the next Session, it would not be necessary for him to detain the House at any length; but owing to the unaccountable silence of the hon. Member for Rochdale (Mr. Cobden), to whom allusion had been made, and who might be said to be the apostle of the policy which had been discussed, he thought it necessary to refer to one or two of the statements of the right hon. Gentleman. The country had been taught to believe, and the hon. Member for Rochdale had laid it down as a maxim, that traders and consumers should be enabled to buy in the cheapest market, and the producers were entitled to open up channels of sale in the dearest markets. That was a sound principle, and he was glad that it pervaded all our legislation in modern times; but that legislation ought not to be exceptionally interfered with. If, however, it were true that the English paper maker had been for a long series of years debarred from access to the raw material, the system was not one of free trade but of protection to the foreigner against the English producer of paper. He was astonished to hear the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer affirm that the number of letters quoted by the hon. Member for Dungarvan did not prove his case. Of those fifty or sixty paper manufacturers some had gone into the Bankruptcy Court, others were working at a considerable loss, others were working half time, and the whole complained that they were making no profit. By the Board of Trade Return of licences it appeared that the whole number of paper manufacturers was not more than 397 or 400. [MR. MAGUIRE: That is the number of mills.] It thus appeared that one-eighth of the whole number were in circumstances of difficulty and distress. Such a proportion of the entire number would be sufficient to satisfy any ordinary person that their complaints were not without foundation. A parallel case would be to suppose that, the conflict in America being at an end, the United States Government finding themselves with an exhausted exchequer, determined to put a heavy duty on the export of raw cotton. The manufacture of cotton fabrics in America would then be stimulated, and our cotton manufacturers would have to struggle on the one hand against a heavier export duty on their raw material, and a free importation of the manufactured article. The whole of the English cotton districts would complain, and the result would be the ruin of the cotton trade. The cotton manufacturers would not be satisfied with a quiet remonstrance in that House against this unjust legislation, but the millions of men who would be thrown out of work and the capitalists would be up in arms. Precisely the same state of things now existed in the production of paper. Or let them take the analogy of the sugar duties. Some time ago the Chancellor of the Exchequer recommended, and the House adopted, a differential scale of duties upon sugar, on the ground that it would place English and foreign refiners upon a complete equality. What was now desired was that the English paper maker, who was only a refiner of rags, should be placed in a similar position with regard to his foreign competitors. The fact that the exportation of paper had increased from 115,000 cwt. in 1859 to nearly 200,000 cwt. in 1864 did not prove that there had been an increase of the quantity of paper produced in this country. The fact was that the home consumers being supplied with paper from Germany, France, and Belgium, our manufacturers had been obliged to seek new markets, and to send their paper almost all over the world, in the hope that somebody would buy it. If, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer said, we were not to wait for other countries, but to set them a glorious example by the complete adoption of free trade principles, he should like to ask the hon. Member for Rochdale how it was that when those great principles were discussed between the Governments of England and France we entered into a treaty in which the raw material was entirely forgotten at the same time that the Customs duty was taken off the manufactured article?

Mr. BLACK said, he wished distinctly to deny the truth of the assertion that the paper question had been settled according to the principles of free trade. It had been settled according to principles of protection, and protection in its worst form. When there was a duty upon corn, it was argued, and justly argued, that the duty raised the price, not only of the corn which was imported, but of all the corn in the country. And the same was the case with regard to paper. The duty upon rags ranged from £5 to £9 per ton, increasing the price of the manufactured article by 30 or 40 per cent. If the duty was taken off, the whole of that 30 or 40 per cent would not be received by the producer. He would get only the regular trade profit, and the greater portion of the duty would be received by the consumer, who would pay less for his paper. The difference between the tax upon corn and the duty on rags was, that while the produce of the former went into our Exchequer, we allowed the latter to go into that of the foreigner. Some time ago we heard very vehement denunciations of the taxes upon knowledge. What had become of those who were so earnest then now that there was a question of reducing the price of rags? No argument could be founded upon the increase of the exportation of paper from this country. The trade was in a state of depression—manufacturers must exert themselves to find markets wherever they could—and the kinds of goods generally exported were writing papers and account books, which went to our own colonies. The fact was that the increase had only been from 91,958 cwt. in 1861 to 129,326 cwt. in 1862, and 154,910 cwt. in 1863, an increase fully accounted for by the increase of the population and wealth of our colonies; and it must not be overlooked that during the same period our importation of paper had increased by 300 per cent. Then again there were some wealthy manufacturers who made the finest paper, but by and bye the foreign manufacturer would supply himself with the best machinery, and be able to compete with them in that branch of the trade. There were those who seemed to look with great complacency on the position of the paper makers, contending that things would right themselves; but how, he would ask, could they do so? We imposed a heavy weight on the home manufacturer, leaving the foreigner unencumbered, and it was under those circumstances easy to see who was likely to win the race. As an illustration of how matters at present stood, he might mention that one mill in his own neighbourhood, which had some years ago been purchased for £45,000, was lying idle, the person who bought it having become a bankrupt, and would gladly be sold for half the money which it had cost. Nor did he for a moment think that the Arcadian view of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was about to be realized, and that those small mills of which he formerly spoke in such eloquent terms were likely to spring up throughout the country. Believing, he might add, that the present was a system of protection of the very worst kind, that it operated with crushing weight on our own manufacturers, he must express a hope that the injury which had been done would as far as possible be remedied.

Sir MINTO FARQUHAR said, that whether or not, free trade was the question before them, all parties had admitted that a portion of the paper manufacturing trade was in a suffering condition. He could not understand the argument of the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he said that they must look only to the question as a whole. He maintained that it was their duty to listen to all who had a grievance, especially when the grievance had been caused by the legislation of Parliament. He, therefore, thought it was the bounden duty of the House to take into its serious consideration the complaints of those whose grievances had been so ably detailed by the hon. Member for Dungarvan that evening. In answering that speech, the Chancellor of the Exchequer said the duty of doing so did not properly belong to his own department, and then turned round to the President of the Board of Trade, who, after the arguments which had been advanced on both sides of the House, would, one would have supposed, have spoken on the subject. Instead of taking that course, however, the right hon. Gentleman had in American phrase "skedaddled," omitting to say a single word in defence of his own department. Again, the Chancellor of the Exchequer informed the hon. Member for Dungarvan, towards the close of his speech, that if he had not made so mischievous a statement, calculated, as he said it was, to produce so bad an effect on foreign countries, the Government would in a very few days in all probability have been able to announce that

France had done something to meet the unfortunate case of the paper manufacturers. But why, under those circumstances, had he not communicated with the hon. Member before he brought the question forward, and assigned as a reason for its postponement that there was a likelihood of France taking immediate steps to meet his wishes? Why, too, he would ask, was the hon. Member for Rochdale silent upon the question, as well as the President of the Board of Trade? He had been given to understand that at the time the hon. Gentleman was negotiating the French Treaty, it was supposed that it would include the reduction of the export duty. He had heard it even stated that the Emperor of the French entertained that notion, but that he had not been able to resist the representations made to him by his own manufacturers, and that he had actually said, "This cannot take place, but I give you leave in consequence to withdraw part of your pledges." As to the case as it stood, it was impossible, after the statements from Scotland, Ireland, and England, which the hon. Member for Dungarvan had read, that hon. Members could allow these paper manufacturers to sit "like patience on a monument smiling at grief," and not pronounce their opinions on the subject. Indeed, the country was, he thought, greatly indebted to the hon. Member for having brought the matter forward, for it was no question of altering the system of free trade which had been accepted, and of which the French Treaty in fact was itself an abandonment. He was glad to find that since the conclusion of that treaty our commerce with France had increased, and he trusted our friendly relations with the French people might be made to depend, not solely on the political, but also on the commercial interests of the two nations. But while he desired as much as any one that result, he could not refuse to listen to the complaints of our own manufacturers, and it was with satisfaction, therefore, he found that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had expressed his readiness to grant a Committee next year to investigate the matter.

MR. WATKIN said, that the hon. Gentleman who brought forward the Motion had argued the question as if the raw material out of which English paper was manufactured mainly consisted of foreign rags; and if that were so, there would be a very great deal in what had been said. He was sure, however, that he was not far from the mark when he said that the proportion of those foreign rags, on account of which so much complaint was made of the admirable treaty which the hon. Member for Rochdale had been the means of bringing to a conclusion, did not constitute more than 15 per cent of the materials used in English paper making. The raw material which the English paper makers used in the largest proportion was cotton waste. In consequence of the American war the value of the cotton waste was 400 per cent greater than formerly. The result of that exceptional state of things was that many paper makers must suffer from distress, but instead of showing that they had a strong case of difficulty to encounter, they turned upon the hon. Member for Rochdale, and said that all their distress was the consequence of the export duty on foreign rags, which constituted only an exceedingly small proportion of the whole raw material used in paper making. As there was to be a Committee in connection with the case of these 400 paper manufacturers, it would be right to know the amount of income tax which those gentlemen paid for three, four, or five years before, and subsequent to, the conclusion of the French Treaty; and he believed that an honest and fair return would show, notwithstanding the exceptional circumstance to which he had alluded, that in consequence of the opening of new markets, not only in this country, through cheap literature, but elsewhere, the profits of the paper makers had diminished but little or not at all. If they were to have a Committee on the state of the paper trade, suffering in consequence of the American war, why should there not be a Committee on the state of the cotton manufacturers, who constituted a much larger interest, and who had not come crawling on the floor of that House asking for an inquiry into an exceptional state of things?

MR. MAGUIRE, in reply, said, that the hon. Member for Stockport might have refrained from indulging in terms so offensive to the paper makers, who did not come crawling to that House *in formâ pauperis*, but stood up boldly and manfully, and simply demanded justice. The hon. Gentleman seemed to think he had made a wonderful discovery when he said that the foreign rags from France and Germany only constituted 15 per cent of the raw material used in English paper making, but the argument would not have been one bit stronger if the proportion were only 5 per cent; because it was the value of those foreign rags which regulated the entire price of the whole of the raw material which the British paper manufacturer used. His hon. Friend near him (Sir Minto Farquhar) had said that if the Government had stated that they were in negotiation with foreign Powers on the subject, the trade would have been unwise to bring forward the subject now; but he was bound in candour to declare that delusive hopes had been occasionally held out, which time had utterly falsified. He had heard a whisper the other night—in fact, he had been semi-officially advised—that he had better not bring forward the matter; upon which he said that he would confer with the trade, and leave the decision to them; and having left the decision to the trade, they requested him by all means to go on with his Motion, for they had been deceived before, and might be deceived again. The noble Lord the Member for Huntingdonshire said that this was a battle, not for the British public, but for a trade, and that the object was to make paper dear. With every respect for the noble Lord, his assertion was entirely destitute of fact. Reduce the cost of the raw material, and you reduce the price of the manufactured article. Place the British maker on an equal footing in the rag market with the foreigner, and you may leave to the foreigner all his natural advantages—such as cheaper labour—and the British maker will be content to meet him in any market in the world. Give the British manufacturer free access to the rag market, and they would have the manufactured article cheaper than now, with the satisfaction of knowing that the man who made it gained a fair profit by his industry and capital. The hon. Member for Rochdale had said that he did not speak exactly the words he had attributed to him, but there were other words which the hon. Gentleman had not spoken, but deliberately put in writing. There was a controversy between the hon. Gentleman and the editor of *The Times*. The latter had charged the hon. Gentleman with a blunder in this matter, and the hon. Gentleman in reply laid down a very singular doctrine. He said it was our duty in carrying out the principle of free trade to buy in the cheapest and to sell in the dearest market, and he added, "If Foreign Governments put foolish restrictions on the export of rags, it is an additional reason why we should take their paper." He never heard anything like that in all his life, and he only wished he had alluded to that opinion when the hon. Member was present. [An hon. MEMBER: He is here.] He had the highest esteem for the hon. Gentleman, and sympathized with his general principles and with his splendid triumphs, but he never heard more inconsequential nonsense than this doctrine. He would say a word with respect to his own connection with the present Motion, and also as to the time at which it was brought forward. First as to the time. In March last the trade sent in a memorial to the Government, but the answer to that memorial was not given until May. A Motion for inquiry was to have been made by an hon. Gentleman present, who, from some cause or other, changed his intention—at any rate, did not persevere with it. When that change of intention was made known to the trade, a deputation from the body waited on him (Mr. Maguire), and requested him to bring the question before the House. Sympathizing though he did with their wrongs, he at first refused, and alleged as one of the reasons of his refusal, the necessity of his going to Ireland; but when they urged the matter very strongly upon him, he agreed to do it. He then tried the chance of ballot—and that night was the first free night he could obtain for the present Motion. So that the responsibility of forcing the case upon the attention of the House did not rest with him, but with the trade—who, he might add, thoroughly understood their own interests, and what would serve or what would injure them. It was said that the cases that he had mentioned did not fully represent the state of the trade. His answer was that the trade, with scarcely an exception, endorsed the facts and arguments put forward in those letters. When they met in Manchester in January last, there were one hundred firms then personally represented, and fifty more were represented by letter, and at that meeting statements of the same character were accepted by those present, who might be said to have spoken in the name of six-sevenths of the trade, or production, of the United Kingdom. Why had not more given up, he was asked? He (Mr. Maguire) thought the list was long and sad enough; but it should be remembered that people held on in the hope of better days, and that many were endeavouring by increased production to reduce their fixed charges—for rent, taxes, management, &c. — and thus live by a fractional share of profit. The case of the trade was now before the House and the country, and it could not fail to evoke general sympathy in their behalf. He was quite satisfied with the assurance which had been given by the Government. He did not think the Chancellor of the Exchequer had answered his statement or disproved one tittle of the case he had made out. He (Mr. Maguire) had laid down no principle, or made no assertion which he had not fortified by facts, and he believed he had made a fair and candid speech, and was certainly not open to the charge of having represented British manufacturers in the House of Commons in a crawling spirit. He begged leave to withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

NAVY—SHIPS OF WAR—ARMOUR-PLATING.

COMMISSION MOVED FOR.

SIR FREDERIC SMITH, in rising to move an Address for a Commission to inquire into the system of Building Ships of War in this Country and in other countries, and to report what beneficial changes may be made, begged to state that he had been in hopes that some of his gallant Friends connected with the navy, or hon. Members interested in shipping, would have brought forward the question, and he for that reason had delayed taking it up till now. He felt he was hardly competent to give a professional opinion on the matter, yet he believed his Motion would be of use in eliciting a discussion that would prove useful to the service. At that moment we were building ships of various kinds, and the question was, which description would be of most value to the country? He had no desire to censure the Board of Admiralty. No member of that House had a greater respect for the noble Duke at the head of the Admiralty, who carried out his duties in a manner creditable to himself and advantageous to the country, but he was anxious to ascertain whether in the fleet they were constructing they were pursuing the wisest and most economical course. They were now building ships of wood, of iron, partly of wood and partly of iron, some of them iron-cased partially, and others iron-cased wholly. Over and over again the House had been told that the time of the Lords of the Admiralty was so occupied that it was impossible for them to devote to the subject the attention which it deserved. He had been Chairman of the Committee to inquire into the state of the gunboats, and Sir Baldwin Walker told the Committee in what manner the authority was given for the construction of a ship. He stated that he desired the constructor to make drawings of a ship, that he examined those drawings, and signed them, and made what was called a submission to the Lords of the Admiralty, laying his plans on the table. They were discussed as such things could be discussed in a board, and generally the first naval Lord signed his name to the drawings, and the work was performed; and yet the builders stated that, however faulty the plans submitted to them for their construction might be, they never presumed to make the slightest alteration in them. Under these circumstances the only security the country had was in the talent and experience of the Chief Constructor of the Navy, and he wished to ask if they had in the Chief Constructor recently appointed that experience in shipbuilding and that description of talent which justified them in placing the fleet under his entire control. He had heard from many quarters that the new Constructor was a man of considerable ability, and he had no doubt that he was so, but talent was not all that was required. The Constructor ought to be a man of great experience, who had been employed continuously in the construction of ships, and who would be able to say at once where strength should be added and blemishes removed. Vessels from 6,000 down to 700 tons were constantly being built. They were constructed in very different ways, and varied in proportion, in material, and in armament in a most extraordinary manner. It was impossible to say when a ship was ordered to be constructed what guns she would carry, and it appeared that this point, this vital point, was never settled till after the vessel was launched; instead of the only rational course of building a ship suitable for a definite battery. That magnificent ship the *Warrior* was built to carry 40 guns, yet she was now only to carry 20. He was old enough to remember when the cost of a ship was estimated at £1,000 per gun. That sum not only found the ship, but the armament and the entire equipment. A vast change had since taken place in that respect. It appeared from Returns presented to the House by the noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty, that the *Agincourt*, the *Minotaur*, and the *Northumberland*, each of which were of 6,621 tons, were only to carry 26 guns. They were of iron but only partially plated. The *Warrior* and *Black Prince*, of 6,109 tons and originally intended to carry 40 guns, were now to carry 20 only. These two were only partially iron-plated and of iron. The *Achilles* was of 6,121 tons, and was to carry only 20 guns; she was of iron and only partially iron-plated; but he hoped the noble Lord would correct him if he was wrong. He had heard, but he did not know, that she was now to be more completely plated than originally intended. Then the *Hector*, of only 4,020 tons, was to carry 24 guns, while the *Achilles* with a third more tonnage was to carry only 20. What was more remarkable was that the *Valiant*, although smaller than either, was to carry 34 guns. He had no doubt the Admiralty Return he quoted from was quite correct. Then, again, the *Bellerophon*, which was larger than the *Valiant*, being of 4,446 tons, was only to carry 14 guns. [Lord CLARENCE PAGET: Her guns are of much larger calibre.] That would enable her to throw a heavier broadside, and was therefore a point which must be borne in mind, but the Returns did not give the information. The *Caledonia*, of about 4,000 tons, was wholly armour-plated and a wooden ship. The *Bellerophon* was an iron ship and partly armour-plated. The *Royal Oak* was of wood, and wholly armour-plated. The *Ocean* was of wood, of a little more than 4,000 tons and wholly armour-plated. The *Prince Consort* was of 4,000 tons, and was to have 35 guns. Why was the *Caledonia* to have much heavier guns than the *Bellerophon?* If the *Bellerophon's* armament was good for a man-of-war of 4,000 tons it ought to be applied to the *Caledonia* also. But nothing was ever more capricious than the present system of armament; every thing about it was complex and costly where simplicity was required. He doubted whether the noble Lord had the guns of large calibre in sufficient quantity. If we were in the right groove, let us continue in it; if not, let us change it. If the Government had nothing to hide, nothing to stifle, they would grant the inquiry for which he asked; and as Parliament was about to break up, it was very important that the House and the country should know how the enormous sum to be spent before they met again was going to be laid out. A French author of some celebrity stated what the right hon. Member for Droitwich would no doubt be slow to admit—namely, that the *Warrior* would have no chance, through not being protected at the bow and stern, against a vessel like *La Gloire*, which was armour-plated all round. He hoped that was not so; but the *Warrior* was an experiment, and he would ask, was it not intended to disarm the bow and stern of the *Black Prince* and the *Warrior?* His right hon. Friend said his object in regard to the *Warrior* was to get a great speed, and he believed that with a clean bottom she would steam from 14 to 15 knots an hour. His right hon. Friend would say that if the bow and stern had not been made so sharp she would not have attained that velocity. That was one of the points which required investigation. The proper way to deal with a question of this kind was not to leave it in the hands of the noble Lord and his colleagues on the Treasury Bench, because in a year or two they might be replaced by other Gentlemen with totally different views. He wanted something specific to be laid down, not for the purpose of controlling the Government or the Admiralty, but with the view of advising and assisting them, and it is lamentable to see how much they want that assistance. A vote of the House, so far from being a reproach to the Admiralty, would strengthen them. He knew nothing except from the newspapers, but he had read that two vessels recently constructed, and called the *Research* and the *Enterprise*, were fitted up, not with the ordinary broadside batteries, but with guns in a sort of box, 33ft. by 32ft. square, in which four guns were used. Any man acquainted with the requirements of ventilation would know that space would be quite inadequate. These four guns ought to be capable of being used at the same time, supposing the vessel to be attacked simultaneously on both sides. It was reported that experiments had been made with these guns; but he would be glad to know at what angle they were fired. It appeared that they were not loaded with shot, but only with powder, and he was told that they were fired at an elevation, and could not be fired in any other way. That was a bad system. He found fault with these two vessels being fitted up with that box, at great expense, without having the box tried on *terra firma*. He had a letter in his possession from the commander of the *Rolf Krake*, belonging to the Danish Government, which was built on Captain Cowper Coles's system, and which had been three times in action, receiving 150 shot wounds, and that letter gave a very good description of her performance, with which the writer was perfectly satisfied. He understood that the *Research*, a vessel with the same armament and of the same size as the *Rolf Krake*, could only fire two guns in any one direction at the same time, whereas the *Rolf Krake* could fire her four guns at the same time and in the same direction. All that he had gathered from naval men of experience and ability gave him a bad opinion of the *Research* and the *Enterprise*. The public mind ought to be set at rest one way or other as to their real character. Then there was another important point. The ship for which they were indebted to the right hon. Member for Droitwich would steam 14 or 15 knots an hour, but they did not hear that the small vessels by which so much was promised to be done would steam 10 knots. Suppose, then, we were engaged in war. In making up our squadrons we must recollect that speed was one great element to be kept in view. What would be the consequence of sending out the *Warrior* along with the *Research* and the *Enterprise?* The *Warrior*, with her superior speed, might run up to an enemy possessing perhaps an equal armament, when her two slower consorts could not come up to her support. Length was the first element of speed; and if we were to have iron-plated ships as nearly as possible shot-proof, by plating them from stem to stern on both sides, it was clear we must, in order to obtain the proper amount of displacement, have a breadth of beam incompatible with high speed. Then there was the great question of armour-plating with regard to which a great deal of uncertainty prevailed, and many experiments had been made. First, the *Warrior* had 4½in. of iron with 18in. of teak backing; but they were not content with that, which was very nearly shotproof with the guns they then had in use. They next determined to build the *Northumberland*, the *Agincourt*, and the *Minotaur*. They proceeded on what they supposed to be a better target. But, if the target was not so good as that of the *Warrior*, the Government had made a mistake, and they have made a mistake. After all, did they want an invulnerable ship? They had not quite got it in the *Warrior*, but it is pretended that they would have it in the target proposed by Mr. Chalmers. It appeared that that target was supposed to be a success; and they heard, also, that it was copied or nearly copied in the *Bellerophon*. Had it been properly tested with full charges and under the same circumstances as other targets? This is to be doubted. Then there was another target for the *Lord Warden*. That was the most complicated structure he had ever seen. It was first of iron, then of wood, then of iron, and then of wood again. If that turned out better than the *Warrior* he should rejoice, but he heard it had been tried and failed. If it had failed, they did wrong to adopt it. The noble Lord would excuse him, however, for saying it had not been very fairly tried. The target actually tried did not represent that portion of the ship it was intended to represent. He wanted to know under what advice our ships were built. Sir R. Seppings made great improvements; Sir William Symonds, it was supposed, had also made improvements. Then came three men who had been brought up in the College of Naval Architecture at Portsmouth, Mr. Crew, Mr. Chatfield, and Mr. Reed—not the Mr. Reed of whom they had heard so much of late. They were admirable men — men of talent. They were employed one day in actual shipbuilding, and another day in scientific studies, thus combining theory with practice. That was a good and sound system for bringing forward practical men. But now the new Naval College was to be conducted on a different system—the students were to spend the six winter months at Kensington, and the other six months in the dockyard. Were they to be employed at the ship's side learning the duties of a shipwright? He was told they were to make drawings at Kensington, but they ought to make drawings from the ships under construction and not from models. He feared the system would turn out a bad one, for though at Kensington they might acquire mathematics in the higher branches and the other elements so much talked of, but which often turned out unpractical, they would lose a great deal that was practical. No one stickled more than the noble Lord (Lord C. Paget) for examinations. At the present moment every one raised from one grade to another in the dockyards had to undergo a competitive examination. It was a great pity the noble Lord had not applied that principle to the case of the appointment of Constructor of the Navy. Had he done so, he might, indeed, have got the same man, but the whole country would have been open to him. The selection might have been made from the most eminent private yards, such as that of the Messrs. Laird, of Birkenhead, that of Messrs. Green, that of the Thames Company, and many other establishments. The best practical man would have been got, but instead of that a gentleman was taken out of an office who had not been employed in shipbuilding for ten years. He did not think that that was right. Then, again, was it intended that the able men at present employed in our dockyards should give way to the students at the Kensington school? If so, great heartburning would be occasioned. First of all, then, they had to determine the question of armour-plating. Then, again, was there sufficient strength in the Admiralty to take up all the great inventions of the day, or did they require more advice? He did not doubt the sea talent of the naval Lord of the Admiralty, or the administrative talent of the hon. Member for Pontefract, who, he had no doubt, would do his work well, but did he pretend to decide what should be the construction of a ship? Had the naval Lords time to turn their attention to the construction of ships? He had heard that the late Controller, a distinguished officer, had said he did not understand shipbuilding. Did the present Controller profess to be able to decide on the lines of a ship? It is believed he did not. They were then in the hands of the new Constructor, and who was his adviser? A connection of his own of very limited knowledge. They wanted as their advisers men of great talent, great energy, and great experience — men who would have the confidence of the country. He feared they had not got them. The noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty, as chairman of Committees, had often to investigate less important matters; were not those of much more importance to be investigated? They could not bring together a sufficient number of Members who had the requisite practical knowledge on this subject, they must therefore look beyond the walls of the House. He had great doubts whether that information could be found even within the walls of the Admiralty. The *Warrior* carried 20 guns, her tonnage was 300 tons per gun, and her cost was £18,050 per gun. The *Defence,* which carried 18 guns, or 207 tons per gun, cost £13,373 per gun. The *Achilles,* of 20 guns, had 306 tons per gun, and cost £16,093 per gun. We ought to have numbers of these ships, and it was of great importance to know that they were being built in the best and cheapest way. Would the noble Lord, therefore, tell the House whether he was aiming at speed, at armament, or at power of resistance? Had the noble Lord entered into the question of constructing ships of steel? Steel was pierced by shot, but it did not splinter, whereas iron splintered, and the splinters were more dangerous than the shot themselves. If it were found impossible to construct at a moderate cost a vessel that would keep out shell and shot, was it worth while to sacrifice speed, and would it not be wiser to let the shot go through if it could not be kept out by any vessel that would go 12 knots an hour? The difference in the construction and cost of these vessels was most remarkable. The *Lord Clyde,* 24, would have 169 tons per gun, and the cost per gun would be £11,600. The *Pallas,* 6, would have for each gun 395 tons flotation, and would cost £22,690 per gun. Why were these ships built apparently hap-hazard, the cost per gun being double in some cases to what it was in others? He wanted to know whether, when a ship was ordered to be built, directions were given what her draught of water was to be, her number of guns, her tonnage, and cost per gun. With every respect to guns and soldiers ashore, he looked upon the navy as our main defence, and the way to keep our navy uncrippled was to economize and build at the lowest price and in the most judicious method possible. But how could the difference between these ships be reconciled? The *Vixen* was to carry four guns, and was to be of 754 tons. The *Prince Albert* was also to carry four guns, but was to be 2,529 tons. As to the *Research,* Admiral Fremantle's Report, for which he had moved, would show what the construction of vessels was. He said—

"The space in the battery is so confined that the men have not room to work the guns with that facility that is required. The battery is thirty-three feet in length by thirty-two feet in breadth inside; within this space are four heavy guns, upwards of eighty men, funnel, wheel, hatchway for supplying powder and shell. There is a difficulty in traversing the guns from the broadside to the bow and quarter ports. When the broadside guns were fired with extreme train, foremost ones to the left, after ones to the right, the captains of them could not stand to direct and fire them. These points being of great importance, I have considered it right to bring them before the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty."

He wished to know what was to be done with the *Warrior*, the *Black Prince*, and vessels of that kind, which were not plated from bow to stern? If Captain Coles's turrets succeeded, as he hoped and believed, he would suggest whether the spaces in the bow and stern could not be occupied with turrets. These ships were known to be the finest in the world, and they ought to have an armament worthy of their reputation. If his Motion were granted, he was certain that a great saving of public money would follow, and he therefore begged the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to issue a Commission to consider the various systems now existing of constructing and Armour-plating Ships of War for the British Navy, as well as for the Navies of other Maritime Powers, and to report what, in the opinion of such Commission, should be the system to be now adopted for the British Navy."—(*Sir Frederic Smith.*)

LORD CLARENCE PAGET said, that if he thought the granting of a Commission would have the effect which his hon. and gallant Friend anticipated, he would be the last to object to it. But he thought that the hon. and gallant Gentleman in the course of his able speech had shown that in the first place any Commission that might be appointed would be led into a sea of difficulties, and next, that by the time it had presented its Report, there would have been such alterations and improvements in guns, shot, armour-plating, and all things connected with fighting ships, that it would really be out of date. He had carefully listened to the speech of his hon. and gallant Friend with a view to ascertain whether he could lay down a line for future action. He had told them truly that, of the 27 armour ships we were now constructing, scarcely two, and in no case more than three or four, were of anything like the same dimensions, and he had found fault with the Admiralty for adopting a number of plans.

SIR FREDERIC SMITH said, he did not object to the class of ships that were built, but he did object that those ships did not appear to be performing the duties which those classes of ships should perform. Where there were ships of the same kind there was not the same armament.

LORD CLARENCE PAGET said, his hon. and gallant Friend seemed to think that, according to tonnage, ships should carry a given number of guns. [SIR FREDERIC SMITH: Yes.] The answer to that was, that although fewer guns might be put on board, yet those guns might be of a heavier calibre, and the Admiralty studied not so much the number of guns as the weight of metal. The hon. and gallant Gentleman stated that the *Warrior* was built to carry 40 guns, while in fact she only carried 20. The fact was that the *Warrior* carried more than 20 guns, because she carried a certain number on her upper deck, but it was true also that the guns had been taken away from that part of the main deck of the ship which was not armour-plated. It was, however, also true that the guns which were left on board were of heavier calibre; so that if the number of guns had been diminished the weight of metal fired from those remaining had been increased. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had compared the *Warrior* with the *Gloire;* but the fact was that, although the *Warrior* carried fewer guns than the *Gloire*, yet she would deliver a heavier broadside in the weight of shot. The great value of guns was the weight of shot they sent. The real object of the Motion appeared to be to find fault with the *Research* and the *Enterprise*. [SIR FREDERIC SMITH: No.] The hon. and gallant Gentleman said, why was not a Chief Constructor of the Navy chosen by competition? He (Lord Clarence Paget) was a great advocate of competition, and it had been his desire to apply that system as far as possible, but it had its limits. We did not appoint our high officers by competition. When a man of great talent and knowledge was required, the Government must undertake the responsibility of selecting a man in whom they had confidence. The history of Mr. Reed's appointment was briefly this—Mr. Reed was originally instructed in one of our dockyards, and he afterwards took a high place among naval architects. That gentleman was employed by the Admiralty to build two vessels, the *Research* and the *Enterprise,* and to do what the Constructors of the Navy had hitherto believed to be impossible, to construct armour-plated ships of moderate tonnage. When the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir John Pakington) inquired what sized ship was required to carry armour-plating, he was told that nothing under the size of the *Warrior* could do it. The *Warrior* was a great success, no doubt, but there were certain defects connected with that ship, such as her excessive length, and it was thought most desirable if possible to reduce the size. The Admiralty wished to reduce expense and to diminish the draught of water; but they had not been able to get below vessels of 4,000 tons. Mr. Reed proposed to adapt the frames of vessels already in course of construction, and said he could construct a vessel of 1,000 tons to be armour-plated, especially on her vital part near the water line. That was the history of the *Research* and the *Enterprise.* The plans of these vessels were sent in, and Mr. Reed was employed to build them. He would not venture to prophesy that the *Research* and the *Enterprise* would be found faultless, because in all experiments, such as they were, improvements in matters of detail would always be discovered. He would pass over what had occurred at Devonport, because he held that the *Research* had not had fair play. The fact of sending her out in a hurry, with her four guns really firing over her decks, exactly as in Captain Coles's ship, was a great novelty, and in his opinion should have been carried out on the first occasion with great care and precautions. The shock did damage to some crockery, and some trifling damage was done to the ship. Those damages, however, were so slight that the Admiral did not report them, but he said the quarters were too confined. It must be borne in mind that those vessels carried men sufficient to full man all their guns, while on other ships there were only sufficient men to man fully one broadside. When the two broadsides were fired one-half of the men were taken from the full number at each gun. In the ships we now possessed the number of men to guns was fewer than in Mr. Reed's vessels. Bearing that fact in mind, it was not surprising that the batteries of these latter vessels should be more crowded; but to make a fair comparison with other ships, one half of the crew should be sent below. There were other defects of detail, such as the funnel and the wheel, which had been remedied. There was, too, the gun slides. He was surprised to hear the hon. and gallant Gentleman ask why they had not adopted Mr. Anderson's slides, when, in fact, these slides had not been invented at the time these vessels were planned. Captain De Horsey, a very intelligent officer, had those two vessels under his orders, and they had been sent singly in order that they might have a satisfactory trial. The hon. and gallant Gentleman said, "Why not send them to the Channel Fleet?" For the same reasons that Captain Coles's vessels were not sent to the Channel Fleet. It was desirable that those new ships should be tried by themselves first. [Sir FREDERIC SMITH: The trial should be public.] They were public, for his hon. and gallant Friend might go aboard if he liked, but the ships were always sent out by themselves in the first instance, just as a racehorse was tried. Captain de Horsey had not been sent to make a favourable report, but to make a faithful one, and he had not known that his report would ever be brought under the notice of that House. He reported on every part of those vessels, and he described them as a success. Having gone through various details, as to their performance under canvas, their wearing and tacking, and their capabilities in running before the wind, and showing that in all respects they were sea-going vessels, he said the accommodation, the stowage, and the ventilation were good, as were the whole internal arrangements of both ships. He said that the ventilation of the *Research* was not so good as that of the *Enterprise,* and that the upper deck was too close to the water; and that the fore and aft deck of the sister ship were elevated above the fighting deck, which he thought was a better plan. There was no concealment, for Captain de Horsey observed that the *Research* was too deep waisted, a fault which the hon. and gallant Gentleman knew was very common in corvettes. Those ships had not been in a gale of wind, but, from a conversation which he had had with the captains, he believed both vessels would be good seafaring ships. Mr. Reed had constructed them, and at a moment when the Admiralty required a Chief Constructor the Duke of Somerset took upon himself to appoint that gentleman. His hon. and gallant Friend said that the Admiralty put their faith in Mr. Reed; but it so happened that there were other constructors of the Navy, very rising men, not to mention Admiral Robinson, who, though not a thorough constructor, was one of the best officers in the navy as regarded an acquaintance with the details of a ship. He wished his hon. and gallant Friend and the public to remember that the mere building of a man-of-war did not represent but half of what was necessary to make her efficient. For equipment, armament, stowage, rigging, magazines, and other points, the judgment and superintendence of a practical sailor were required. His hon. and gallant Friend found fault with the Admiralty because they did not appoint some marvellous man, such as he supposed his hon. and gallant Friend had in his own eye; and another charge brought against them was that they did not inquire sufficiently. Why, several Committees of Inquiry on several different points had been appointed. For the last three or four years they had had a Committee on Armour Plates, presided over by his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Wakefield (Sir John Hay); and now they were going to have a Committee to inquire into the novel and interesting proposal submitted by Captain Coles for rigging ships on the tripod system to suit the cupolas. They had had many Committees on points of detail, but to appoint a Commission or Committee and tell them they were to construct ships for the navy would be absurd and impossible. His hon. and gallant Friend as the Member for Chatham must know, if he ever visited the dockyards, what the Admiralty were doing with steel, and yet he came to that House and said to the Admiralty, "You are behindhand, and do not use steel." To justify the Admiralty, he would read a letter, dated July 8th, from an independent gentleman, whose authority no one would question—Mr. Fairbairn. The letter was marked "private;" but he was sure that the writer would not object to its being read to the House. At all events, he could not resist reading portions of it. Mr. Fairbairn went into details, which it was unnecessary to bring before the House, though they were most interesting to nautical men; but the following portions of his letter, which was directed to Admiral Robinson, could not fail to be gratifying to every hon. Member:—

> "Some days previous to leaving town I visited Chatham along with Mr. Reid for the purpose of examining the iron ship *Bellerophon*, now in frame at the dockyard. In this inspection I was highly gratified to find that you had adopted what I have all along considered the true principle of construction in the formation of the hull with double bottom, or double sheathing in the cellular form. Longitudinal kelsons united to transverse frames from 3ft. to 4ft. asunder is, in my opinion, the only secure form in which wrought-iron as a material for shipbuilding can be employed; and I have to congratulate you on the prospect of having one of the strongest and lightest ships ever yet constructed for Her Majesty's service. I offer no opinion as to the armour-plating, that is already determined experimentally, and I must leave the lines and form to better and wiser heads than my own. One thing I, however, observed, namely, the capacious breadth of floor at midships, which, I think, is a great improvement."

He thought hon. Gentlemen were too apt to take up newspapers and read some story of the French having advanced beyond us, and of American ships, wonders of the world, which were to completely eclipse anything which we had afloat. He assured the House that as regarded the French he spoke with the greatest respect of their ships, because we owed to those ships many improvements; but he was not at all afraid of our ships; for they were equal if not superior to those of any other nation. He did not deny that their cost was great. They cost perhaps more than they would if constructed in private yards, but he believed they were of superior workmanship, and that their superiority in that respect more than compensated us for the extra cost. He could assure his hon. and gallant Friend that steel shot and the construction of guns were matters not lost sight of by the Admiralty, and that in regard to both we were not behind any other nation. As to the *Lord Warden* target, it was quite true that target had been roughly handled, but it had not yet been pierced by any gun in use in the service. He did not mean to say that it had not been much shaken.

SIR JOHN HAY: The noble Lord must be speaking of some other target.

LORD CLARENCE PAGET: No, he was speaking of the *Lord Warden* target, which was fired at by the 10·5-inch 12-ton gun, on board the *Royal Sovereign*—the biggest gun we had got—and which was not pierced by it. It was true that the target had not yet been taken to pieces, and, consequently, the exact amount of damage could not be ascertained. In the *Lord Warden* and the *Lord Clyde* we had ships of the very strongest construction. They had the scantling of a line-of-battle-ship, and the only distinction between them and the armour-plated ships built of wood previously was that they had an inner skin of 1½ inch. To call that construction complicated was a misapplication of terms. He would not follow the hon. and gallant Gentleman into the various details of the construction of ships, but he would only say that it was a subject which constantly engaged the attention of the Admiralty, and where they found that any branch of the subject required accurate and detailed information they appointed a committee of practical men. But to throw down on the table instructions to a Commission to construct ships for our navy would be perfectly futile, would lead to vast and extravagant expenditure, and, instead of leading to efficiency, would be a most unfortunate thing for the navy.

Sir JOHN HAY said, that though he did not agree with his hon. and gallant Friend as to the expediency of referring this general subject to a Commission, he did not think that the noble Lord had given reasons which would induce the House to reject the Motion. With regard to the *Lord Warden* target, the noble Lord and himself must be at cross purposes. If the noble Lord had been present at the experiment, he never could have said that the *Lord Warden* was not pierced. [Lord Clarence Paget: It was not pierced by the 300-pounder.] He was sorry that he had not the Returns with him, but the noble Lord would see that the target was exposed to a very severe fire, and was not only pierced but destroyed in a most wonderful manner. It was exposed to the fire of four of the heaviest guns in existence. One shell struck it, broke in the target, made a hole four feet in diameter in the front, and eight feet diameter in the rear. The fire was exceedingly heavy, but it was quite possible that our ships might be subjected to such a fire. He quite agreed with his noble Friend that it would be unadvisable to appoint a Committee to go into the general subject of the construction of the navy, but there were points of detail on the subject of construction which might properly be referred to a Committee or Commission. What the public were disposed to find fault with the Admiralty for was, not that they made too many experiments, or that they did not do their duty in endeavouring to ascertain what was the best description of ships, but that their inquiries appeared to be aimless, and that they did not set before them any definite object. There were several points on which a definite decision might be wisely arrived at, and which might be referred to a Committee or Commission. First of all, there was the question of speed. The object of a ship was to be able to carry the best possible guns with the greatest possible speed into the required position, and that the vessel should be capable of being manœuvred with facility when she was got into that position. The ascertained speed of some ocean-going steamers was from 16 to 17 miles an hour, and it would be desirable to ascertain what speed our men-of-war could reasonably be expected to attain. The speed of a fleet or squadron acting in concert was measured by the speed of the slowest vessel in it, and it would be necessary, therefore, to come to some definite understanding as to what should be the slowest speed given to vessels intended to act in concert. Then, again, there was the question of the draught of large ships. Great disadvantages had arisen from the large draught of some of our large ships, which did not permit them to approach the shore, and which made them unable to enter any of our docks. Another point was the difficulty of turning some of our new long ships with a single screw, and the consequent difficulty of manœuvring them in action or in a narrow channel He was not prepared to affirm positively that the twin screw had solved this difficulty, but he believed in his heart that it had. By means of the twin screw the longest ships might be manœuvred in their own length, and if the Admiralty adopted that principle, he believed they would have solved the difficulty. These were questions which might be wisely referred to a Committee or Commission. He was fully aware of the difficulties the Admiralty laboured under in regard to the question of armament; but he believed we were pausing a little too long over our experiments. This point, at least, had been made pretty clear, that, in a conflict with armour-plated ships, no gun lighter than the 12-ton gun would be of much service. If it could be proved that we could have a 12-ton gun which could be rifled for rifle projectiles, and at the same time used as a smooth-bore gun, let us have a supply of those guns at once sufficient to arm the number of ships we intended to commission, or which we might commission, in the event of a war. There was another point which would require the attention of the Admiralty, and that was, how those new iron ships were to be coppered. His hon. and gallant Friend (Sir Frederic Smith) was not sanguine that that could be done. It should be borne in mind, however, that the ships of Her Majesty's navy must keep the sea for a very long period in time of war, and therefore the question was well deserving the attention of the Admiralty. He was of opinion that when the talent of the country was brought to bear upon it the difficulty might be overcome. There was another subject which had not been alluded to, but which was of deep national importance. We were protecting our ships by iron, and making the hull fireproof; but, after all, the great danger in battle was the danger of fire. Once that we had a certainty that our enemies would be provided with steel shells, we might be equally certain that if the fittings were made of deal the bursting of such a shell would cause not only considerable destruction on board, but even a panic among the crew. Therefore it was necessary that combustible materials should, as far as possible, be got rid of. He had heard with some surprise that after certain trials the *Royal Sovereign* was about to join the Channel Fleet. But unless the *Royal Sovereign* was masted, she would hardly be in a condition to be employed as a seagoing ship. They had been asked to give the *Royal Sovereign* fair play. But what Captain Coles complained of, and what the general public had been led to believe, was that Captain Coles had had not fair play from the Admiralty—that he had not had entire control over the ships which he was to build. Would Captain Coles be satisfied that the *Royal Sovereign* should be sent to join the Channel Fleet without masts? [Lord CLARENCE PAGET: She has light jury masts.] But not such masts as it would be desirable to send her to sea with. To talk then of sending her to make a trial of her sea-going qualities with the Channel Fleet was, to sea-going men, absurd. As to the *Prince Albert*, which Captain Coles was building, though it was not for Members of that House to take exception to the number of persons employed upon her, yet he thought everything ought to be done to get her forward, with a view to make a requisite trial. It was hardly judicious to parade before the House the charge that fair play had not been given to the *Research* and the *Enterprise*, and to challenge hon. Gentlemen to give fair play to the *Royal Sovereign* and the *Prince Albert*, particularly when the latter vessels had hardly received at the hands of the Admiralty all the consideration to which they were entitled. In the unfortunate Danish war the *Rolfe Krake*, a ship of the same description, had been tried, and the manner in which her guns had been used, her speed, and the way in which she had manœuvred, were admirable. The experiment in the case of that ship ought to induce us to push forward vessels of the same description, so that we might be able to ascertain what class of ships was best adapted for the public service. His noble Friend had told the House that in the *Research* the funnel and wheel were matters of detail. But a steamship without a funnel, and any ship at all without a wheel, would not be in a favourable condition for going to sea. Let it be assumed that in action there were forty men below and forty other men with a funnel and wheel in a space about as large as a good-sized dining room. [Lord CLARENCE PAGET: The funnel would be taken away.] Then it would be deprived of the protection to which it was entitled, and so would the wheel. [Lord CLARENCE PAGET: The wheel would be below in action.] He did not think that would be a convenient place for it. However, the Admiralty originally approved of a place about as large as a good-sized dining room for some forty men, a funnel, and a wheel. And besides these they had four large guns in this space requiring forty men to work them, and the ports of the guns were so placed that there was a large space over which the guns could not be trained. Now, an authority whom all would respect, the late Sir Howard Douglas, had laid it down that in no action had any good been done by the guns unless where there was a stable platform, and where the gunners had means of knowing how much or how little the vessel was likely to roll. In Captain Coles's ships the guns would be trained all round the compass, but in the *Research* the position of the ship must be altered before the guns could be brought to bear, and unless the vessel was in perfectly smooth water an efficient aim could not be taken. The first object should be to make the guns available, and the idea of constructing a ship with such a defect as he had described showed a great want of judgment. Although a good case had been made out for inquiry, he could hardly agree with his hon. and gallant Friend that the whole subject should be handed over to one Commission. There were, however, a few points of detail which were well worthy of the attention of the Admiralty, which might be sent for inquiry to a Committee or a Commission, and which it would be well to have settled as speedily as possible.

MR. LAIRD said, that it was hardly advisable to appoint a Commission, as in naval matters changes were made from day to day. After the large sums of money expended upon the navy, however, the House had a right to ask what position the navy was in if the country were now called upon to go to war. The noble Lord had rightly said it was desirable for the Admiralty to turn their attention to the subject of vessels of light draught of water. If we went to war with Russia, France, or America, we had only two armour-cased vessels — the *Research* and the *Enterprise*—that would go at all into shallow water. The *Research* could only throw a broadside of 170 lb. [Lord CLARENCE PAGET: 220 lb.] He had put a question some time ago with regard to the *Enterprise*, which was the successful vessel, according to the noble Lord's statement, about the depth of the armour-plating. At the request of the noble Lord he went to the Admiralty to see the plans, and he found that the armour-plating was only one foot above the water. [Lord CLARENCE PAGET: That was a confidential communication.] The *Enterprise* was a wooden vessel, and he would ask what would be the effect if a shell such as those fired by the *Kearsarge* were to hit that vessel one foot above the water? They were not to suppose that vessels were always to fight in smooth water. They must take some account of a little swell, and he maintained that as an armour-cased vessel the *Enterprise* was perfectly useless. The result of sending Captain Coles's ship, the *Royal Sovereign*, to sea without being properly masted would be in his opinion a total failure. He trusted that the Government, for the sake of the country, would do justice to Captain Coles, and allow that vessel to be masted, so as to make her an efficient sea-going ship. Much had been said of the difficulty of getting effective vessels of a light draught on the cupola system. Now, having paid some attention to this subject, he was prepared to state that vessels of about 1,200 tons could be built with a speed of twelve knots an hour, to carry two of the heaviest guns, two 300-pounders, and throwing a broadside of 600 lb. against the 220 lb. of the *Research*. Such a vessel could be completely armour-plated, fitted on Captain Coles's plan, masted, rigged, and arranged, so that she should be available not only for harbour and coast defence, but able to go round Cape Horn or any other part of the world. He did not profess much knowledge of gunnery, but he believed that the only method of carrying the heavy guns now proposed was on the plan of Captain Coles, because the guns could be trained in the simplest and easiest manner, and worked with fewer hands than in any other ships. He trusted that the Admiralty would consider the subject, because if they would use all possible appliances for working the yards, rigging, and guns of their ships, they would require fewer men to man the navy, and might then reduce the Navy Estimates. The Admiralty would also, he hoped, give their attention to vessels of a smaller class. The cost would not be great, and if they were to go to war to-morrow they would have suddenly to apply all the resources of the dockyards and private yards to provide themselves with vessels of light draught, capable of going across the Atlantic or to cross the Channel, in order to compete with what on the other side of the Atlantic were called turret vessels. But if the Admiralty were to send such vessels as composed their African squadron—if they sent out slow, wooden vessels—they would meet with the fate that befell the *Alabama*. [Lord CLARENCE PA ET: Those vessels go to the bottom, too, sometimes.] He was not alluding to regular sea-going vessels, but if we went to war we must not wait to be attacked, but must have the means of attacking the enemy on his coast. He challenged the noble Lord to contradict his statement that this country was in a very unsafe condition in that respect. On the rivers of France there were floating batteries of great power and slow speed, which were more than a match for any vessels we could send out, except vessels like the *Warrior*, which would not float in shallow waters. To make our fleet efficient in this way would not cost a large sum. The Admiralty could not assert that it was enough to have two experimental vessels of wood merely cased to the water-line. The Admiralty would have to do what they had been urged for years to do—namely, to follow private enterprise, and construct our navy entirely of iron.

SIR MORTON PETO said, he did not think a Commission would be useful. The only way of meeting the difficulty of the case was the reconstruction of the Board of Admiralty itself. He did not dispute the talent of Mr. Reed, the present chief constructor of the navy, but it was not right and proper that the Admiralty should be guided by one mind. The constructor should design the vessels, and submit those designs to practical men, so that any defects, such as were discovered in the *Research*, might be found out before the ships were constructed. That was done in other countries, and practically we had simply adopted what had been initiated in other countries. The great problem to be solved was how the greatest force could be most judiciously employed. As the Admiralty was at present constructed it could not, he believed, deal with that problem; they were too much in the hands of a single individual.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, the question which had been raised was of the highest importance, but he was sorry that he was obliged so far to differ from his hon. and gallant Friend that he could not be any party to recommending Her Majesty's Government to appoint such a Commission as he had recommended. He was opposed to the appointment of a Commission, both because he would not be a party to any step which would relieve from its proper responsibility the department of the State to which Parliament had intrusted the management of our naval affairs, and also because he felt the unanswerable force of the argument that we were in a state of transition with regard to the subject, that new inventions were being brought forward every day, and when the Commission had made their Report they would probably find that something had been devised which would entirely supersede their recommendation. The only safe course was to leave matters to the responsibility of the Admiralty, in which he was sure that his noble Friend would admit that Parliament had of late years placed great confidence. He had always expressed the opinion that the Admiralty were right in trying any experiments or adopting any course which had a reasonable prospect of success. All that was desired was that they should to the best of their ability adopt all the improvements which might be devised in regard to the armour-plating of ships. He was afraid that on some occasions they had not carried out their experiments with all the caution that was desirable. He referred especially to the manner in which they had dealt with Captain Coles's invention of cupola ships. It was a great mistake to cut down the *Royal Sovereign* instead of building an entirely new vessel. Perhaps, however, there could hardly be a more striking illustration of the change which was now taking place than was to be found in the fact, that there was good reason to believe that the *Royal Sovereign*, reduced in size and carrying five guns, was a more valuable and effective ship than before she was cut down, and when she carried 130 guns. His noble Friend had spoken of her joining the Channel Fleet.

LORD CLARENCE PAGET explained that he did not mean that the *Royal Sovereign* was to be considered as a sea-going ship, but only that she was to be placed under the orders of Admiral Dacres, who commanded the Channel Fleet. She would be a coasting ship.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, that that showed the mistake which had been made. Although the *Royal Sovereign* was intended for harbour purposes she drew 27 feet of water. He did not intend to cast any censure upon Mr. Reed, who deserved the credit of having first tried the experiment of applying armour-plating to small vessels, but he could not help contrasting the *Research* with the *Rolfe Krake*. These two vessels were as nearly as possible of the same size, tonnage, and armoury. They each carried four guns, but while the *Rolfe Krake* could use them all on either side, the *Research* could only fire two on each side; and while the *Rolfe Krake* drew only 10 feet of water, the *Research* drew 15. There could be no question as to the superiority of the vessel built in the Clyde by Messrs. Napier to that built for the Admiralty by Mr. Reed. He thought that the Admiralty had made a great mistake in the style of rigging which they had adopted for our larger class of armour-covered vessels, such as the *Defence* and the *Hector*. He did not lay much stress upon the fact that the rig of those vessels was so unsightly that it seemed as if the Admiralty had exercised their ingenuity to see how ugly a man-of-war could be made; but he was told that the masts and yards of these vessels were so deficient in size and power that they could not go to sea under canvas. That was a great misfortune, both because in the case of any accident to their machinery they would become helpless, and because the system of compelling vessels always to steam was a most expensive and extravagant one.

Lord CLARENCE PAGET said, that the French ships spread less canvas than those of the rig of which the right hon. Baronet was complaining.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, that he was dealing with this as a positive question, and not as a matter of comparison. His complaint was that these vessels would not be effective under canvas. The House had a right to expect that the Admiralty should call to their aid all the greatest talent that they could command, should devote every care to the consideration of this subject, and should boldly and freely try any experiment which held out a reasonable prospect of success. If they would persevere in that course, it would be better to leave these questions to their responsibility, and not to incumber them with inquiries or commissions which could lead to no practical good.

Sir FREDERIC SMITH, in withdrawing his Motion, said that the discussion which had taken place had been a useful one, and he, therefore, trusted that the House would not blame him for having introduced the subject.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

POOR RELIEF (METROPOLIS) BILL.

LEAVE. FIRST READING.

Mr. C. P. VILLIERS, in rising to move for leave to bring in a Bill to make provision for distributing the charge of relief of certain classes of poor persons over the metropolis, said, he simply sought by the measure to give effect to the recommendations of a Committee which had arrived at an unanimous conclusion on the subject. The House was familiar with the accounts which so frequently appeared of the wandering poor who paraded the streets of the metropolis at night, and who were sometimes unable to obtain the relief which the law provided, and the Committee inquired very closely into the liability of the parishes to contribute to their support. Upon investigation it seemed that the present law failed in the respect that there was an unfair distribution of charges throughout the several Unions, while there was no doubt of the liability of the various parishes to support the destitute. After much inquiry the Committee came to the conclusion that the evil arose from the unequal distribution of the charge, and they recommended that some common fund should be created for the maintenance of that class of poor. They considered that the machinery of the Metropolitan Board of Works might be made available for the purpose, while under the machinery of the Poor Law Board there would be every check against abuse. The Bill provided for the creation of the necessary fund, which would only amount to £5,000 for the whole metropolis, while the property, on which the Metropolitan Board made their rate, amounted to £13,600,000. He believed that all the Unions in the metropolis agreed to the Bill, and that the Metropolitan Board did not object to it.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill to make provision for distributing the charge of the Relief of certain classes of Poor Persons over the whole of the Metropolis, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Villiers and Mr. Gilpin.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°. [Bill 224.]

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Massey, Bill to apply a sum, out of the Consolidated Fund and the Surplus of Ways and Means, to the Service of the year one thousand eight hundred and sixty-four, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament, *ordered* * to be brought in by Mr. Massey, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Peel.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 225.]

BRIBERY AT ELECTIONS BILL.

On Motion of Sir Fitz Roy Kelly, Bill for the more effectual prevention of Bribery and Corruption in the Election of Members to serve in Parliament, *ordered* * to be brought in by Sir Fitz Roy Kelly, Sir John Pakington, and Mr. Whiteside.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 227.]

STAMP DUTIES ACT (1864) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Bill to amend an Act of the present Session, chapter eighteen, as to the Stamp Duties on certain Letters or Powers of Attorney, *ordered* * to be brought in by Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer and Mr. Peel.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 225.]

House adjourned at a quarter after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, July 20, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills — *First Reading*—Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental* (No. 221).

Their Lordships met; and having gone through the business on the paper, without debate,

House adjourned at a quarter before Four o'clock, till To-morrow, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, July 20, 1864.

MINUTES.] — Public Bills — *Ordered*—Titles (Ireland)*; Portsea Island (Rights of Way)*.
First Reading—Portsea Island (Rights of Way)* [Bill 229]; Titles (Ireland)* [Bill 230].
Second Reading—Facilities for Divine Service in Collegiate Schools [Bill 208] *negatived;* Defence Act Amendment* [Bill 223]; Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Poor Relief (Metropolis)* [Bill 224].
Committee — Cathedral Minor Corporations* [Bill 220]; Corn Accounts and Returns* [Bill 214]; Poor Removal* [Bill 222]; Indian Medical Service* [Bill 213]; Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment* [Bill 225].
Report— Cathedral Minor Corporations* [Bill 220]; Corn Accounts and Returns* [Bill 214]; Poor Removal* [Bill 222]; Indian Medical Service* [Bill 213].
Considered as amended—Improvement of Land Act (1864)* [Bill 187]; Contagious Diseases* [Bill 212]; Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* [Bill 204].
Third Reading—West Indian Incumbered Estates Act Amendment* [Bill 215]; Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000)* [Bill 217]; Clerks of the Peace Removal* [Bill 209].
Withdrawn—Inns of Court* [Bill 104]; Appeal in Criminal Cases Act Amendment [Bill 14]; Private Bill Costs* [Bill 221].

APPEAL IN CRIMINAL CASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL—[Bill 14.]

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Sir FITZROY KELLY said, that it was with great regret he rose to announce that he felt compelled to abandon the Bill for that Session. There was a proposition lying at the root of this all-important question, and worthy of the consideration of those who were opposed to the Bill, and that proposition was that every man in the country had a right to demand of the Government under which he lived that, before he should be deprived by the irresistible power of the State of his life or liberty, all practical means at least should be exhausted to ascertain whether he was guilty or innocent of the crime with which he was charged. So long as there was no effectual appeal in criminal cases that right was virtually denied to the subjects of this country. For want of such a court of appeal an intolerable evil had arisen in the practice which had grown up in the office of the Secretary of State for the Home Department. Under the name of the exercise of the prerogative of mercy, the office of the Home Secretary had become of late years merely and simply a court of criminal appeal without any of the qualities and powers which belonged to a court of justice. The result was, that the greatest possible dissatisfaction at the decisions of the Home Office in these matters had been excited, for no one could tell whether those decisions had been correctly arrived at. Various accidental circumstances had from time to time prevented his proceeding with the present Bill, and he had been disappointed in mitigating the serious opposition which existed to it in certain quarters. Though he believed that he had the authority of the greater number of the Judges in Westminster Hall in favour of the measure, yet he feared that the Government were opposed to it both in principle and detail, and, consequently, he felt that at that period of the Session it would be a waste of public time were he to enter at large into the question. He moved, therefore, that the order of the day for the second reading of the Bill should be discharged, giving notice at the same time that at the commencement of next Session he would submit to the consideration of the House a similar measure.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL observed that had the discussion come on, he would have been prepared to show that there were grave objections to the Bill, and that the measure could not be adopted without great inconvenience.

Order *discharged:* Bill *withdrawn.*

FACILITIES FOR DIVINE SERVICE IN COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS BILL—[Bill 208.]

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. COLLINS said, he rose to move the second reading of the Bill, which had come down from the House of Lords. The object of it was to legalise what now took place without law — namely, the holding of divine worship in collegiate schools. Eton, Winchester, and other large schools had their own private chapels, to which the students resorted; and it was considered advisable to give the boys of other schools the advantage of Divine worship in the same way, as there was not really proper accommodation for them in many of the churches belonging to the particular parishes in which those schools were situated. It might be said that it would materially interfere with the parochial system, but surely that was absurd. Take the cases, for example, of Rugby or of Harrow. Surely it could not be considered that the boys in those schools were parishioners of either Rugby or Harrow, when it was well known they came from all parts of the kingdom? If the Bill were passed those schools would become to a certain extent separate parishes, and the cure of souls would be assigned to the schoolmaster of each school, with, of course, the assent of the Bishop. Any apprehensions lest an objectionable form of worship should be introduced into those collegiate chapels, would be found untenable when it was recollected that no school could thrive in which the religious teaching was not to a certain extent in accordance with the views of the parents of the pupils. The parents of the boys would therefore, he considered, have a greater control over the character of the Divine service in those schools than they had at present over the services performed in the parish churches. Such sermons as Dr. Arnold delivered at Rugby and Dr. Vaughan at Harrow were surely more appropriate and beneficial for an audience of boys than those which were usually addressed to mixed congregations, and it was desirable that every facility should be afforded for such services. The Bill was carefully worded, and only applied to schools incorporated by Act of Parliament or by charter, where the religious service was required to be in accordance with the doctrines of the Church of England. By a clause in the Bill it was provided that no persons except residents or persons connected with the college should have power to enter those chapels. If the words were not stringent enough he would be ready in Committee to make any Amendment which would provide that the parochial system should not be interfered with, except so far as those who were legitimately connected with the college were concerned. After all, the parochial system was not the essence of religion, and he was at a loss to know how any objections could be raised against the Bill upon that score. He trusted that the House would assent to the principle of the measure by agreeing to the second reading.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Collins.*)

Mr. HARDCASTLE said, he should move that the Bill be read a second time that day month. He looked upon the Bill as one introducing an innovation in respect to religious service in collegiate schools all over the country, which was highly objectionable. The hon. Member had spoken of the Bill being applicable to Harrow and Rugby, but if he looked to the interpretation clause he would find that neither Harrow nor Rugby would be affected by the Bill, inasmuch as neither of these schools was incorporated by charter or Act of Parliament —they were private foundations. He believed the real object of the Bill was to enable the masters of the schools known as King Edward Schools to conduct service morning and evening without the presence of the parents, and to administer the Communion without the control of the clergyman of the parish, and so that the parents of the children should have no control over the religious instruction imparted to them. Now, these schools were really established for towns, and not for scholars who were drawn from a distance by the reputation of the head master. At present the children of Dissenters attending these schools were only required to attend church once a day, and the parents might attend, and if any improper instruction were given them they could have it rectified; but if the Bill passed the parents could no longer be present at the service, as one of the provisions was that none but the boys should be present, and thus Dissenters would be practically excluded from the schools. He did not mean to say that under certain circumstances there should not be private chapels in connection with some of the large schools, but a measure to provide such chapels required great consideration, and ought not to be introduced at the close of the Session, when there was not time to fully discuss it.

Mr. KINNAIRD seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day month."—(*Mr. Hardcastle.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. REMINGTON MILLS said, that the real object of the Bill was very artfully concealed, so as to give it quite a plausible appearance. It would extend to all the grammar schools throughout the country, and would have the effect of compelling pupils to attend the services of the Church of England, even though they were not boarders, but lived with their parents. A new principle was thus introduced into education, and the rights, duties, and responsibility of parents were invaded. Wherever it was possible children ought to attend worship with their parents, and the domestic relations ought to be especially preserved in these sacred matters. Another objection to the Bill was, that it limited the choice of the managers of a school in the appointment of a master, as he must be a man in priest's orders; and, on the other hand, it imposed a new duty on the master which might prevent him from accepting clerical engagements elsewhere. That was an exceedingly inopportune time for bringing forward such a measure, for a Commission was talked of in regard to these schools, and this would naturally form one of the subjects of inquiry. The measure was quite uncalled for, and would do a great deal of harm. It would shut out Dissenters from the schools, give those institutions a narrow sectarian character, and create unhappy associations in the minds of boys between the school where perhaps they had been flogged, and the church in which they worshipped. The Bishops did not want the control that was to be given them by the Bill, and he considered the Bill, if carried, would have an injurious effect upon the schools by excluding large numbers who would not submit to it.

MR. KINNAIRD said, he should also support the Amendment. He protested against the practice of bringing in measures of such importance as the present at the close of the Session, when there was no time to consider them properly, and hurrying them through without proper explanation. He held that the Government ought to protect independent Members against such proceedings. He deprecated exceedingly the multiplication of religious services in schools. He could say from his own experience that the compulsory attendance of boys at frequent services had a tendency to create a distaste for religious matters. Boys were hurried to church every saint's day and holiday, and were thus led to regard attendance at service as an infliction from which they ware glad to escape. At present the masters and tutors had sufficient means of instructing those under their charge in strict religious principles. The Bill would interfere not with the large schools so much as with the grammar schools throughout the country, and would create a prejudice against the Established Church. He thought it was a wholesome and proper custom that children should accompany their parents to church. A notice had been put on the paper on behalf of the Government, which showed that they deemed it necessary that some protection should be given to the Nonconformists; but the Amendment proposed was not sufficient for the purpose. He trusted the House would not agree to so mischievous a measure.

MR. NEATE said, he objected to the Bill. It would have the effect of fastening on many of the schools a more exclusive connection with the Established Church than they now possessed. Great difficulty would arise in working the act in the giving a definition to what schools it was to apply, the schools described being those "incorporated by Her Majesty for the purpose of instruction in religious and useful learning in accordance with the Church of England." He concurred that the multiplication of these chapels would tend to abuse the religious feeling of the people. He would give an instance of the evil effect of the present system on boys, and that evil effect would no doubt increase if the Bill passed. A boy on leaving one of the public schools, took off his hat, and addressing the chapel, said—"Good bye. I have been in you often enough. I'll take care I don't attend another." He thought the daily prayers should be shortened, rather than increased.

MR. F. S. POWELL said, that a sort of phantom fear possessed hon. Gentlemen opposite in regard to this measure. The spirit of the hon. Member for Peterborough seemed to pervade them, and to inspire them with a vague fear of the "Pope being at the bottom of it." The initiative in regard to the services contemplated by the Bill was to be taken not by the masters but by the governing bodies of the schools. He was not aware of any intention to hold morning and evening services in the school chapels, and believed that the apprehensions on that score were groundless. It would not be an injury to the head-masters to call on them to preach to the boys. On the contrary, it would be a benefit to them to be able to combine the ordinary work of tuition with the discharge of clerical functions. It would also be an advantage to the boys and would improve the general tone of the schools. He deprecated as much as any one the separation of boys from their families in religious worship, but he did not see that it was necessarily involved in the working of the Bill. At any rate, he was sure that if any strong feeling on the subject were expressed by the parents, it would be respected. It had already been sufficiently provided by the Act which was passed some time since, that the children of Nonconformist parents should be exempt from religious instruction in grammar schools, and therefore the argument that the Bill would exclude Dissenters from these schools failed. He had no doubt that in Committee there would be a disposition to include the large schools as well as the others. To the third and fourth clauses he objected, as they were an unjustifiable interference with the authority of the rector and churchwardens.

Sir GEORGE GREY said, he concurred in a great deal that had been said by his hon. Friend the Member for Perth (Mr. Kinnaird) as to the inconvenience of Bills of such importance coming down from the other House so late in the Session. The measure had created considerable, although he believed exaggerated alarm among the Nonconformist members of the community, and more time should be allowed for its consideration. Looking to the importance of the principle, to the nature of some of the details, and to the strong objections urged even by the supporters of the Bill to part of it, he thought that it should be sent to a Select Committee, and, on that understanding, would have been willing to vote for the second reading. It was not at all clear from the second clause what schools were included in the Bill; and alarm was caused by the supposition that it would comprehend all the smaller as well as the great grammar schools throughout the country. By the foundation of most of these schools they were intended to afford religious instruction according to the Church of England; but as day pupils, if not as boarders, the children of Nonconformists attended. Now, if the effect of the Bill would be to compel the attendance of all pupils at the services of the Church of England, that was a measure which the House, he was sure, would not be prepared to sanction. It would be right in any case to limit the operation of the Bill to boarders and perhaps also to schools with not less than a certain number of scholars. It would be very inconvenient to have every small grammar school setting up a chapel of its own. Nothing was said in the Bill about daily services, but they might be established under it, and the service could not be abridged. Under these circumstances, and considering the period of the Session, he hoped the hon. Gentleman would not press the Bill that year.

Mr. COLLINS said, he felt that, under the circumstances, he had no resource but to withdraw the Bill for the Session.

Amendment and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Second Reading *put off* till this day fortnight.

TITLES (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Monsell, Bill to provide more certain and economic means for transferring and otherwise dealing with certain Lands in Ireland, *ordered* * to be brought in by Mr. Monsell, Mr. Herbert, and Sir Colman O'Loghlen.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 230.]

PORTSEA ISLAND (RIGHTS OF WAY) BILL.

On Motion of The Marquess of Hartington, Bill to extinguish certain Rights of Way through the Landport Gate, Ravelin, and Glacis, and the Sallyport adjacent thereto, at Portsea Island, in the county of Hants, *ordered* * to be brought in by The Marquess of Hartington and The Judge Advocate.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 229.]

House adjourned at Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, July 21, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—On Highways Act Amendment *appointed* and *nominated* * (*List of Members*); Thames Conservancy *appointed* and *nominated* * (*List of Members*).

Report—Railways Construction Facilities * (No. 160).

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000)* (No. 224); West India Incumbered Estates Acts Amendment * (No. 225).
Second Reading—Weights and Measures (Metric System (No. 164); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* (No. 214); Militia Pay*; Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* (No. 218); Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. (No. 219); Expiring Laws Continuance* (No. 208); Highways Act Amendment* (No. 207); Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal* (No. 212); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* (No. 211).
Committee—College of Physicians* (No. 114); Inclosure (No. 2)* (No. 177); Trespass (Ireland)* (No. 202); Sale of Gas (Scotland)* (No. 152); Naval Discipline* (No. 205) [H.L.]; Local Government Act (1858) Amendment* (No. 190).
Report—Burials Registration* (No. 144); College of Physicians* (No. 114); Inclosure (No. 2)* (No. 177); Trespass (Ireland)* (No. 202); Sale of Gas (Scotland)* (No. 152); Naval Discipline* (No. 205); Local Government Act (1858) Amendment* (No. 190).
Third Reading—Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Russia)* (No. 204) [H.L.]; Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans)* (No. 206); Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment* (No. 209); Militia Ballots Suspension*.

CUBA SLAVE TRADE.
GENERAL DULCE.—EXPLANATION.

Lord BROUGHAM said, he had received a letter from his noble Friend, Lord Howden, complaining that when, in the observations he made the other evening in reference to the Cuba slave trade, he accused the Spanish Governors of Cuba generally of having taken bribes and encouraged the slave trade, he made no exception of General Dulce. The fact was, however, that he did state on the occasion referred to, that General Dulce formed an exception, and ten days before, in contrasting the conduct of the Government of Spain with that of Brazil, he bore testimony in favour of General Dulce, and the noble Earl the Foreign Secretary had also commended General Dulce's conduct. But praise did not penetrate the walls of that House as vituperation did, and the reason was that the former did not bear the same price in the market. If all the Spanish Governors had been but half as good as General Dulce, the slave trade would now be probably at an end. Lord Howden had expressed a strong opinion that the Aberdeen Act ought no longer to be maintained, because the Brazilians had entirely abolished the slave trade. Lord Aberdeen himself in 1856 declared that either in the event of the slave trade ceasing, or the Convention being renewed, he would be disposed to move for the repeal of that Act. Though not liable to the charge of having neglected to praise General Dulce, he had made an omission of which the Jamaica petitioners complained, and that was that he had not given Admiral Hope the credit so justly due to him. Admiral Hope was a gallant officer who had in every respect performed his duty with respect to the Cuban slave trade, and had also distinguished himself in the East. It was with the greatest pleasure that he bore testimony to his merits, as he was the son of a revered friend, the late President of the Court of Session in Scotland.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL.
(No. 164.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Earl FORTESCUE, having presented a petition in favour of this Bill from the Association of Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom, said, that the question of weights and measures had an hereditary claim upon his support, because he whose place he so unworthily filled succeeded in carrying through the other House of Parliament many years ago a measure establishing the system of weights and measures now the law of the land. After twenty years' experience of the working of the present system, however, his late father was so convinced of the superiority of the metric system that he was one of the first to give his adhesion to the introduction, in a permissive shape, of the metric system in this country. The former Act was introduced in pursuance of the recommendations of a Select Committee, and the present Bill was equally the result of the unanimous recommendation of a Committee of the other House composed of men of all parties. It was unnecessary to remark that the present being a permissive Bill must necessarily remain a dead letter unless it were adopted by the free will of the people; but that it would be freely adopted by all persons engaged in trade, manufactures, and science, he had not the least doubt—in fact, the petition from the Associated Chambers of Commerce, which he had just presented, seemed to place the matter beyond doubt, as the petitioners might be fairly considered as representing the feelings of all practical men in the important towns they represented. Their Lordships must be fully aware of the variety of the measures of grain, wine, and beer which prevailed in different parts of the country. In some countries a bushel of wheat was 60 lbs., in some 64 lbs., in others 70 lbs.; sometimes it was sold by weight, sometimes by measure; the mode of measuring distances varied—in short, nothing could be more confused than the present system. The adoption of the metric system would cure this want of uniformity, and would substitute for that which was inconvenient and difficult to learn a system which was simple and easy to be acquired. The adoption of this system would save half the time which was at present occupied in making calculations. The very strongest evidence had been given in its favour by practical men. Among those who recommended its introduction, and some of whom employed it in the transaction of their own business, were the late Mr. Locke, the eminent engineer, who, having found the metric system in one of his foreign contracts so advantageous, that he adopted it for the transaction of his business in England; Mr. Whitworth, Mr. Robinson of the Atlas Works, Mr. Crossley, Mr. Anderson superintendent of the gun factory at Woolwich, Sir Rowland Hill, and Professor Graham the Master of the Mint. Scientific men were equally favourable to the metric system. The Jurors at the International Exhibitions of London and Paris said, that a great part of the benefit which might have arisen from the exhibition of the raw produce and manufactures of various countries was lost to thousands of persons in consequence of the difficulty of comparing the weights and measures and the moneys of one country with those of another. Professor Hoffman and Professor Owen, in their reports as Jurors of the Exhibition of 1862, referred to the confusion and discord which existed in the systems of weights and measures of different countries. The fact was that this confusion was so great, and so much time and labour were consumed in converting the weights and measures of one country into their equivalents in a foreign system, that practically the knowledge of one nation was a sealed book to the scientific men of others. As to the facility with which the system could be learnt there was the most conclusive testimony, and Professor Leone Levi summed up its general result to be that a boy could make the same progress in arithmetic taught according to the metric system in ten months as would according to the existing method take him two years and ten months to accomplish. Considering the value of youthful labour and the short time which could be spared to education by the children of the poor, this was a matter of some importance. He entreated their Lordships not to take any step which would impose upon these children two years of useless labour, and not to aid in preventing the free interchange of the manufactures and commodities as well as of the knowledge and information of all the people of the world. The noble Lord concluded by moving that the Bill should be read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Earl Fortescue.*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY admitted that there was a good deal of confusion attached to our present system of weights and measures, but desired to point out that, notwithstanding the pound had become the uniform measure by which all things were sold, and that to introduce the metric system would be only to add another element of confusion. He would ask their Lordships whether, at this period of the Session, and, as a consequence, without due time for its discussion, it was desirable to pass a measure whose operation would be to create confusion in every market town in England? Believing that it was not, he should move that the Bill be read a second time that day six months.

Amendment *moved* to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Six Months").—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said, he thought the Government would not allow the Bill to pass through their Lordships' House without expressing some opinion as to its proposal. If this country had passed through such a crisis as France passed in 1789 it might not be disadvantageous to introduce the metric system; but under existing circumstances, it not being proposed to abolish the present system, but only to allow the introduction of the new system *pari passu* with the old, he thought the confusion would be augmented rather than diminished. Nothing, he would add, but compulsory legislation would induce the people of this or any other country to give up the system to which they were accustomed in favour of one even more scientific and simple.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL, speaking solely for himself, said that he had heard no valid argument urged against the Bill, and should vote in its favour. The fact, he contended, that almost all the Chambers of Commerce throughout the country supported it by their petitions was one of great importance for the consideration of the House, for it afforded a strong proof that many persons in the mercantile world were of opinion that to them, at least, the system would be advantageous. It was said that the operation of the Bill would be to add to the existing confusion; but it was, in his opinion, impossible to do that, at all events so far as Scotland was concerned. There were "bolls" and "bushels," varying in capacity, in almost every county in Scotland. He did not suppose that the habits of the people in various localities could be very easily altered in dealing with the local system of measures; but the proposed change would, he thought, be very generally adopted in the case of large mercantile transactions, particularly those transactions with foreign countries which were so greatly on the increase. It could only be used where both parties to a contract consented; they would only use it if they thought it convenient. It was not compulsory on any one, and therefore could do no one harm; but by allowing its use the effect might be that ultimately it would elbow out the present confused and defective system. The Bill, at all events, could do no harm, and he saw no good reason why their Lordships should not adopt it.

The Earl of HARROWBY supported the Bill, remarking that if men largely engaged in commerce wished for it, he saw no reason why the House should stand in the way of its passing.

Lord BROUGHAM regarded the Bill as an important step in the right direction, and he hoped to live to see the decimal system in general use. He was, he might add, an advocate of the change not only in a commercial but in an educational point of view, and he had the testimony of Mr. Chadwick, to whose efforts the half-time system—one of the greatest improvements of our day—was due, to the effect that the introduction of the decimal system would shorten the time occupied in the teaching of arithmetic by one-half.

The Earl of CARNARVON said, it was a mistake to suppose that noble Lords on that side of the House were averse to the metric system as such. What they objected to was that a Bill of this importance should be introduced at that late period of the Session. Either the Government ought to take it up and pass it on their own responsibility, or there ought to be a Select Committee next Session to take the Bill into careful consideration. The argument that the Bill was only permissive was very much against it, for if it were right that all the weights and measures in the country should be equalized, it must be by a compulsory measure. A mere permissive Bill only added another element to the confusion.

Earl FORTESCUE, in reply, said, that in all the countries in which the system had been introduced, its simplicity had caused it to work without any friction or opposition.

On Question that ("now") stand part of the Motion? their Lordships *divided* :—Contents 34; Not-Contents 23: Majority 11.

Resolved in the *Affirmative :* Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* next.

CONTENTS.

Westbury, L. (*L. Chancellor*).

Armagh, Achbp.

Somerset, D.

Westminster, M.

Chichester, E.
Clarendon, E.
Effingham, E.
Fortescue, E. [*Teller.*]
Harrowby, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Wicklow, E.

Falmouth, V.
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster*).

Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.
London, Bp.

Brougham and Vaux, L.
Camoys, L. [*Teller.*]
Churchill, L.
Dartrey, L. (*L. Cremorne*).
De Mauley, L.
De Tabley, L.
Ebury, L.
Foley, L.
Houghton, L.
Llanover, E.
Mostyn, L.
Portman, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Seymour, L. (*E. St. Maur*).
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde*).
Stratheden, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll*).
Taunton, L.
Wensleydale, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Buckingham and Chandos, D.

Bath, M.
Salisbury, M. [*Teller.*]

Amherst, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry*).
Lanesborough, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Nelson, E.
Powis, E.

Hawarden, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore*). [*Teller.*]

Chelmsford, L.
Churston, L.
Colchester, L.
Denman, L.
Dinevor, L.
Egerton, L.
Monson, L.
Redesdale, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford*).
Templemore, L.
Wynford, L.

POISONED FLESH PROHIBITION, &c., BILL—(No. 212.)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD REDESDALE, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said, that it had frequently happened that valuable animals, the property of other persons, had been destroyed by eating poisoned meat laid for the destruction of vermin; and this evil the Bill was intended to remedy. The principle of the measure was precisely the same as was sanctioned by Parliament last year in reference to poisoned grain.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Redesdale.*)

LORD WODEHOUSE said, that the second clause imposed a penalty of £10 for placing poisoned meat or other matter upon any land; and the consequence would be that the owner of any house or stack could not place poison, even in his own garden, for the destruction of rats, without incurring a penalty. It would be for their Lordships to consider whether the clause should not be modified.

LORD CHELMSFORD observed that by an exception in the first clause, an owner or occupier of land in Ireland could not place poisoned matter upon the land without first posting a notice that such was done; but he (Lord Chelmsford) could not understand how this notice would prevent dogs eating the poisoned meat.

LORD REDESDALE said, that he was not responsible for the details, for the measure had been altered in the Commons; and their Lordships knew that in the other House exceptions with reference to Ireland were often inserted in measures which were under consideration. If the Bill were now read a second time the details could be considered in Committee.

THE MARQUESS OF BATH thought that the exception practically excepted Ireland from the operation of the Bill, and in his opinion it was very desirable that England should be excepted also.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY thought it hardly desirable to proceed further with the Bill this Session.

THE DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH thought that the putting of poisonous substances upon land by gamekeepers for the destruction of vermin was a great and growing evil; and in the south of Scotland he could state of his own knowledge that where strychnine had been used valuable shepherds' dogs had been killed by eating the poisoned vermin.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE said, he also knew that dogs and pigs were frequently poisoned, and pheasants likewise were destroyed. It was a curious and well-known fact in natural history, that though the maggots generated in the poisoned carcasses were not affected by the poison, yet they communicated the destructive effects to birds that eat them. Every reason which applied to putting poisoned grain upon land applied also to the placing of poisoned meat there.

LORD WODEHOUSE said, he was certainly not in favour of laying poison for small birds, which, so far from being noxious, were extremely useful. If he could prevent the poisoning of foxes, and at the same time allow the poisoning of vermin, he would do so; but this Bill would prevent the latter, and would thus occasion serious inconvenience and injury. This was not a fox-preserving question on the one side and a game-preserving question on the other. It should be looked at as neither of those questions; but, believing that the Bill would be productive of mischief on the whole, he moved that it be read a second time this day three months.

Amendment moved, to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months").—(*Lord Wodehouse.*)

LORD PORTMAN hoped their Lordships would not reject this Bill on the second reading. Many of the points to which objection had been made could be amended in Committee. He was sure that if in the Bill for prohibiting poisoned grain which passed last year a clause had been introduced to prohibit poisoned flesh it also would have been passed. Some noble Lords were most anxious to destroy the birds and others to destroy the animals. He knew that it was a practice of keepers to poison rabbits with strychnine, and place them in preserves to poison vermin. Now, if one of these rabbits should be picked up by any passer-by and eaten, the consequences might be deplorable.

On Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion? Their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 31; Not-Contents 18: Majority 13.

Resolved in the *Affirmative:* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

CONTENTS.

Westbury, L. (*L. Chancellor*).

Buckingham and Chandos, D.

Westminster, M.

Amherst, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensbury*).
Harrowby, E.
Nelson, E.
Romney, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Falmouth, V.

Camoys, L. [*Teller.*]
Churchill, L.
Churston, L.
Colchester, L.
De Mauley, L.
Denman, L.
De Talby, L.
Dunsany, L.
Ebury, L
Foley, L.
Llanover, L.
Mostyn, L.
Portman, L.
Redesdale, L. [*Teller.*]
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford*).
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Stratheden, L.
Taunton, L.
Templemore, L.
Wensleydale, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Armagh, Archbp.

Somerset, D.

Bath, M. [*Teller.*]

Airlie, E.
Chichester, E.
De Grey, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Powis, E.

Hawarden, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore*).

Chelmsford, L.
Dartrey, L. (*L. Cremorne*).
Hatherton, L.
Monson, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll*).
Wodehouse, L. [*Teller.*]
Wynford, L.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Select Committee *appointed* and *nominated.* The Lords following were named of the Committee; the Committee to meet *To-morrow*, at One o'clock, and to appoint their own Chairman:—M. Salisbury, Ld. Steward, E. Romney, E. Powis, E. De Grey, E. Eversley, L. Wodehouse, L. Hatherton, L. Stanley of Alderley, L. Egerton, L. Llanover.

THAMES CONSERVANCY BILL.

Select Committee *appointed* and *nominated* as follows:—The Viscount Hutchinson (Chairman), The Lord Abercromby, The Lord Mostyn, The Lord De Mauley, The Lord Methuen; The Committee to meet *To-morrow*, at Eleven o'clock.

House adjourned at a quarter before
Seven o'clock, till To-morrow,
Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, July 21, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Ordered*—Masters and Servants*.

First Reading—Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia)* [Bill 231] (*Lords*); Masters and Servants* [Bill 232].

Committee—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation); Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) [Bill 218]; Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2) (*re-committed*)* [Bill 226]; Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* [Bill 211]; Cranbourne Street (*re-committed*)* [Bill 154]—r.p.; Corn Accounts and Returns (*re-committed*)* [Bill 214]; Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment* [Bill 225].

Report—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation); Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) [Bill 218]; Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)* [Bill 226]; Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* [Bill 211]; Corn Accounts and Returns* [Bill 214]; Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment* [Bill 225].

Considered as amended—Corn Accounts and Returns* [Bill 214]; Poor Removal* [Bill 222].

Third Reading—New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan) [Bill 150]; Contagious Diseases* [Bill 212]; Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* [Bill 204]; Corn Accounts and Returns* [Bill 214]; Westminster Bridge Traffic* [Bill 205]; Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal [Bill 161] (*Lords*); Improvement of Land Act (1864)* [Bill 187] (*Lords*); Cathedral Minor Corporations* [Bill 220] (*Lords*); Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension* [Bill 201]; Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues* [Bill 202], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Metropolis Management Act (1862) Amendment* [Bill 219].

NAVY—PAYMENT OF OFFICERS.

QUESTION.

Mr. C. P. BERKELEY said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, If he considers that the officers of long standing and high rank in the Navy are satisfied with the recent distribution of pay, as lately gazetted, by which it appears that their juniors will receive more than themselves; and if he considers that the fact of officers receiving more on the Retired Lists than those who remain on the Active Lists, will act beneficially in inducing officers to seek service; and if, considering the anomalies which have arisen in the various rates of pay, half-pay, retired pay, and reserve pay, Her Majesty's Government will cause any inquiry to be made, either by Royal Commission or otherwise?

Lord CLARENCE PAGET, in reply, said, he had heard of no complaints to the effect that the officers of the navy were dissatisfied with the distribution of pay as recently gazetted. With regard to the junior officers receiving more pay than their seniors, that was undoubtedly true, but he had to observe that that was the only way in which officers could be induced to retire from the service, and make room for others more active. That arrangement was, therefore, inseparable from all schemes for retirement. His hon. Friend also asked whether he considered that the scheme would act beneficially in inducing officers to seek service; and he (Lord Clarence Paget) had to reply that he was not aware of the existence of any reluctance on the part of officers to seek service. On the contrary, there were repeated applications from officers for active employment. With respect to the latter part of the Question of his hon. Friend, he had to state that Her Majesty's Government had given great consideration to that subject, and that they were not at present disposed to cause any inquiry to be made, by Commission or otherwise, into the various rates of pay in the navy.

MR. C. P. BERKELEY said, he would give notice that he should call attention to the subject at the earliest opportunity.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN STATE PAPERS.—QUESTION.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether a publication, called *The British and Foreign State Papers*, issued annually, and edited by the Librarian of the Foreign Office, is printed either wholly or in part at the public expense; and if so, whether such a selection might not be distributed to Members at the ordinary price of Parliamentary Papers instead of being charged 30*s.* a volume; and whether it might not be brought up to the present time like the French collection?

MR. LAYARD said, in reply, that *The British and Foreign State Papers* were printed at the expense of the public, and sold at a certain rate, the proceeds passing to the public account. As to the distribution of the publication at the ordinary price of Parliamentary Papers, there was, of course, no objection to that if the House were willing to incur the expense. As to the work being brought down to the present time, that was impossible. The French publication referred to was of a different nature. It was a collection, hastily brought together, of documents published in various ways on the Continent. The State Papers, on the other hand, which were published by the British Foreign Office, were very carefully edited. They could not be brought down to the present day, because many of the papers were not printed till four or five years after they had been made use of. Some years ago the collection was very much behindhand. The present Librarian of the Foreign Office, however, who was a gentleman of great intelligence and zeal, had published two volumes a year, and was anxious, if possible, to increase the annual issue to three volumes. The work required so much care and attention that it was not desirable to undertake more than two or three volumes a year. By 1867 or 1868, he believed the collection would be brought up to within five years.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR said, that as far as he was aware they were not secret papers.

CONVICTION FOR SALE OF DISEASED MEAT.—QUESTION.

MR. CRAWFORD said it appeared from the Report of the Sanitary Committee of the City of London that in the twelve months ending September, 1863, not less than 114,000 lbs. of diseased, and 76,000 lbs. of putrid meat, were seized and condemned in the City of London. He therefore would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether Alexander Stewart, who was convicted at the Central Criminal Court in December, 1863, of the offence of sending diseased meat from Scotland to London for sale, and sentenced to the payment of a fine of £50, and imprisonment for the term of twelve calendar months, has been liberated from gaol without payment of the fine; and, if so, that he will state the grounds on which Stewart was so liberated and the fine remitted; and whether applications are not now before the Secretary of State for the Home Department for the remission of punishments and penalties in other similar cases.

SIR GEORGE GREY: I find, Sir, that Alexander Stewart, the person referred to, was convicted in November, 1863, for exposing for sale meat unfit for food. An application was made for a mitigation of the sentence, which was refused. But at the end of May, when he had undergone six months of the sentence, the Visiting Justices of Holloway Prison recommended his discharge on medical grounds, sending a certificate from the surgeon stating that his life was in great danger, and that unless soon liberated he would die; upon which he was discharged. The only other case of a similar kind in which, so far as I can ascertain, any application has been made is that of a man named George Thompson Smith, sentenced in March last to six months' imprisonment, and that application has been refused.

RESERVOIRS.—QUESTION.

MR. FERRAND said, he rose to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If it is an illegal act for the owners of a hill reservoir to fill it with water, and keep it full, or nearly full, for several successive weeks, without having had it duly certified by two Magistrates; if so (the Secretary of State having declared that he has no official authority to interfere), whether it would be an illegal act for the inhabitants whose lives are in danger to resist the filling of the reservoir until duly certified, for the purpose of securing their self-preservation, and their homes from destruction?

SIR GEORGE GREY: Sir, there is no general law to the effect stated by the hon. Gentleman, and I am not aware that in any case it is necessary to obtain the certificate of two magistrates before a reservoir is filled. But there is a clause in some Private Acts authorizing the construction of water works (and it is in the Bradford Waterworks Act), by which, on a representation being made to two justices by the owners or occupiers of any premises liable to be injured, that the embankment of the reservoir is in a dangerous state, such justices, if satisfied on an inquiry of the truth of such representation, shall require the Company within a given time to repair it. And the Act empowers the magistrates to take certain steps in the event of the Company not complying with the order. In this case, therefore, the law has provided an effectual remedy against danger. In answer to the latter part of the question of the hon. Gentleman, I can only say that I should advise him, or those who apprehend danger, to avail themselves of the provisions of the law, instead of taking the law into their own hands.

MR. FERRAND said, he wished to know whether there was any power to make the magistrates act?

SIR GEORGE GREY said, the words of the clause were, not that the "magistrates may," but that "the magistrates shall" do such and such things. The Court of Queen's Bench would deal with the magistrates if they wilfully neglected their duty.

WINE LICENCES.—QUESTION.

MR. COX said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the injustice done by five Magistrates of the county of Middlesex, sitting in Special Sessions, to a Mr. Weston, not only in refusing him a "Gladstone" Wine Licence for the Retreat Tea Gardens at Kentish Town, but also in refusing to give the grounds of their objections when called on so to do by the Counsel of Mr. Weston, to enable him to appeal to Quarter Sessions; and whether he will bring in a Bill next Session making it compulsory on Magistrates refusing applications for such Licences to state their reasons for refusing to grant the same?

SIR GEORGE GREY: Sir, a short statement of this case was placed in my hands a few days ago by the hon. Gentleman. I can only state in answer to his question, what the law as to granting Wine Licences is. By the Act of 1860 (23 & 24 *Vict.* c. 27, s. 13), on an application for a Wine Licence for the first time being made to the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, the Supervisor of Excise for the district is required to send notice of the application to the Justices of the Petty Sessions, stating that the licence will be granted after thirty days, unless the justices send a written notice that they object to its being granted on some or one of the grounds specified in the Act. It is further provided that no such objection shall be sent by the justices until they shall have heard what the applicant has to say against the objection, unless he refuses or neglects to attend before them on a summons, which summons must state the grounds of objection. Mr. Weston, therefore, must, I presume, have been summoned and the ground of objection stated to him before the notice of objection was sent to the Excise by the magistrates. It does not appear that there is any appeal to the Sessions in the case of a first application, the appeal being limited to an objection to the renewal of a licence already granted. The Act was one brought in by my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I cannot give any assurance as to a Bill for altering its provisions.

MR. COX said, he would give notice that he should to-morrow ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he will bring in a Bill to compel magistrates to give their reasons for refusing applications for licences?

NAVY—THE "RESEARCH" AND "ENTERPRISE."—QUESTION.

SIR FREDERIC SMITH said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether he has any objection to lay upon the table of the House, Copy of the Reports of Captain de Horsey on Her Majesty's Ships *Research* and *Enterprise?*

LORD CLARENCE PAGET, in reply, said, he had already stated that Captain de Horsey's Reports upon these two ships were partly favourable and partly unfavourable. They were very voluminous, and were accompanied by various diagrams, so that they could not easily be published. He had further to observe that they were to all intents and purposes confidential Reports from officers to their superiors; and if he were to make a practice of laying Reports of this nature on the table, the Admiralty would never receive papers which were not drawn up with a view to publication.

TROOPS FOR JAPAN.

QUESTION.

LORD NAAS said, in the absence of his hon. Friend (Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald), he would beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether a force of Marines has been sent from this country to Japan, of how many men it consists, and when it was despatched from this country?

LORD CLARENCE PAGET stated, in reply, that on the 21st of December last Her Majesty's ship *Conqueror* was sent to Japan with a limited crew and 500 marines.

PASSPORTS IN FRANCE.

QUESTION.

SIR WILLIAM FRASER said, he wished to say a few words in putting the Question of which he had given notice. At this time of the year there were a great many British subjects travelling in France; and it was of great importance that they should know whether or not they were required to carry passports; and, if so, whether the French *visé* was necessary? No one who had any experience of the subordinate officials of the French Government could fail to be aware that they were rather difficult people to deal with, and occasionally went beyond the orders of their superiors. A year or two since the French Government gave out that no inquiries would be made of British subjects travelling in France; but cases had come to his knowledge in which these orders had not been carried out. He hoped the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs would be able to give a clear and definite statement as to whether passports were required on the part of British subjects in France.

MR. LAYARD said, it was well known that the Emperor of the French, with great liberality, had removed all restrictions upon British subjects travelling in France. He had never heard any complaints of the nature mentioned by the hon. Gentleman. French *visés* were not required for British subjects, nor was a passport necessary; but occasionally a traveller might be asked for his passport in order to identify his nationality. But although a passport was not essentially necessary, he should advise travellers to provide themselves with passports. He had always received the greatest civility from the French authorities when travelling, and he had never heard of a *bonâ fide* British subject being subjected to inconvenience. The countries in which a passport was not required at present were Bavaria, Belgium, Denmark, Holland, France, Italy, Prussia, Spain, Sweden, and Norway. In all other Continental countries passports were required.

POOR RELIEF IN THE METROPOLIS.

QUESTION.

LORD CLAUD HAMILTON said, he had a Question of considerable importance to bring under the notice of the House, and that he might put himself in order he would conclude with a Motion for adjournment. The subject to which he wished to call attention was one of great magnitude. A very extraordinary proceeding on the part of those who administered the poor relief of the country had been resorted to, in passing the second reading of a Bill yesterday in so hurried a manner that the Bill had not first been printed, and consequently no copy of the Bill was at the time in the hands of hon. Members. The effect of the Bill was to subvert the whole system upon which the administration of the relief of the poor was founded —namely, a combination of the principles of taxation and representation. He had not had time to give notice to the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Poor Law Board of his intention to bring forward the subject; but the right hon.

Gentleman could scarcely complain, as he himself had given no notice to the House of the nature of his Bill. The object of the Bill was to provide for the relief of the casual poor of the metropolis, and it enabled certain persons who had not heretofore been connected with the administration of the Poor Law system to pay money to any amount and throw the whole burden upon the property within the metropolitan district. Never had such an attempt been made to smuggle through an important measure, involving a totally new principle, in so objectionable a manner. The Bill was not printed in time to be distributed to hon. Members yesterday morning, although it was down for a second reading yesterday afternoon: he went to his Club, and the Bill was not to be found there; and on inquiring at his own house, at six o'clock, he found that a copy of the Bill was not delivered there until three or four o'clock in the afternoon. Yet the Bill, which he might say had been smuggled through the second reading, contained a provision that the Metropolitan Board of Works should be able to give any sum of money the guardians of unions might be pleased to ask for, without having the slightest knowledge whether it was honestly, properly, or judiciously administered. The Metropolitan Board of Works was understood to be established for the better management of the metropolis in reference to sewerage, paving, draining, lighting, and cleansing; and he saw no reason why they should be introduced into the administration of the poor relief, and the proceeding that had been taken was contrary to all Parliamentary usage. He wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Poor Law Board, if he intended to go on with the Bill during the present Session, and in order to afford him an opportunity of explaining his views he would move the adjournment of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."

MR. SPEAKER said, it was perfectly competent for an hon. Member to invite the attention of the House to anything which he thought irregular in its course of proceeding; but it would not be regular on a Motion for the adjournment of the House to enter into a discussion of the merits of the Bill which stood for consideration to-morrow.

EDUCATION—INSPECTORS' REPORTS.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. HUNT said, he wished to take that opportunity of making an appeal to the noble Lord at the head of the Government with regard to a Motion which stood on the paper, for rescinding a Resolution of the House relating to the Education Inspectors' Reports. The House would recollect that the Resolution was passed on the 12th of April last, and that in consequence of that Vote of the House, the Vice President of the Committee on Education retired from his office. A Committee was subsequently appointed to inquire into the matter, and it had now presented its Report, which referred to the evidence taken and to an appendix setting forth certain Inspectors' Reports that had been marked, or returned, or otherwise dealt with by the Department. Well, the evidence and the appendix to which the Report referred were not yet in the hands of Members; and in addition to that reason for not now proceeding with the Motion he begged to remark that it would be a most unusual and most objectionable course, at the very end of the Session, when probably there would not be half the number present which passed the Resolution, for the Government to attempt to rescind it. He did not wish now to say a word about the merits of the Motion, and whenever it came on he should be prepared to give it a fair and candid consideration; but as a matter of principle he must enter his protest against that attempt to smuggle through the rescission of a Resolution which had been passed when the House was tolerably full. It might be said that the Department against which the Resolution was directed ought not to be left under the imputation which that Resolution might be supposed to cast upon it till Parliament met again. But he must observe that the Government had not shown any great hurry to remove the stigma from the Department, because the Resolution was passed on the 12th of April, and the Motion for appointing the Committee was not made till one month afterwards. Therefore the Department sat very comfortably under whatever imputation might have been thought to rest upon it for a month; and they might, therefore, very well allow the Motion of which notice was now given to stand over till next Session, when it could be fairly and properly considered. It was a very unusual thing to move to rescind a Resolution of the House. It might be quite right to rescind that Resolution, but it ought to be done deliberately and after all the Members of the House had had a full opportunity of reading the evidence on which the Report was founded; then, if the House thought fit to rescind the Resolution, well and good. But he wanted to know whether the noble Lord could point to any case where it had been attempted to rescind a Resolution during the last few days of the Session, when, as they well knew, the whole of the business was entirely under the control of the Government. He did not know whether the Department, the conduct of which was supposed to have been impugned, would be very well satisfied with such a rescission, because what would it amount to? A Resolution had been passed, after due notice, and in a tolerably full House; and if the noble Lord made his Motion on Monday, when probably the House would consist of about half the number of Members who voted in the minority on the previous occasion, what would be the validity and effect of such a decision? He did not think it could be very satisfactory to the Department, and it could hardly satisfy the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Lowe) who had felt so sore on the point as to throw up his office. Certainly, if he were the right hon. Gentleman, he should prefer that the Motion be postponed till another Session, when, if carried, it might really afford some consolation to him. He begged, therefore, to suggest that the noble Lord should postpone his Motion.

JAPAN—DESPATCH OF TROOPS.

QUESTION.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, he wished to know upon whose authority the troops of the Line and Marines have been sent to Japan? If they are sent by the authority of the Cabinet they can state their reasons. If not, they must have been sent by the authority of some subordinate authority. He should like to know whether it is constitutional for anybody to involve the country in war, and whether the Despatch of General Brown will be laid on the table previous to the debate?

CASUAL POOR (METROPOLIS) BILL.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. HARVEY LEWIS said, he had received a copy of the Casual Poor (Metropolis) Bill before ten o'clock yesterday morning, and he confessed he had learnt with surprise that a measure of such importance had been brought forward at the fag end of the Session. He had had a great deal of communication with his constituents on that question, and while everybody must be convinced that something should be done with regard to casual destitution in the metropolis, yet the general feeling was that having waited so long they ought to wait till an opportunity should be afforded for the proper consideration of the Bill, without hurrying it through the House in the manner now proposed. He thought it impossible that the measure should pass in the present Session, but if the Government persisted in going on with it, it would be his duty in Committee to move Amendments which would be likely to raise considerable discussion.

MR. T. J. MILLER said, that at present the Metropolitan Board of Works had had no opportunity of discussing that question; but they were to meet to-morrow, when they would be able to do so, and to give their opinion upon it.

MR. LYALL, as a Member of the Poor Law Committee, which had sat for three years, wished to say that the Committee were unanimous in the opinion that the subject of this Bill should be early considered, and its principle carried out. They all knew what great distress occurred last winter in the metropolis, when they heard many harrowing tales respecting the condition of the casual poor; and it was therefore a matter of urgency that this question should be dealt with promptly.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY said, that the President of the Poor Law Board made his statement with reference to this Bill about two o'clock in the morning, when not fifteen Members were present; but the right hon. Gentleman gave no notice that he intended to hurry the measure through so rapidly as actually to read it a second time before it was printed. [No!] At least he did not get his copy before the second reading. The Bill was one of the greatest importance, and he could not understand why it had been brought in so late in the Session, when it could not possibly receive due consideration. He had a great objection to the Metropolitan Board of Works being mixed up with the relief of the poor.

MR. C. P. VILLIERS said, he had no idea the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) would have taken that opportunity of stating his views regarding this Bill. He had stated, in reply to a Question put by the hon. Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Lyall), that he did intend, in deference to the unanimous opinion and recommendation of the Committee, to introduce a measure on this subject. It was not possible to collect the opinions of the guardians of unions in the metropolis, but he thought it his duty to bring it forward even at that late period of the Session; and, as he did not expect any opposition, he hoped it would pass. On the following evening he moved for leave to bring in the Bill, but not at so late an hour as had been stated by his hon. Friend. [SIR JOHN SHELLEY: At five minutes to two.] It was very shortly after one, immediately after the Orders of the Day had been disposed of. It was very important and urgent that some provision should be made for the objects of this Bill before the coming winter set in. It in no sense transferred the poor from the Boards of Guardians to the Metropolitan Board of Works; but he said he thought that the Metropolitan Board might collect the trifling sum that would be necessary for the support of this class of the poor. The Bill was under their consideration, and he hoped they would consent to do that. He anticipated certainly the opposition of his hon. Friend the Member for Westminster (Sir John Shelley), but he certainly did not anticipate any opposition from the other side. Before he proceeded to move the second reading, he had taken care to inform himself that the Bill was in the hands of Members generally, having ascertained at the Vote Office that the Bill was printed and delivered to Members with the Votes. [Lord CLAUD HAMILTON said, he did not receive his copy till between three and four in the afternoon.] Well, that must have been a solitary instance. He had even been urged to put the Bill for Committee to-day, but thought it better to place it in the Orders for to-morrow. There would be ample opportunity for hon. Members to express their opinions on the subject on the Motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair. He could not, therefore, admit that the House had been at all taken by surprise. He certainly, however, was taken by surprise at the objection which had been stated. There was no novelty in the case. The Committee had been sitting for three years upstairs; they had carefully considered the matter; they were unanimous in their recommendation; and the hon. Gentleman who was most urgent for the adoption of the measure sat on the other side. When, therefore, he (Mr. C. P. Villiers) saw the urgency of the case, he saw no reason to postpone the Bill. He hoped hon. Gentlemen opposite would consider whether they had any good reasons for opposing it.

MR. H. BAILLIE observed, that the right hon. Gentleman adopted the course of the young woman who when charged with having had a bastard child vindicated herself by saying it was a very small one. The right hon. Gentleman said this was a very small Bill; but it was a very important one, and it was disrespectful to the House—indeed it was treating the House with contempt—to bring forward such a Bill at that period of the Session, when most of those who took an interest in these questions had left town. He trusted the Government would reconsider their decision. The charge was, not that the Bill was read a second time before it was printed, but that in the very last days of the Session—after the Appropriation Bill had been brought in, and when there were very few Members present besides the occupants of the Treasury Bench—a Bill involving such a total change in the constitution of the Poor Law was attempted to be shuffled through the House.

SIR HENRY WILLOUGHBY said, he was present when the right hon. Gentleman made his communication to his hon. Friend the Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Lyall), and he certainly did not understand that the Bill involved the new principle, that the Metropolitan Board of Works should be made an engine for levying the poor rates. He believed there would be found to be a difference of opinion on the Bill when it came to be discussed, and he thought the fullest opportunity should be given for the consideration of so important a proposal.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: In answer, in the first place, to the noble Lord the Member for Huntingdonshire (Lord Robert Montagu) who asked, by whose authority it was that troops of the line and marines had been sent to Japan—whether it was or was not by order of the Government?—I have to state that this force was sent on the decision of the Government. We thought it desirable to increase the defensive force on that station. With regard to the observations of the hon. Member for Northamptonshire (Mr. Hunt), I have to state that I thought it my duty to take the earliest moment, after the Report of the Committee was in the hands of Members, to ask the House to do justice—as I conceive — to my right hon. Friend the Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe), and the Department to which he belonged. I apprehend there will in all probability be as large an attendance on Monday as when the Resolution in April passed. There were not 200 Members present on that occasion; and that number at least, in all probability, will be present on Monday. That will be the time for the hon. Gentleman to put forward any objection he may entertain to the proposition. I cannot, in deference to his wishes, postpone the Motion of which I have given notice.

Lord HOTHAM said, he regretted very much that the noble Lord had refused to give way in this matter. He entirely agreed with the objection of his hon. Friend on the score of time and usage. Considering the period of the Session—considering that the Appropriation Act had been brought in — connsidering the small attendance they could expect—considering the importance of proposing to rescind a solemn Resolution of the House —and considering how difficult it would be to adduce any instance of such a proposal as that of which the noble Viscount had given notice—being made at such a time and under such circumstances, he did deeply regret the decision of the noble Viscount, and he did sincerely hope he would reconsider his determination. He should be glad to know what was the particular object of the Motion? Was it for the sake of the Department or for the sake of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Lowe?

Mr. SPEAKER would remind the noble Lord that he was now entering upon the subject-matter of a Motion that was fixed for to-morrow.

Lord HOTHAM would bow at once to the decision of the Chair. His object simply was to impress on the noble Viscount the impolicy, on every account, of bringing forward such a Motion at that period of the Session. He begged it to be understood that he could have no hostility to the right hon. Gentleman, his objection applied solely to the proposition itself. He did not know whether he was at liberty to allude to what had transpired within the Committee of which he was a member; but this, he might be allowed to say, that the Members of the Committee were perfectly satisfied that, as far as the right hon. Gentleman was personally concerned, everything had been satisfactorily explained; and he would say, moreover, if his (Lord Hotham's) wish had been followed it would have been this — that while the Committee made its Report on the case generally, the Chairman should have been instructed by the Committee to state to the House, on the Motion for printing the Report, that in the opinion of the Committee the difference which had existed between the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne and the noble Lord below (Lord Robert Cecil)—the direct contradiction on a matter of fact—had been satisfactorily explained, and that it was the unanimous opinion of the Committee that the resignation of the right hon. Gentleman was totally and entirely unnecessary. Under these circumstances, it was not to be supposed that he had any hostility to the right hon. Gentleman. He was acting solely on principle, and feeling strongly that the usual course of proceedings in the House should not be departed from. There was yet another objection to be urged against the course proposed to be taken by the noble Viscount. There were two parties to this unfortunate misunderstanding. There was the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Lowe) who was then in his place, and would most probably be there on Monday, on the one hand, and there was the noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Lord Robert Cecil) on the other. Whether the noble Lord was in London or in England he could not tell; but certainly he could not have expected that such a proposition would have been made at this period of the Session. He asked, therefore, whether it would be decorous to enter upon a question of this sort when one of the parties was absent? Again, he implored the noble Viscount, for the sake of the Department, which he thought might rest satisfied after the Report of the Committee, and for the sake of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, not to ask the House to come to a conclusion to which, supposing the questions were brought forward at a proper time and in a proper manner, every one might readily assent. He said that without committing himself to any opinion at present; but if the Motion were pressed on Monday, and a difference of opinion were expressed upon the point of form, it would be easy for the country to suppose that it was based upon the facts of the case, and, therefore, it might be injurious to the right hon. Gentleman, a result which he (Lord Hotham) had no desire to see.

Lord FERMOY appealed to the President of the Poor Law Board to reconsider the arrangement he had made in respect of the Metropolitan Casual Poor Bill. He would be prepared at the proper time to show that the Bill as it was drawn would not work, and therefore, in Committee, much discussion would arise. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would bring on the Bill at a time when it could be fully discussed, whether at a morning or an evening sitting.

NAVY—THE "LORD WARDEN" TARGET.

QUESTION.

SIR **JOHN HAY**: I rise to ask a Question of which I have given private notice to the noble Lord the Secretary of the Admiralty. It will be in the recollection of the House that on a recent occasion I stated that the "*Lord Warden* target" had been completely penetrated by shot more than once at the trial of that construction. The noble Lord denied that the target had been penetrated at all, though he said it had been roughly used. I ask him, therefore, whether, in stating that the 300-pounder Armstrong gun had failed to penetrate the *Lord Warden* target, he alluded to 300lb. rifled shot, or to the 168lb. steel spherical (smooth-bore) shot; and whether the *Lord Warden* target was not completely penetrated by three shots, one of them being the 300lb. rifle shot fired from the 300-pounder 10½-inch gun, with 45lb. of powder, as I stated to the House?

LORD **CLARENCE PAGET**: I regret that I did not sufficiently explain my meaning upon the occasion referred to, and I also regret that the hon. and gallant Gentleman had not then amplified his statement, as in either case this misunderstanding could not have arisen. It was the 300lb. smooth-bore gun to which I referred when I said it had failed to penetrate the *Lord Warden* target. [SIR JOHN HAY: What size of shot?] With 168lb. shot. That is the only gun of the size in use in the navy—the same as is on board the *Royal Sovereign*. But it is true that one of the 300lb. rifled guns carrying a 300lb. shot did pierce the target after it had been fired at for a long time and was much shaken. I must remark, however, that the gun then used was one concerning which there were grave doubts whether it was strong enough to bear the concussion of such heavy shot, and consequently whether it was a gun fit to be introduced into the navy.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE—KAFFIR WAR.

QUESTION.

MR. **S. WESTERN** said, he wished to ask, Whether there were any grounds for the apprehensions expressed in the newspapers of another Kaffir war?

MR. **CARDWELL** said, that by the latest intelligence received by the *Hydaspes*, he was informed that the Governor had telegraphed on the 27th of June for all available troops to be sent to the frontier, as there were apprehensions that Kreli intended to cross into the Trans-Kei territory. A later telegram of the 28th announced that there were hopes that such an occurrence would not take place; and still later, on the 29th, a confident hope was expressed that no difficulty of that kind would occur.

JAPAN—DESPATCH OF TROOPS.

QUESTION.

LORD **ROBERT MONTAGU** said, the noble Lord at the head of the Government had only answered one of his Questions—that as to the expedition of Marines to Japan. He would, therefore, ask, Whether the troops were sent to Japan in consequence of a decision of the Cabinet; and also whether the despatch of General Brown would be given before the debate of to-morrow night?

VISCOUNT **PALMERSTON**: The troops which were sent from Hong Kong were sent in consequence of a requisition from Sir Rutherford Alcock in Japan, and not in consequence of orders from the Government here. The troops were sent to Hong Kong in order to be in readiness in case they might be wanted; but the immediate cause of their removal was a requisition from Sir Rutherford Alcock. The noble Lord asks whether the despatch of General Brown will be laid on the table to-morrow in time for the discussion? That I am not able to say. I cannot say whether that despatch by itself is one which should be laid upon the table without other accompanying despatches, but I will inquire.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

NAVY—SHIPS OF WAR—ARMOUR-PLATING.—EXPLANATION.

MR. **LAIRD** hoped to be allowed to make a personal Explanation of a circumstance which occurred on Tuesday. In the course of the debate upon the Motion of the hon. and gallant Member for Chatham (Sir Frederic Smith), he had ventured to make a few remarks. The noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty also spoke and made one observation which he (Mr. Laird) did not catch at the time, and of which he was not made aware until he was leaving the House. He (Mr. Laird) had stated, as was reported in *The Times*, referring to the *Enterprise*, that at the request of the noble Lord he went to the Admiralty to see the plans, and he found the armour-plating was only one foot above the water. [Lord CLARENCE PAGET said, that was a confidential communication.] The facts relating to that visit were these. Upon March 10 he put this Question to the noble Lord, which, with the answer, he would read—

> "Mr. LAIRD said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the depth from the deep-load water-line at the fore and aft ends of Her Majesty's ships *Enterprise* and *Research* to the top of the armour-plating; and what depth of side above that is unprotected by armour-plating?"
>
> "Lord CLARENCE PAGET: the armour-plates of the *Enterprise* are only to the water-line, and that part of the ship which contains her batteries. With regard to the *Research*, a much larger vessel, she has armour-plates right up to the beam of the lower deck. I do not think it desirable to state the exact number of feet and inches, the hon. Gentleman asked for, but if he will come to the Admiralty I shall be very happy to show him full details of each ship."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxiii. 1757.]

Upon that invitation he went to the Admiralty and saw the plans; but if he had believed that the information thus afforded him was to be regarded as confidential, and that he was not to use it, he should not have gone to the Admiralty. He had asked the question for public information, and not for himself. Since he had put that question he had seen in print, in a book published last year, an exact description of the vessels in question, the depth of armour-plating, and all details, and he had also seen in the public prints a full description of those vessels.

LORD CLARENCE PAGET said, he fully acquitted his hon. Friend of any intention of making an improper use of the information he had received. He should state that the hon. Gentleman had moved for many Returns as to armour-plating, with statements of dimensions of vessels, and other information. These Returns had been conceded to the hon. Gentleman, but he was bound to say that for granting it he (Lord Clarence Paget) had been blamed by officers of the navy. The hon. Gentleman then asked what was the depth of the armour-plating above or below the water-line in certain ships? The Duke of Somerset was strongly of opinion that those were details which ought not to be published. If those details had been published, and this country had been at that time unfortunately engaged in war, it would have afforded to our enemies information as to the exact spots in which to plant their shot. The Returns were, therefore, refused; but as the hon. Member was one who was held in great respect at the Admiralty, he was told that he could see the details for his own information. It was to be regretted that the hon. Gentleman had made public that information; but after his explanation there was no doubt he had done so under a misapprehension.

ROYAL ACADEMY.—QUESTION.

MR. GREGORY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, pending future arrangements, the Royal Academy will be allowed to continue as heretofore?

SIR GEORGE GREY said, he was not aware of anything to prevent the Royal Academy from continuing its functions pending future arrangements.

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

COMMITTEE.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

SIR CHARLES WOOD: Sir, when I had the honour of addressing the House this time last year upon the subject of Indian finance, I stated that, so far as it was possible to judge, the experience of the preceding year had fully verified the predictions which I had ventured to utter in the year 1859, that, in three or four years' time, we should witness the restoration of our Indian finances to a prosperous condition. I am now happy to say that the experience of another year does but confirm that opinion. I was told at the time I uttered those predictions, that the hopes which I was holding out were entirely fallacious; but I am glad to say that the course of events has proved that I was not mistaken. In the third year from 1859—namely, in the year ending the 30th of April, 1862, the equilibrium of the Indian revenue and expenditure was so nearly restored, that on a revenue and charge of about £44,000,000 the deficit was no more than £50,000. In the year ending the 30th of April, 1863, the accounts of which are now before the House, instead of a deficit, there was a surplus of £1,827,000. In the year ending the 30th of April last the surplus is estimated at £257,000, and Sir Charles Trevelyan anticipates that the surplus at the end of the current year will amount to £823,000. This increase has been accomplished mainly by a great reduction of expenditure in India, but to a great extent by an increase in the important branches of revenue; and although we were compelled to increase many of the taxes, and to impose some new ones, a considerable portion of these have already either been repealed or reduced. I am not aware that the demands of the public service have been in any instance stinted in the expenditure which was necessary for them, or that there has been any neglect of the measures which should be adopted to encourage the development of our resources in India; and I think the House will concur with me in the opinion, that it is a most satisfactory state of things when, so soon after so extraordinary a depression of the finances as for three years together took place in India, so large a surplus follows a year in which the expenditure and revenue were nearly equal. But, beyond this, I am happy to say that we have discharged a considerable amount of debt in the course of the last two years. Sir Charles Trevelyan stated in India that this payment of debt had amounted to £9,000,000, and though I think that calculation is rather in excess of the real sum, I do not believe that the difference is very great, because we have paid off in this country a temporary loan of £1,500,000, £256,000 of India bonds, and also debentures which fell due during the last year, to the extent of £5,557,000. The amount of debt paid off in this country is, therefore, £7,313,000. In addition to this, £1,000,000 was paid off in India, so that in the last two years the sum which has been cleared off amounts to £8,313,000.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR: Do those figures appear in any accounts?

SIR CHARLES WOOD: I am not quite sure.

SIR HENRY WILLOUGHBY: What years?

SIR CHARLES WOOD: From the 1st of May, 1862, to the 30th of April, 1864. I stated last year that, in consequence of the apprehension entertained in India by the falling off of the revenue, and of a deficiency of payments by the railroad companies at home, we had at one time borrowed more than we actually wanted. I must now say that the alarm entertained in India was entirely unfounded, and before the end of the year the railway companies paid in to the full extent of the estimate, so that the sum borrowed was not required. [An hon. MEMBER: Was the sum borrowed £5,000,000?] £4,000,000. It is not true, therefore, that the amount of debt paid off has been liquidated from the surplus of the revenue. ["Hear, hear!"] My hon. Friend cheers, as if there were some wonderful discovery in this fact; but he might have easily seen that £8,000,000 of debt could not possibly be satisfied by £3,000,000 of surplus. The financial state of India as it now stands shows that there has been a steady surplus for three consecutive years, following a year in which the revenue and expenditure were pretty nearly balanced; that upwards of £8,250,000 of debt has been paid off. Nor have we accomplished this by unduly reducing our balances, for on the 20th of April the estimated amount of the balances at the treasuries at home and in India is about £19,000,000. Satisfactory as this statement is, I must beg the House not to attach too much importance to the amount of the sums which I have mentioned as indicative of what must necessarily occur in future years; because one item of revenue—opium—will always remain a source of anxiety to the Indian financier. The amount of revenue received from opium in the year 1861-2 was about £6,359,000; and in the year, the accounts of which are now before us, it is £8,055,000, showing an increase of £1,696,000. In the year, however, ending in April last, the receipts in this Department of the revenue fell to the extent of £1,205,000. Therefore, hon. Members will at once see that the revenue from opium cannot be depended upon with any certainty. In fact, by the falling off of the opium revenue in the year which has just closed, the surplus in India was reduced to £30,000. It so happened, however, that by some arrangements made at home with the other Departments of the Government, a larger sum than we expected was received here, and the surplus was thus brought up to £257,000. [Colonel SYKES: The Income Tax?] I will speak of that tax with the other taxation. I do not think it worth while to enter into a detailed statement of the estimates and receipts, as I have sometimes done in former years, when there has been a question as to how the balance turned the one way or the other; and I think it will be more interesting to the House if I give the figures rather more generally. Now, the maximum charge in the year 1858-59 was £50,248,000 and the revenue £36,060,000 leaving a deficit of upwards of £14,000,000. In the next year the deficit was reduced to £10,000,000, and in 1861-2 to £50,000, the charge amounting to £43,880,000, and the revenue to £43,830,000. In the current year Sir Charles Trevelyan has estimated the revenue at £46,163,000, and the charge at £45,340,000, leaving a surplus of £800,000. For the last few years the receipts from the main articles of revenue have been steadily increasing. I will give the House a comparative statement of the receipts of this year and the year 1856-7, the year before the Mutiny, when matters were in their ordinary and normal state; but I must inform them that I cannot specify the amount on every article in that year, because, although we have the receipts on each item separated in the accounts before us, they were not so distinguished in the former year. Since 1856-7 the increase on the land revenue forest and abkarry (that is, the Excise) was £3,500,000, and on opium £3,000,000, I am obliged to put the Customs and salt duties together, because owing to a change which has taken place, the importation of salt from this country having entirely superseded the manufacture of salt in Bengal, the receipt of duty, formerly in the Excise, is now in the Customs. The revenue from salt and Customs has increased in that time about £3,000,000; stamps have increased about £1,100,000; and the whole increase, therefore, amounts to £10,600,000. The land revenue has steadily increased, owing to a larger quantity of land being brought into cultivation, and that is one of the best proofs of the increased prosperity and of the development of the resources of the country. Opium has increased, as I before stated, in a most extraordinary manner, and they anticipate even a larger revenue from it in the course of this year than was received two years ago. The salt revenue, in like manner, has increased in the last two years to the extent of £700,000; but, as I have already mentioned, a great change on this head has taken place. The manufacture of salt by the Government in Bengal has entirely ceased, and the objections which the natives entertained to English salt seem entirely to have vanished. After communications with the Salt Chamber of Commerce in this country, orders have been issued for the sale of the Government stock of salt in India; and henceforth I trust that the importation of salt from this country will entirely supply the province of Bengal. With respect to the income tax, I must observe that it was imposed under the pressure of circumstances, and it certainly is not a tax that has been very successful in India. With regard to the small holders of land under what would here be called Schedule A, hardly any portion of them pay the tax, and the tax on profits in trade, which I fear is not very honestly paid in this country, is hardly paid at all in India. The richest merchants in India somehow or other contrive to evade any considerable payment, and the result is that nearly the whole produce of the income tax in India has proceeded from a few large landholders, from the public fundholders, and from persons receiving salaries. It is not a tax which it is desirable to impose in India, except under circumstances of pressure. Last year 1 per cent was reduced on the income tax, and next year it is proposed to repeal the whole, as a general tax, leaving only a portion for the purpose of defraying certain local expenditure, which ought to be defrayed by the inhabitants of the particular districts. With respect to the Customs duties, hon. Gentlemen are aware that under the pressure of circumstances they were raised from 5 per cent to 10 per cent. Within a couple of years the duty on piece goods and yarns was reduced to the former amount of 5 per cent, and 3½ per cent *ad valorem*. The duty on beer was considerably reduced last year, and this year the remaining 10 per cent duties will all be reduced to 7½ per cent. Therefore, with respect to all articles imported into India, nearly the whole of the temporary duties are already reduced. It is true, however, that the Customs duties are not very productive, and, omitting the duties on piece goods and salt, the whole amount is not much above £1,000,000. Of that sum of £1,000,000, more than one-half is paid on articles consumed by Europeans, such as spirits and wine, or which hardly ought to pay duty at all, such as metals, railway articles, and the result is that the whole amount of the Customs duties levied on articles consumable by the natives little exceeds £400,000. When it is considered that the people of India are improving in condition, and that in this country £38,000,000 are raised by duties on the great articles consumed by the mass of the people, sugar, tea, spirits, wine, &c., it is a striking circumstance that so small an amount of revenue should be derived from articles imported into India for the use of the mass of the inhabitants. When pressed by the people of Manchester to repeal altogether the duty on piece goods, I can only say that without these two duties on salt and piece goods, the mass of the people in India would be practically untaxed. It appears that the first articles of luxury in which the people indulge are gold and silver ornaments, such as bracelets, armlets, &c. No duty is paid on these articles, and the extent to which they are used accounts in a great measure for the way in which the large importations of gold into India have been absorbed. Consequently, we do not derive in India in respect of taxable articles of consumption the same advantage which other countries do from the improved condition of the people. That improved condition, however, is evidenced by the great rise which has taken place in wages, which has made it necessary for the Government to take into consideration the emoluments, not only of the native army, but of the lower-paid civil servants. The pay of the Native officers and soldiers has been increased chiefly by additional good conduct pay. The expenditure on public works is much larger now on account of the rise in the rate of wages; and the administration of justice, in like manner, is much more expensive. As a country advances in civilization the expense for the administration of justice is greater than in an uncivilized country. The administration of justice in patriarchal style, under the shade of a tree, is cheaper than its administration in a judicial court by an English barrister. The increase of charge in India in two years has been £2,000,000, under the following heads:—Public works, £1,000,000; law, justice, and police, £500,000; surveys and settlements, £500,000. This sort of additional charge must be made if we are to do justice to the country. The increased price of food, which has necessitated an increase of wages, is, to a certain extent, due to the quantity of land diverted to the production of cotton from the production of grain and cereal crops. The distress caused by the failure of the American cotton supply has not been confined to the manufacturing districts of this country. The native manufacture of cotton has been pretty nearly destroyed in India. In one district the people had to resort for support to the public works, and at another place there were disturbances which we were obliged to suppress by force. Hon. Gentlemen will be not a little astonished, I daresay, at the extraordinary increase in the prices of different articles of produce. I have a return which illustrates this in a very striking manner:—

> "In 1859 one could buy for a rupee 810 tolas of rice in Ahmednugur; in 1863, 660 tolas; and in the same year in Dharwar, a cotton district, only 525 tolas. In 1859 a rupee procured 2,670 tolas of wheat in Ahmednugur; in 1863, 1,080; and in 1863, in Dharwar, 542. In 1859 a rupee procured 3,240 tolas of bajree in Ahmednugur; in 1863, 1,080; and in 1863, in Dharwar, 568. In 1859, a rupee procured 3,960 tolas of jowaree; in 1863, 1,260; and in 1863, in Dharwar, 595. Again, in 1859, a rupee would fetch 2,760 tolas of grain in Ahmednugur; in 1863, 1,170; and in 1863, in Dharwar, only 536."

It is not difficult to imagine the extent of the distress which has been occasioned among the working classes by this extraordinary rise in the prices of provisions. So far, however, as this country is concerned, it is very satisfactory to observe the increase in the importation of cotton from India. Rather exaggerated expectations were, at the outset, entertained as to what could be done at once in procuring cotton from India. In no country is it possible that the permanent supply shall very much exceed the permanent demand. If people cannot sell produce they will not grow it. After the experiment tried some years ago of growing cotton for the English market in India, which was entirely superseded by the supply of superior quality from America, and great loss thereby caused to the growers in India, it is not surprising that they were not ready to produce on demand a large quantity of cotton, which but for that sudden emergency would not have been required from them. The first effect of the sudden demand was to bring out all the old stores of cotton, much of it of very inferior quality. It is said that even mattresses and beds were ripped open, and that the cotton inside of them was sent to this country. There was thus a considerable increase in the supply of cotton; but, in order to test the amount of production, we must compare the amount we got last year with the amount we received the year before this sudden demand arose, and not in the year after the increased demand. Even before the extraordinary demand there was a considerable increase in the amount of the supply. In 1858 the quantity of cotton imported from India was 1,185,000 cwt.; in 1859, 1,717,000 cwt.; in 1860, 1,822,000 cwt.; in 1861, 3,295,000 cwt.; in 1862, 3,505,000 cwt.; in 1863, 3,878,000 cwt. Last year I quoted one of the best publications I have seen on the production of cotton in India—letters addressed to a Bombay newspaper by a cotton broker, Mr. Smith, of Liverpool, who travelled over a considerable part of India and made some most sensible observations. Mr. Smith stated very truly that it was absurd to expect a sudden rise in the supply; but if prices were kept up there would be ultimately a steady but gradual increase in the production of cotton. Referring to the accounts of the importation of cotton into this country for the first five months of the year, ending on the 31st of May, the House will see that there has been a steady and remarkable increase in the last years. In the five months of 1858, 1859, and 1861 respectively, the cotton imported from India amounted to about 340,000 cwt. In the five months of 1861 it was 342,000 cwt.; 1862, 734,000 cwt.; 1863, 962,000 cwt.; 1864, 1,247,875 cwt. We are fairly entitled, therefore, to say that the production of cotton in India and its importation into this country have been pretty nearly quadrupled in those periods. In Berar, Nagpore, and the other cotton districts of Central India, the number of acres under cultivation in 1861 was 380,000; in 1862, 427,000, and in 1863, 588,000. Similar progress, I have no doubt, is observable in other parts of India where cotton can be grown. On the score of quantity, therefore, we have every reason to be satisfied with what India has done for us in regard to cotton. I am afraid, however, I cannot say as much as to the improvement in the quality of the cotton. That is, of course, necessarily a much slower process. The grower who receives a high price by weight, has in many cases been tempted to enhance the weight and his profit by unfair means. So great did the evil become, that the Bombay Government passed an Act for preventing the adulteration of cotton; and from the Report of the Inspector who was appointed to carry out the law, I understand he has been very successful in accomplishing that object. The main difficulty, at present, consists in preventing the mixing of different qualities of cotton. Superior and inferior kinds are grown in the same field; and great care is required both in sowing the seed and in picking the pods to prevent a mixture. I have no doubt that when the Indian growers find that they can get a higher price for a better quality they will be clever enough to produce a superior kind of cotton. Of the other articles of produce the return is really very satisfactory. Between 1858-9 and 1862-3 the quantity of coffee exported to this country has increased from about 11,000,000 to 21,000,000 lbs.; of indigo, from 9,000,000 to 11,000,000 lbs.; and of jute, 317,000 to 1,266,000 cwt. The export of wool has increased from 15,000,000 lbs. to 21,000,000 lbs. With regard to the tea grown in India, I am afraid that there is some prejudice against it at the present moment, but I believe that it has very much improved in quality. The extent of the plantations has considerably increased. In Assam the cultivation has been introduced and is carried on by private enterprise, and the result has been so successful that the Assam Tea Company have been enabled to pay their shareholders a dividend of 25 per cent. It has also been successfully introduced by the Government into the North of India, and so successfully that at the present moment all the Government plantations are to be disposed of with the exception of one which has been reserved for the production of seed. I do not possess an account of the quantity of tea exported for a period of years, but the value of that exported in 1858-9 was £60,000, and in 1862-3 it had increased to £223,000. A plantation for furnishing tea seeds and plants has been formed in the Neilgherries. There is another matter which is likely to prove advantageous not only to India but the world at large. Mr. Markham, a clerk in the India Office, has succeeded in introducing from South America the seed of the cinchona tree, from which quinine is obtained, and the cultivation of that plant in the Neilgherry Hills has proved most successful. In January, 1862, 8,600 plants were growing, but in April last the number had increased to 341,000; and what is still more remarkable, the bark of the few trees which have attained sufficient size to enable the quality of the bark to be tested, gave a produce exceeding that of the bark of the same description of tree in South America. The cultivation of the cinchona plant is now being greatly extended, and I believe that the superintendent of the Dutch plantation at Java, who went over to inspect the plantations on the Neilgherry Hills, has declared that the plants are superior to anything they have in Java. The great increase in the exports from India has led to an extraordinary importation of gold and silver. In the last five years the amount has been £50,000,000 of silver and £25,000,000 of gold, but a considerable portion must have been employed by the natives in the manufacture of ornaments for themselves, their wives, and families. A large proportion of the gold and silver imported seems to have disappeared in this way, as it has not been exported anywhere. [Colonel SYKES: Has there been an increase in the coinage?] There has been a great amount of coinage. I do not intend to advert to the subject of the currency, as that question was discussed in the House a short time ago, but I shall be happy to answer any question which may be put to me upon it. [Mr. J. B. SMITH: Has a gold currency been adopted in India yet?] I stated when the subject was before the House a short time ago, that I was not prepared to take any steps in the matter until I had received a report from the Government in India. I have not yet received that report, but I have every reason to believe that I shall do so before long. The public works have been carried on with great vigour, and without any limit as to funds. The only difficulty which has been experienced has been one which we were not prepared to anticipate in India—namely, want of labour. I, in common with others, was for some time under the impression that the supply of labour was abundant in all parts of India; but I am informed that in all districts where the public works are going on, it has been found extremely difficult to obtain an adequate supply of labour. In the central districts in India the railroads and other public works have been in competition with the agriculturists for labour. The consequence has been that the price of labour has been raised, and the cost of the construction of the public works increased. In Assam, South Canara, Central India, Scinde, and the North Western Provinces there is a great want of labour, and unfortunately these are the districts in which English capital and English settlers can be most beneficially employed. So great is the inconvenience which is experienced from the want of labour, that I have been asked to do something towards importing Chinese labourers into India, which is a proposition not a little startling to those who have always been led to believe that the population of India was more than sufficient for the requirements of the country. Railroads are being carried on with great activity in all parts of India. A number of gentlemen have come forward and have undertaken the construction of what is called a light branch railway communication through the northern parts of India. They have done this without a guarantee upon obtaining the land from the Government and a contribution for a certain number of years. The terms are much more favourable to the Government than anything we have hitherto been able to obtain. I sincerely hope that the undertaking will succeed. It will show that works of this kind may be done by private companies, not only with advantage to the country, but to the shareholders themselves. The gauge is the same as that of the great railroads. Beyond that, in the course of the winter, a telegraphic cable has been laid down from Kurrachee to the head of the Persian Gulf. The recommendations of the Commission presided over by the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley) to inquire into the sanitary condition of the Indian army, have been followed up by the appointment of Sanitary Commissions in each presidency, who have already commenced their labours, not only with regard to the barracks, but also in reference to the condition of the town of Calcutta. For a long time, to the disgust of the more civilized inhabitants, it has been the practice in Calcutta to throw dead bodies into the river, the result of which was to aggravate during last year the ravages of the cholera, which broke out very severely. It was thought desirable to take some precautionary measure, and the first step taken was to prohibit the throwing of dead bodies into the Ganges. There was no intention on the part of the Government to interfere with the prejudices or wishes of the Hindoo inhabitants of Calcutta; and it will be a consolation to the hon. and gallant Member (Colonel Sykes) to know that the prevention of the abomination of throwing dead bodies in the river had the entire approval of the Hindoo municipality of Calcutta. [Sir JAMES FERGUSSON: What about the state of the gaol?] The last report we have received was that the gaol was in a satisfactory state. It had been inspected by the magistrates at Calcutta, appointed under an Act of Parliament, who are bound to inspect it at least once a month. The progress of internal affairs in India is also most satisfactory, and there is no disturbance within our frontier. If there has been some little disturbance just outside our North Western frontier it has turned out to be a matter of very little consequence. Early in the Session, in answer to a question, I stated very shortly what had happened in that case, and perhaps it is right that I should now recur to it. Many years ago a Mahomedan fanatic established himself and his followers in the district beyond the Indus when Runjeet Singh ruled in the Punjab. He contended for some time to defy that ruler, and was ultimately killed, but the remainder of his companions took refuge in the hills and made marauding incursions into the territory of that ruler. When we took possession of the Punjab they had no more love for us than they had shown for Runjeet Singh, and they had been a thorn in our side, more or less, ever since. They were settled on the western bank of the Indus, just on the outside of our frontier, and were in the constant habit of making inroads upon our territory, murdering and plundering the inhabitants of the villages, and disturbing the peace of the district in every possible way. In 1857 an expedition was undertaken against them under Sir Sidney Cotton, who destroyed two of their strongholds, and took engagements from the neighbouring tribes that they would not allow them to harbour among them, or come thence to harass our frontier as they had been wont to do. For a year or two they gave us no further trouble, but being partially strengthened by some mutineers who took refuge among them, these marauders recommenced their incursions. They advanced into our territory and into one of the States under our protection, and committed their usual outrages by murdering the persons whom they came across and burning the villages. We called upon the tribes through whose territory they passed to perform their engagements and arrest their progress. One of those tribes was divided in feeling, one-half of it being disposed to do what it could to prevent these marauders from coming through its territory, the rest not being disposed to do so, and saying that they were too strong for it, and that if we wanted to stop them we must do it ourselves.

After considerable hesitation Lord Elgin authorized an expedition against the marauders, but the officers on the spot were a little indiscreet in one respect in the course they took. They proceeded by way of the Umbeylah Pass, but they did not take into account sufficiently early the probability of their alarming the powerful tribe of the Bonairs by their advance. They had not the least reason to apprehend any opposition from the Bonairs, who on a former occasion took our part against these marauders, and we had not the least intention of injuring the Bonairs. However, our officers did not send a communication to the Bonairs until they had reached the top of the Umbeylah Pass, within a few miles of their territory, and, with the suspicion natural to an Oriental tribe, the Bonairs thought we were about to attack them. They, therefore, turned out in great force and resisted our troops. They were afterwards joined by other fanatical Mahomedans, but they were repulsed with considerable loss to themselves, but with some loss also among our force. While this was going on, the agent of the Governor General, who had been absent, returned and apparently succeeded in assuring the Bonairs that we had not had the slightest intention to injure them, and they were willing to withdraw. But the fanatical allies from other tribes, under the influence of a sort of Mahomedan prophet called the Akhoond of Swat, persuaded them to continue their resistance. A successful attack was made on their lines, and they were driven from their position, and after two days' fighting the Bonairs themselves, the very people who had commenced the resistance to us before, said they were ready to go with our force and destroy the strongholds of the marauders. That object was accomplished, and the expedition ended as satisfactorily as a matter of that kind could end. It was a most unfortunate circumstance that opposition should have been offered to our troops through a false alarm on the part of the Bonairs. But the greatest pains were afterwards taken to assure them we never had any intention to attack them; that our only desire was that our frontier should not be harassed by bands of plunderers who harboured in their territory; and that we should only be too happy to live on good terms with them. We have no reason to fear that anything of that kind will occur again. [Mr. VANSITTART asked whether the expense of that war had been brought into the accounts?]

The expense is in the estimated expenditure for the past year, and it amounts to between £150,000 and £200,000. Perhaps I should next notice the civil war between the Ameer of Cabul and his brothers. We simply acknowledge the *de facto* ruler in that case, and refuse to take any part whatever on either side. We are leaving them to fight it out in their own way, and taking the greatest care not to give the slightest assistance to either party. There is only one other quarter which may to a certain extent disturb the peace of our frontier. I refer to Bhootan. For many years inroads have been made by plundering bands of Bhootans in our territory, and it had been determined to send an expedition there, but the mutiny prevented anything of that kind being done, and Lord Elgin thought it better to come to some arrangement if possible with the rulers of that country. There was no reason to believe that the mission to them would not be well received, because on two former occasions such a mission had been favourably received. On the present occasion, the Envoy was grossly insulted. It is difficult to know exactly how he should have acted ; but although I think it would have been wiser not to have gone on, we can hardly form a fair judgment after the fact, and I have no doubt of Mr. Eden's having acted to the best of his judgment in very difficult circumstances. It would be hard to blame him now. The country was in a state of complete anarchy. The recognized rulers of the country are a spiritual chief and a temporal chief ; there are also an eastern viceroy, and a western viceroy, with subordinate chiefs. At present there are two temporal chiefs, two spiritual chiefs, two eastern and three western viceroys. These viceroys were in a state of hostility with each other. We have not the least notion of going into that country or maintaining any position there ; but we do intend to take possession of a narrow strip of low country, and to occupy the passes to prevent inroads, and in that way we may be able to bring them to as much reason as is possible with a race of barbarians. There is another topic to which I should wish to refer—the result of experience with regard to those legislative measures which the Legislature of this country has passed for India. In 1861 three Acts of Parliament passed specially affecting India. One was for admitting in the Council of the Governor General not only Englishmen unconnected with the Government, but Natives of India. The Council of the Governor General and that of the Governor of Madras and of Bombay was increased in this way, and a council was given to the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal. As far as we can judge, that legislation has been successful, and, what is most satisfactory, the Natives who were to form part of the Council seem to have taken a very active part in legislation, and expressed their opinions with freedom, very greatly to the advantage of the Government. Three Natives were put in by Lord Canning, one of whom has since died. Lord Elgin put in three other Natives, and, I think, wisely brought a Native Chief of considerable influence from Madras. Three Natives have been put into the Madras Council, five into the Bombay Council, and eight into the Council of the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal. I believe the measure has given the greatest possible satisfaction to the people of India. The next measure passed was one for the improvement of the High Court of Justice. This too has worked well; the barristers, judges, and the civilians have acted very harmoniously together, and a very able Native Judge has been placed on the bench of the High Court of Calcutta. On the recommendation of a Law Commission which I appointed when I was President of the Board of Control, a code of civil procedure has been introduced into India. Upon that subject the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal says—

> "The result of all the inquiries I have made from the Native Judges, by whom nearly all original suits are tried, and of whom I have now seen many in different parts of the Lower Provinces, is that the new procedure in working has been successful even above all hope."

Mr. Harington says—

> "As showing how successful the Code of Civil Procedure has been in expediting the administration of justice, it may be mentioned that in a Court of Small Causes in the North Western Provinces, established under the provisions of Act XLII., of 1860, the average duration of suits disposed of during the past year was only eight days, including the day on which the plaint was filed. Under the old system of procedure the average would probably have been between two and three months."

The third measure was one to enable the Governor General to appoint officers from the civil service to certain offices for which they were not till then eligible. I have laid on the table this year the number of appointments under that Act, and I do not think it will be found that there is reason to complain of any one of them.

The measure has been entirely successful in the objects it sought to accomplish. Since I last addressed the House on this subject we have been deprived by the stroke of death of the services of Lord Elgin, and I know no one better fitted to undertake the Government of India as his successor than that old and eminent servant of India, Sir John Lawrence. I believe it is the opinion of the people of both countries that this appointment is the best that could have been made. Sir John Lawrence will, I feel confident, justify all the expectations that have been formed from his former career, and from his intimate knowledge of the country. And I think that no one could have been found so well qualified as he to fill that high position with advantage. I am happy to think that the policy pursued of late years in regard to India has met with due appreciation on the part of the Natives of India. That policy is not mine. It is the policy of the Sovereign, the policy of this House, the policy of the country at large. I am grateful for the support which I have received from all sides of the House, and more especially the impartial and straightforward support which has been given to all those measures which he believed to be for the good of India by the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn, from whom I have seldom differed in matters relating to India. The policy adopted towards the country has been, I repeat, the policy of the Queen and of Parliament, and all that I have done has been faithfully to carry it out. For this reason, that it has been the policy of the country, and that they are entitled to any expressions of gratitude from the people of India. I hope, without being accused of undue vanity, I may be permitted to advert to a resolution passed at a public Native meeting which was convened in Calcutta, and there an address was agreed to which was signed by 8,000 of the most intelligent and influential Natives of that city. At this Native meeting, which was attended by the most influential persons in Calcutta, a resolution was passed which expressed the opinion of all the persons who signed the address. It is as follows:—

"That this meeting desires to record their high sense of gratitude for the wise and beneficent policy which has distinguished the administration and control of Indian affairs for the last five years (by Sir Charles Wood), a policy which has nobly sustained the authority and dignity of Her Majesty's Government in her Indian dominions; which has strengthened by new bonds of attachment the confidence and sympathy of the princes and chiefs of the country; which has, above all, steadily sought to govern the empire in consonance with justice and the true interests of her teeming millions."

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR: What is the date of the meeting?

SIR CHARLES WOOD: It was held in March last year. I claim no credit to myself for what has been done, for although I have received the expression of these thanks, it is not to me, but to the Sovereign and people of this country that the thanks of the people of India are due. Theirs has been the determination to pursue this policy. I have only been the hand to carry it out, and I feel convinced that this country will reap the fruits of this wise and beneficent policy long after I have ceased to take any part in Indian affairs. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by moving the following Resolutions:—

1. That the total net Revenues of the Territories and Departments under the immediate control of the Government of India for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1863, amounted to £3,481,927 sterling, and the Charges thereof, for the same period, other than Military Charges, amounted to £3,049,501 sterling.

2. That the total net Revenues of the Bengal Presidency, for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1863, amounted to £11,755,377 sterling, and the Charges thereof, for the same period, other than Military Charges, amounted to £2,060,713 sterling.

3. That the total net Revenues of the North Western Provinces, for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1863, amounted to £5,162,401 sterling, and the Charges thereof, for the same period, other than Military Charges, amounted to £1,497,179 sterling.

4. That the total net Revenues of the Punjab, for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1863, amounted to £2,612,517 sterling, and the Charges thereof, for the same period, other than Military Charges, amounted to £1,192,674 sterling.

5. That the total net Revenues of the Territories and Departments under the immediate control of the Government of India of the Bengal Presidency, of the North Western Provinces, and of the Punjab, together for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1863, amounted to £23,012,222 sterling, and the Charges thereupon, including the Military Charges, amounted to £14,753,114 sterling, leaving a surplus available for the general Charges of India, of £8,259,108 sterling.

6. That the total net Revenues of the Madras Presidency (Fort Saint George), for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1863, amounted to £5,819,048 sterling, and the net Charges thereof, for the same period, amounted to £5,383,285 sterling, leaving a surplus available for the above Presidency, for the general Charges of India, of £435,763 sterling.

7. That the total net Revenues of the Bombay Presidency, for the year ended the 30th day of

April, 1863, amounted to £7,831,597 sterling, and the net Charges thereof, for the same period, amounted to £4,831,841 sterling, leaving a surplus available in the above Presidency, for the General Charges of India, of £2,999,756 sterling.

8.—That the total net Revenues of the several Presidences, for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1863, amounted to £36,662,867 sterling, and the Charges thereof amounted to £24,968,240 sterling, leaving a surplus Revenue of £11,694,627 sterling.

9.—That the Interest on the Registered Debt of India, paid in the year ended the 30th day of April, 1863, amounted to £3,351,680 sterling, and the Charges defrayed in England, on account of the Indian Territory, in the same period, including Guaranteed Interest on the Capital of Railway and other Companies, after deducting net Traffic Receipts of Railways, amounted to £6,515,601 sterling, leaving a surplus of Indian Income for the year ended as aforesaid, after defraying the above Interest and Charges, of £1,827,346 sterling.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR said, he was quite willing to endorse the commendation of the Calcutta meeting. He believed that the confidence of the Natives of India in us had increased in consequence of the policy we had pursued since the Mutiny—a policy which repudiated annexation. He believed that if that policy had been previously adopted we should have had no mutiny at all, and should have been spared all those harrowing scenes which had occurred. As to the finances of India, the House hardly seemed in a position to discuss them. The Estimates had been laid before the Indian public; but the House of Commons knew nothing officially of what the policy of Sir Charles Trevelyan for the next year might be. He trusted that either Sir Charles Trevelyan's speech or a *précis* of it would be laid upon the table. There were three sets of Indian accounts. Hon. Members had the Accounts of 1862-3, and the Estimates of 1863-4 before them. But the Estimates of 1864-5 were in the bureau of the Secretary of State for India, and were not accessible to the House. He could not understand the exact position of the land question; but he approved the redemption of the land tax, which had been carried out to a limited extent. The right hon. Gentleman insisted on his system of survey of the waste lands, although it would retard the process of reclamation, and was, he thought, much inferior to the American plan. The coffee plantations on the other side of India were very important. A portion of these were held by English planters and the rest by Natives. It was calculated that 100,000 acres would require capital amounting to £10,000,000 for its due cultivation. The difference, however, was that the English planter raised a great deal more coffee per acre than the Native planter, and it was therefore important to encourage the English planter. The planters desired to have the land sold to them out and out, because, in order that they might borrow money to invest in the culture of coffee, it was necessary that they should have the fee-simple. Many persons were anxious to start companies for the cultivation of coffee; but, in consequence of the refusal of the Government to part with the fee of the land, they could not succeed in their objects. At present it took an emigrant twelve months before he could get land at a public auction, and the expense of living for that time in a Presidency town was a very serious matter. While other countries were bidding for English labour and capital, in India it seemed to be treated as quite a favour that Englishmen should be allowed to engage in the cultivation of land. This spirit ran through all the dealings of his right hon. Friend and the Indian Government. The right hon. Gentleman had made some important observations as to the rate of wages. He said that the rate of wages was rising, and that labour was hard to be had in India. Yet emigration from that country was going on to a great extent, and large estates in Ceylon and Mauritius were cultivated by labour from India. There was some analogy between India and Ireland in this respect—that the people were underfed and the rate of wages was too low. He thought it highly desirable that the Native population should have better food than they were able to procure at present, and therefore he was glad that the rate of wages was rising. He did not think that would add anything to the real cost of the public works. It was impossible that half-starved Natives who only earned 3*d.* a day should do as much work as was performed by the same people when they went to Ceylon or the Mauritius and received 1*s.* or 2*s.* a day. It was the case of the Irishman over again. If you paid him 6*d.* a day in his own country, you got sixpenny-worth of labour from him, but he did not work as hard as he did when he went to the United States and received a dollar. His right hon. Friend was surprised at the slow rate at which the Customs duties increased, and so was he. The fact was that although the well paid Government officers were well clothed, and that entirely in cotton goods from Manchester, the cultivators of the soil were miserably clad in a mere rag each. He thought that a Finance Minister should not be satisfied unless he saw the Customs revenue increase, for they were a sure index of the condition of the people. He regretted that so little progress had been made with the construction of the Indian telegraph. The delay was mainly attributable to the right hon. Gentleman's adherence to the route by Bagdad and the Persian Gulf, against which he was warned by Sir Henry Rawlinson. He was glad that a line was now being constructed through Persia, and he hoped that we should soon have a complete telegraphic communication with India. Russia had completed a telegraph to the extremity of the Asiatic continent. The progress of railways was extremely satisfactory, but there were some lines which were still much wanted—for instance, lines from Indore to Agra and from Trichinopoly to the South. As to the general question of the construction of public works, he thought that it would be better, instead of raising £4,000,000 annually from the people of India for that purpose, to contract a loan in this country, as was suggested by Lord Dalhousie. There were at present in existence one or two taxes which, either in their nature or the mode of their imposition, were highly obnoxious. In the first class was the institution stamp, which ought at once to be abolished. The tax upon spirits, although proper in itself, was open to great objection in consequence of the mode in which it was levied. The spirits were manufactured by the Government and sold at certain places, under licences which were granted to the persons who undertook to dispose of the largest quantity. This acted as a direct encouragement of drunkenness. The sellers paid a large sum for their licences, and they were obliged to resort to all sorts of means to induce their neighbours to consume the quantity of spirits which they had undertaken to sell. Upon the whole the accounts were satisfactory. The events occurring in the United States had of course exercised great influence upon India, but he was convinced that if the right hon. Gentleman had allowed land to be more extensively sold in fee simple more capital would have been attracted to India, and there would have been a still larger increase in the growth of cotton. If the American contest were now brought to an end, he had no doubt our main supplies of cotton would again flow thence; but if proper measures had been taken during the five years the right hon. Gentleman had presided over the India Office, cotton might have been fixed as a staple production of India. The same care applied to the cultivation of the plant in India as was given to it in America would have greatly increased its value. It was the mixed and dirty cotton that was objected to, and improvement could not be looked for until capital and enterprize were permitted to engage in the trade. In 1858, when the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley) was at the head of the India Office, he had many applications from gentlemen and companies to purchase land. How was it that now there were no such applications, or if there were applications why were they refused? The right hon. Gentleman should encourage the introduction of English energy and English capital into India, and thereby benefit both the Indian and Imperial exchequers. He believed, with Sir Charles Metcalfe, that every Englishman who went to India added to its security and resources. He trusted that in future the right hon. Gentleman would not overlook that important point, upon which might depend to a great extent the permanency of our hold upon India. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman that Russia, with nothing like our vast resources, was pressing forward in every direction. Only yesterday it was announced that she had concluded terms for railways through Herat and through Persia; she had an immense length of navigation up the Amoor, and she had telegraphic communication with China. Surely it would be well if we were to follow the wise example thus set to us. We ought to fix ourselves in India as firmly as we could, and the best way of doing so was to encourage our countrymen to go there with their capital. The more the Natives were encouraged to lay out their money in the purchase of land the more would they be attached to our Government. He hoped that when next the right hon. Gentleman addressed the House upon this subject he would be able to show that the important points to which his attention had been called had been practically considered. In that case the right hon. Gentleman would increase the claims which he already had upon the gratitude both of this country and of India for having so long administered the affairs of the latter great empire.

Mr. J. B. SMITH said, that while he congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on the improved state of India, he at the same time regretted that he had placed himself in such a position as to make it his (Mr. Smith's) duty to find fault. What he found fault with was—that the right hon. Gentleman had pursued the same course this year which he did last year, namely, of delaying his Indian Budget until two days before the Whitebait feast, when, as usual, not more than twenty Members could be got to listen to it. If the House was to take any cognizance whatever of Indian affairs, it was but just that they should have an opportunity of doing so at a time when they were not in an exhausted state, as they undoubtedly were at the end of the Session. The subject should be brought before the House at an early period of the Session. He had likewise to complain that the right hon. Gentleman had not furnished them with the speech of the Finance Minister of India. He could not account for the right hon. Gentleman objecting to furnish the House with that without which the Indian accounts were nothing but a mass of figures. What could the House make of the Exchequer accounts without the explanation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer? When he mooted the question on a former occasion, the right hon. Gentleman said that he might as well be asked for the Chancellor of the Exchequer's speech, as for the statement of the Indian Finance Minister. But there was this difference, that the latter statement was made in India, while the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was made in that House, and was printed in all the newspapers the next morning. He could see no just ground for withholding from the House that explanation which was given by the Finance Minister of India, and if the right hon. Gentleman should persevere in bringing forward his Indian Budget at the latter end of the Session, and declined to give the House the explanation of the Finance Minister of India accompanying the Indian accounts, he should feel it his duty in the next Session of Parliament to bring the subject under the notice of the House. He would again congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on the improvement which seemed to pervade all classes of Indian society. There had been a great demand for labour, and a great advance in the price of provisions. That was easily accounted for—the demand for labour had been for Indian railways, and for the growth of a variety of products, especially of cotton. Labour had been transferred from the growth of provisions to the growth of other articles, and the consequence had been a great advance in the price of provisions. There was no question that there had been a great advance in the wealth and capabilities of India, but still he thought the resources of the country were very far from being developed. Their railways would do something in that respect; but he regretted to find that so little attention was still paid to opening out the navigable rivers, the natural highways of India. The Godavery with its affluents was a highway 2,000 miles long, but only about 400 miles of the river, was at present navigable; and he regretted to find from the Reports which had been laid on the table respecting that river, that there was little hope of those 400 miles being much extended. The right hon. Gentleman had made some observations about the Customs duty on cotton, which he said amounted to £500,000. He did not know whether the estimate of the duty on cotton goods was taken at 10 per cent or 7½ per cent. [Sir Charles Wood: In 1862 the duty was reduced to 5 per cent.] Well, the duty might be said to be 5 per cent, but it was in reality 10 per cent, and he considered it altogether an unjust tax. It was founded upon a system of protection, so far as the Indian manufacturer was concerned. In India there was a protection which could not be taken away. There they had the cotton on the spot, and England had to fetch it 10,000 miles, manufacture it into goods, and then send those goods back to India. When, in addition to all the expense these processes involved, we had to pay a high Customs duty, protection to a very large extent was of course afforded to the Indian manufacturer. Sir Charles Trevelyan complained that the great embarrassment to the trade of India had been the want of imports to meet the large amount of exports, and he said every possible encouragement should be given to the import trade. In his (Mr. Smith's) opinion the best way to encourage imports was to abolish the duty on cotton goods, and they would thus meet the objection which Sir Charles Trevelyan made. But if it was necessary to raise that revenue on cotton goods, then the duty ought to be levied on a fair principle, which would give the English manufacturer a chance. If they levied a duty on the goods of the

English manufacturer, they ought to levy a like duty on the goods of the manufacturer in the country, otherwise they afforded to the Indian manufacturer an unjust protection. Sir Charles Trevelyan, speaking of the sale of opium, said that one of the causes of the decline in the price of opium was the difficulties connected with the monetary system. He stated that in 1859 the price of a chest of opium was 1,429 rupees, while at another period it was 1,100 rupees, being a difference of 300 rupees a chest. This showed the importance of the right hon. Gentleman turning his attention to the gold currency for India. He (Mr. Smith) must confess he had little expectations of a sound measure from Sir Charles Trevelyan, and that was from this circumstance—he said the effect of the gold currency would be that the depreciation of gold would be arrested. Now he there assumed that gold had been depreciated, and any one who concocted a measure on that assumption would not be likely to make it a sound one. He hoped the Secretary of State for India would do something on this subject. In conclusion, he could only repeat his congratulations at the favourable report of the finances and prospects of India as made by the right hon. Gentleman, and he hoped he would be able to do something in reference to the complaints which he (Mr. Smith) had felt it his duty to make.

Mr. KINNAIRD said, he did not think any blame could fairly be imputed to his right hon. Friend the Secretary for India for not introducing his Budget at an earlier period of the Session when the difficulty of getting in the accounts was taken into consideration. Even if it could be brought forward at an earlier period, he scarcely imagined that the right hon. Gentleman would be able to secure a larger attendance of Members than was usual when Indian Questions were being discussed. The real point to be dealt with was, had India improved of late years? and he must say, after the speech which he had heard from the responsible Minister for the country, that there were the strongest evidences of her material progress. He regretted his right hon. Friend had made no allusion to the enormous duty on salt, than the bringing of which within easier reach of the poorer classes there could be no greater measure of relief. He should not enter into a detail of the great suffering which was occasioned by the existing state of things in that regard, but he hoped that, with the prospect of an increasing revenue before them, the matter would not escape the attention of the Government. Unless they took some steps in that direction, he should feel it to be his duty to bring the question under the consideration of the House early next Session.

Mr. VANSITTART said, he quite concurred in much that had fallen from the hon. Gentleman who spoke last but one, and whom he was happy to see sitting on the Opposition Benches—an indication he hoped that those on that side of the House might look forward to receiving his valuable support in future. He also concurred with the hon. Member for Poole (Mr. Henry Seymour) in regretting that he had not the advantage of the speech of Sir Charles Trevelyan before him, for he had, he believed, set down his surplus at the modest figure of £20,000. However that might be, he did not entertain any confident expectation of a permanent improvement in the finances of India, while so many reasons existed to disturb the calculations of a Chancellor of the Exchequer. Our surplus this year would have been larger, but for the hastily conceived and badly organized proceedings on the North Western frontier; and the surplus of next year, he believed, would be swallowed up in consequence of that insatiate and insatiable desire to thrust our trade and commerce upon the inhabitants of Bhootan, which had resulted in our envoys being grossly insulted—the probable consequence of which was that war would be carried on in those sterile and mountainous regions, if it had not already been commenced. The taxpayers in this country would find their expenditure largely increased owing to our wars in New Zealand, China, Japan, Ashantee, the Cape of Good Hope, and, he believed, in Bhootan. These two hostile collisions in India might have been avoided if we had followed the plan which we had adopted at Cabul, where our negotiations were conducted through a Native. By this method the prejudices of the Natives were conciliated, and the terms upon which the British Government stood with reference to Cabul were of the most amicable character. It was notorious that even in time of profound peace, our surplus in India depended entirely upon the value of the sales of opium. There appeared to be two systems existing in India in reference to the cultivation of opium. The one was carried on in Bengal, where the Government was the producer; and the other in Malwa and Central India, where the Government did nothing but levy a duty on its exportation to China. This duty was originally 200 rupees or £20 a chest, but it was gradually raised by Sir Robert Hamilton to 500 rupees, or £50 a chest. Lord Canning was anxious to raise it to 600 rupees, but he was dissuaded, because, as long as the opium was grown by the British Government in Bengal, and was a Government monopoly in that Presidency, the producer in Malwa and Central India had not a fair market for competition. The actual cost per chest in Malwa to the producer varied from 300 to 400 rupees, or from £30 to £40, and the average selling price might be estimated at from £100 to £120, sometimes falling as low as £80 or £90. Taking, therefore, the cost of production at £35 and the duty at £50, there would remain a profit of about £15 to cover risk, insurance, and other contingencies. If the Bengal monopoly glutted the China market, the price of the chest would fall, and the loss to the Central Indian merchant would almost inevitably entail his ruin. Sir Robert Hamilton had proposed to check the monopoly of growth by the British Government in Bengal by placing an uniform duty of £50 a chest on all opium exported to China, wherever and by whomsoever grown, and thus adopt the Central India system uniformly throughout the whole of India. He believed that if this were done, we should not have any decrease in our revenue from the sale of opium, and that our China trade would be placed on a healthy foundation without involving in so disgraceful a speculation the British Government, the Secretary for India, and his Council.

Mr. CRAWFORD said, he desired to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to the effect of the duty imposed on saltpetre. On the assumption that they possessed a monopoly, the Government of India, in 1860, raised the duty to 50 per cent on the value of the article. Previous to that period the export duty had been 3 per cent on the value. The price of saltpetre was 26*s.* per cwt, and the duty £6 per ton, which was an enormous duty; and, in consequence of it, people of an inventive turn of mind had turned their attention to finding a substitute for it, and had discovered in a preparation from nitrate of soda an article which was applicable to many of the purposes for which saltpetre was used, and large quantities of this article were imported from Magdeburg and other towns of Germany. In 1859—the last year before the change in the duty—the quantity of saltpetre exported from Calcutta was 25,000 tons; in 1860 it was 19,000; in 1861, 22,600; in 1862, 31,000; in 1863, 21,000; and in 1864 the falling off it was calculated would be to a considerable extent. Now, up to 1860, there had been no saltpetre received from the German ports; but, in 1861, 1,591 cwts. were received; in 1862, 4,480; in 1863, 8,418; and in 1864, down to the 31st of May, no less than 12,510 cwt.; showing the extent to which we are receiving supplies of manufactured saltpetre from foreign countries to the exclusion of the saltpetre which we used to receive from India. The quantity of nitrate of soda supplied from Peru and Chili was in proportion to the quantity of saltpetre received from German ports. The quantity of saltpetre received from Bengal and exported from this country had fallen off from 151,000 cwt. in 1862, to 74,000 in 1863, and this year to the present time the exports were 41,000. The deduction from this was, that the trade was in considerable jeopardy from the heavy duty on the export from Calcutta. If any advantage from this arrangement accrued to the public he would have no right to complain; but such was not the case, and on the part of those engaged in the trade in the City of London, he had taken the opportunity of laying the matter before his right hon. Friend, in order that it might be brought under the notice of the authorities in India. With reference to the introduction of a gold coinage into India he confessed he was one of those who did not anticipate much advantage from such a measure. The whole of the pressure which had been experienced at Calcutta and Bombay arose not from any want of money, but from the inability of the possessor of hard silver to convert it into current coin. It was within his own knowledge that a person in the possession of silver to the extent of thousands of pounds, had been obliged to pay 15 per cent per annum for the temporary use of coin while his silver was being coined at the mint. He (Mr. Crawford) thought the coining power of the mint ought to be increased at least threefold. The hon. Member for Stockport (Mr. J. B. Smith) was misinformed when he stated that the best cotton was grown in Dharwar. Considerable quantities had lately come from the interior of India far superior in quality to any that had been grown in Dharwar, as he should be happy to show to any gentleman who would favour him with a call at his office. His hon. Friend the Member for Poole (Mr. Henry Seymour) talked about the Russian Government making a railway to Herat; but as Herat was thousands of miles from any civilized part of the Russian dominions, he (Mr. Crawford) received with utter incredulity the statement of such a scheme. His right hon. Friend the Secretary of State had adverted to the fact that the Government received but little in the shape of Customs duties from the Natives of India. That was a result which could not surprise any one who was acquainted with the mode of living of the people of that country. They drank hardly any wine or spirits, or tea; the sugar and the tobacco which they consumed were manufactured upon the spot, and they therefore made very few purchases of any of the articles on which Customs duties were principally raised. He entirely coincided in the statement of his right hon. Friend, that a considerable increase in wages had taken place in India during the last few years. The fact was, that since railway operations had been carried on in India the value of labour had risen to an extent which no person could a few years ago have thought possible. He was glad to be able to join the Members who had preceded him in congratulating his right hon. Friend on the very satisfactory state of affairs which he had been able to bring under their notice that evening.

MR. TORRENS said, that he also would offer his congratulations to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for India on the very satisfactory statement he had made on that occasion; but he could not help regretting that it should be submitted to their notice at so very late a period of the Session. He was aware that that was occasioned by the period up to which the accounts were made up in India; but he could not see any reason why these accounts should not be closed at the end of December or November instead of April, which would allow the right hon. Gentleman to make his statement about the same time as the Chancellor of the Exchequer was making his statement here. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be slow to act on the suggestion of the hon. Member for Windsor (Mr. Vansittart), that the system of opium cultivation in Bengal should be assimilated to that in Malwa and the West of India. He should be sorry to see the ill-feeling which existed between the indigo planters and the ryots extended to the cultivation of opium. He did not think the matter of a gold coinage was so pressing as it had been represented to be, and he hoped that the Secretary of State, before taking any step with regard to it, would wait to receive suggestions from the local authorities. The right hon. Gentleman had adverted to the Act passed last year for throwing open certain civil appointments to persons not belonging to the covenanted service, and he seemed to speak favourably of that measure. But he (Mr. Torrens) believed that of the instances quoted by the right hon. Gentleman to exemplify the working of the Act, two at least were open to animadversion. In one case a gentleman of great local interest—brother-in-law to the Governor of Bombay—was put into an appointment contrary to the Act, and the right hon. Gentleman had thought proper to cancel the appointment. In another, a Native named Gopal Rao Hurry had been appointed to an assistant-judgeship at Ahmednuggur, and the appointment was so illegal that it was taken up by the High Court of Judicature, and the Government was obliged to cancel it. This Native, however, was put into another appointment, which gave rise to a memorial from the whole Civil Service there. He hoped that memorial would be sent home.

MR. GREGSON said, he quite concurred with the hon. Gentleman that it was desirable that the Indian accounts should be brought down to a later date; and he thought that by the employment of an additional staff at Calcutta that might be done. He also thought it desirable that the accounts should be closed on the 31st December instead of the 30th April. With regard to the opium question he entirely disagreed from the right hon. Gentleman, for he thought that the opium system of Bengal should be assimilated to that of the Western Provinces. He thought the monopoly of the opium trade by the Government of Bengal was injurious and ought to be abolished. He heartily congratulated the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State on the flourishing condition of the Indian revenue, as he had laid it before the House that evening. India had had three prosperous years in succession; and the Indian Treasury had been enabled not only to reduce the debt £8,000,000 but there was £19,000,000 in the Treasury. This was a highly satisfactory statement. But he perceived that the increase of revenue to the amount of £1,600,000 was from opium; but opium revenue was a precarious and dangerous source of income to rely upon. The increase upon the land revenue was in every respect satisfactory. But he did not think that the Indian finances had yet been put on an unexceptionable footing. The tax on salt was oppressively high. Salt was essential to the health of a population that lived chiefly on vegetable food, and he would therefore urge upon his right hon. Friend the propriety of reducing the tax at the earliest possible moment. He did not believe that the revenue would ultimately suffer by the reduction—on the contrary, he believed it would be rather increased than diminished. But in order to effect any good, the change must not be made in any niggardly spirit. The tax was at present from 1,800 to 2,000 per cent on the value of the article, and the diminution in the cost if the tax were reduced to a moderate amount would be certain to produce a vastly increased consumption. He thought there were many grounds on which the right hon. Gentleman might take into favourable consideration the introduction of a gold currency into India; nor did he think it would be attended with those difficulties the right hon. Gentleman anticipated. There was already a gold coin in India, but it was not in general circulation. He thought that the introduction of a more portable medium of exchange than silver would be received with favour. In conclusion, he congratulated the right hon. Gentleman and the House on the growing prosperity of India. It was a little more than one hundred years ago that the tragedy of the Black Hole occurred — now we reigned over nearly 200,000,000 of people, whom our Government had raised to a great degree of material prosperity. He believed that the whole of the intelligent Natives of India were well satisfied with our Government. Such indeed had been the improvement effected of late years in the moral and intellectual well being of the Indians, that he thought in course of time they might be trusted to govern themselves.

Sir HENRY WILLOUGHBY said, that at present he was hardly sanguine enough to believe in an Indian surplus; but, however that might be, the Secretary of State would do well to bring forward this question a little earlier in the Session, so that there might be a creditable debate and a fair audience. He did not object to the Resolutions of the right hon. Gentleman, except the sixth, in which there appeared to be a mistake of £2,000,000. [Sir Charles Wood: It is a misprint; instead of £5,383,285, the figures should be £7,383,285.] When the revenue was £46,000,000 and the expenditure £45,750,000, it could not be said that a margin was left. Some £16,000,000 or £17,000,000 out of the revenue was gone, being bespoke as interest of debt, allowances, obligations under treaties, and expenses of collection, which according to his estimate amounted to nearly £6,250,000. Under our present system a deficit was just as likely to happen as a surplus. The cost of the army was very large, for in the last three years this charge had amounted to £37,000,000 — nearly as large as the army expenditure for the United Kingdom. He wished to know what had been the expenses thrown upon the Indian revenue by the necessity of doing justice to the officers of the Indian army. The prophecies of those who deprecated the amalgamation had been fulfilled, and it seemed that having made the blunder and given the guarantee, the Natives of India were now being made "to pay the piper." He should be glad if the right hon. Gentleman would give some explanation of the state of this account at the present time. Did he understand that the late war with the Hill Tribes had cost only £150,000?

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, that was the estimated cost, but in order to cover contingencies a sum of £200,000 had been taken.

Sir HENRY WILLOUGHBY could only say that the war had been a very cheap one; but he presumed that this was the extraordinary expenditure. The whole proceeding was rather in the nature of a blunder, and the war might have been avoided if the proper steps had been taken in the first instance. However, he did hope that we were not going to engage in another war with this wild people, and that we should be able to check the Hill Tribes, leaving their country alone, and thus avoiding the little wars which destroyed the Indian surplus from year to year. Nothing was to be got by attacking them, but they were very good shots and might give our troops a good deal of trouble. This was not the time to enter into the gold currency question, and it had recently been discussed in that House; but with regard to the salt tax, the Government should deal with it with great caution. It was necessary to consult the prejudices of the Natives. It was difficult to find a tax that they were willing to pay, but they would pay taxes to which they had been accustomed. Though the hon. Member for Lancaster (Mr. Gregson) hoped that the people of India would pay the income tax, he must say he agreed with Mahommedans and Hindoos in thinking the tax extremely abominable. He should, therefore, be glad to find that the Government did not press that tax on India. But, on the other hand, bearing in mind that there were not many means of obtaining revenue from the Indian people, he thought that the salt tax ought to be approached with the greatest caution.

COLONEL SYKES said, that no doubt the financial administration of Indian affairs by the right hon. Gentleman the present Secretary for India, had been surrounded with a bright halo during the last few years, but all the rays of this crown of glory could hardly be said to emanate from the brilliant administration of the right hon. Gentleman, for many of them were traceable to the Government of the East India Company. The right hon. Gentleman boasted of the increase of land revenue; but that was the result of the establishment by the Court of Directors of a permanent system of taxation, which stimulated the Natives to lay out their money to extend their cultivation, with the certainty of themselves reaping the profit. The next statement the right hon. Gentleman made was, that the cash balances were in such a good state as enabled him to pay off a considerable amount of debt; and the hon. Member for Lancaster (Mr. Gregson) talked of the cash balances being £19,000,000. According to Sir Charles Trevelyan's last Report for the years 1863-4, the cash balances instead of being £19,000,000 were only £14,000,000; but in 1857—that was before the Mutiny broke out, and under the administration of the East India Company—they amounted to £15,389,000, and the Indian Government were then enabled to pay off a 5 per cent loan. He understood his right hon. Friend to say that the employment of Natives in judicial administration was a new thing within the last five years. [Sir CHARLES WOOD explained that what he stated was that Natives had for the first time been put into high class judgeships.] He approved that step, but, with respect to the administration of justice, it was the fact before that 98 cases out of 100 were adjudicated on by Natives, as he (Colonel Sykes) had shown by publishing the official consecutive Judicial Returns for twelve years for all India. He gave the right hon. Gentleman credit for putting Natives into high places, but they were Princes and Royal personages that were so appointed; and they, no doubt, considered it to be a great honour to be associated with their governors; but they were not the persons best acquainted with administration, and he wished to know whether it would not be more advantageous if persons of a lower class with greater administrative ability were made members of these Councils? The right hon. Gentleman was, moreover, inconsistent in exercising his power in the appointment of Natives to office, in not allowing the employment of Natives in the medical service in India, notwithstanding that some Natives had come to this country to be educated at their own expense, and on examination had been rewarded with gold medals and full diplomas. He hoped such men would be included in the new medical service about to be established in India. He would not now touch on the still continued wrongs of the officers of the Indian army, in violation of Acts of Parliament, as there was no doubt that that question must be distinctly mooted next Session. The imports into India, though the House would scarcely believe it, had actually fallen off. According to Sir Charles Trevelyan's Report the Customs duty in 1861-2 was £2,876,139; but in the regular estimate for 1863-4 it was only £2,324,200, and the estimate for the next year was still less. On the other hand the exports had enormously increased, rendering the settlement of the balance of trade annually more difficult. The revenue from opium fluctuated greatly year by year. The Chinese were the only consumers of the drug, and what was the state of that country? Anarchy reigned throughout the land, and England had lent her aid to aggravate the desolation. They could not, therefore, look upon opium as a permanent source of revenue, but must be prepared for a time when it would, to a considerable extent, break down. In Bengal there was a vicious Government monopoly. The farmer had not control over his own land, for he was obliged to cultivate opium on a fixed portion of it, and sell the produce to the Government, who bought it at a low and sold it at a very high rate. That was neither a sound nor a creditable system. On the Bombay side of India an Excise duty was imposed on opium, and its cultivation was left to the discretion of the people. There was a great deal of talk about developing the resources of India; but the fact was that they had already been developed to such an extent that the balance of trade was annually increasing against us. We required Indian productions—indigo, sugar, cotton, oil seeds, jute, flax, &c., and must have them; but the people of India did not want our woollens or warming-pans. The demand for their products was increasing year by year, and we were obliged to pay for them in hard cash. Since 1800, by a Return which he (Colonel Sykes) had moved for, it appeared that the amount of silver and gold which has been introduced into India was £254,000,000 sterling. No part of this sum had come back again, or was likely to come, seeing that it could be lent at from 10 to 30 per cent. It was absurd to talk of the people burying their money, for they were much too acute to do that when they could get 20 or 30 per cent for it. His right hon. Friend, in his review of Indian progress, had not included the financial movements of 1863-4, which must be in his possession, as he (Colonel Sykes) held an official paper on the subject in his hand, and these figures would have been more acceptable than those of former years.

Mr. BAZLEY said, he joined with every other Member who had spoken in regretting that the Budget had not been brought forward earlier in the Session. An impression was growing in the public mind that there was a disposition to carry on the Government of India irrespective of the control of Parliament. If, as had been proposed, the accounts for the year were submitted to Parliament at a proper time, very valuable suggestions, no doubt, would be made in the course of the discussions, the result of which might be of great benefit to the Indian Government. He wished, however, he could congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on the services of the Government in regard to the cultivation of cotton in India, and its increased supply; but on the part of his friends in Manchester he had to complain that the Indian Government had interfered in the affairs of the Manchester Cotton Company in such a way that that concern had been reduced to comparative ruin. In describing the prosperity of India, the right hon. Gentleman was wanting in candour in omitting to state that the surplus price of cotton remitted to India at the present time amounted to little less than £50,000,000. But how were the Indian Government requiting Lancashire for the excessive price they were paying for cotton? Why this was the very moment which was chosen for inforcing increased exactions on Manchester goods to the amount of 100 or 150 per cent, taking into account the high value of cotton. Such was the dissatisfaction in Manchester that a claim was raised not merely for a reduction of the duty on cotton manufactures, but for the admission of Lancashire goods into India free of duty. The practical effect was that the Lancashire manufacturers were carrying on very extensive works at a great pecuniary loss. There were individual establishments contributing to the revenue of India as much as £100 per week in the duties levied, which were about to be mulcted in £200 or £300 a week, thus, of course, adding to the losses they already sustained. It was cheering to learn from the hon. Member for London (Mr. Crawford) that an improved quality of cotton was now being received from India. He had never doubted that that country might be made to grow cotton which would not only compete with but even supersede the American supply; but it was of great importance that a superior quality of fibre should be cultivated in India. If, while the Indian supply was in its present condition, the American supply were suddenly to be restored, the manufacturers would prefer the latter, and the result would be that all the efforts that had been made in India during the last few years would be thrown away. Every effort ought, therefore, to be made to raise the character of the cotton which was produced in India. He trusted that next Session more time would be given to the discussion of Indian affairs.

Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE said, that they were met together on the 21st of July for the purpose of re-enacting the solemn farce which last year was performed on the 23rd of July. After a Session passed in laborious discussions, a mere fragment of the House of Commons met for the purpose of deliberating upon the Government of more than 200,000,000 of people. A more scandalous sight could not be presented to the British nation than the aspect of the House at that moment. The Government of 200,000,000 of people was confided to their care, and yet the welfare of that enormous population was muttered over to Benches almost empty. The statement of the right hon. Gentleman was to some extent encouraging, as it showed that the natural resources of the country, assisted by that Providential interposition which generally came to our aid when we had committed great blunders, had raised the revenue of India to a paying point. He, therefore, trusted that the Government of India would feel inclined to treat the two services in India with more liberality than they had hitherto displayed. It had been remarked that evening that the Speaker had heralded the finale of the labours of the Session by his annual dinner, and he (Sir James Elphinstone) therefore felt justified in calling this a post-prandial discussion of a subject that was worthy of greater respect and attention by the House. By a formal decision of the House it had been declared that those services were entitled to consideration, and he gave the right hon. Gentleman fair warning, that if the subject was not satisfactorily dealt with or explained by the right hon. Gentleman, that at the beginning of the next Session the subject would be forced upon the attention of the Government and the sense of the House again taken upon it. The revenue and expenditure of India which they were now discussing were matters of history, and debates of this kind simply converted the House of Commons into a debating society for expressing opinions upon India in general. He was glad to hear that the Government had at length adopted the recommendation of the Committee, to transport our troops to India by the way of the Red Sea, rather than by the Cape. This was a course so consistent with common sense and economy the marvel was that the Government did not see the advantage of it before. He wished to ask on whom the expense for providing the passage of those troops from England to Alexandria was to fall, and whether this country or India was to provide the transports from England to Alexandria? He hoped that the Government of India had duly considered the periods of the year when the health of the troops would be seriously endangered by their transit. At the fall of the Nile fever set in, which lasted for three months afterwards, and therefore the troops should not be sent to India by this overland route between the months of June and November. Now that there was extensive railway communication in India it was time for the Government to look before them, and to consider seriously whether a reduction in the Indian establishments could not be effected. Sir Sidney Cotton — a most able and experienced authority — stated with those means of communication with India they could govern India with 30 per cent less of troops than they had heretofore thought necessary to have there; but that could only be done by the abandonment of the old system of cantonments, which was now entirely obsolete, and by availing themselves of the facilities afforded by the extension of the railway system. He recommended the Secretary of the Colonies to consider whether a similar course might not be advantageously pursued in the colonies for the development of railway communication. There was, however, one point to which the attention of the Government of India did not appear to have been sufficiently turned. The whole of our efforts for the last few years had been directed to the development of the internal traffic of India. No doubt that was of paramount importance, but in order to render it effectual it was also necessary to give increased facilities for the coasting trade of India. Much had been said about the scarcity of labour in India; he did not believe there was any such scarcity. No doubt the higher portions of the country were more sparsely inhabited than the alluvial portions of the country. The lines of communication which were now established in India appeared to be intended more for the transport of the products and commodities of the country than for the purpose of supplying food to the population; if the Government afforded proper facilities for conveying labour from one part of the country to another all the difficulty would cease. Three years ago he obtained a Committee to investigate the possibility and practicability of deepening a channel through Adam's Bridge, connecting the Continent of India with the Island of Ceylon, so as to enable large ships to go through the passage instead of going round the Island. There were between 3,000 and 4,000 yards of ground requiring to be cut through, but the work was not greater than was met with in any ten miles of railway out of London, and it was most important with regard to the coasting trade of India. According to the evidence taken by that Committee it was quite clear that £100,000 or £150,000 was all that was necessary to open that channel for a line-of-battle ship. He asked the right hon. Gentleman whether any steps had been taken to open up that channel? The present extra expense of the coasting trade, arising from the necessity of taking a 350 miles' voyage for one year, would pay for the canal and enable the *Princess Royal*, the flag ship of the station, to sail through the Straits. Materials of excellent quality were on the spot, and the surplus which the right hon. Gentleman had in hand would enable him to carry out that improvement. We had peace in India, and revenue was springing up. The East India Company was constantly at war, coerced into it by the Board of Control; and when the Company had taken the chesnuts out of the fire they were set aside, and the right hon. Gentleman took credit for the present state of things. Another point on which he desired to have information was who paid for the British navy in India? The coasts of India were about 4,000 miles in extent, from Beloochistan to Singapore, and the whole police of these seas was managed by the Royal Navy. One of the first acts of the right hon. Gentleman was to extinguish the Indian navy. The Indian navy comprised more scientific men, for its numbers, than any other service in the world, excepting a strictly scientific service like the Royal Engineers. They were employed as ambassadors, diplomatists, residents, consuls; they explored countries, they investigated the ruins and antiquities of the country; they were linguists, surveyors, admirable seamen, and they maintained a post of the highest respectability and honour under the East India Company, and performed services of the very greatest importance in the survey and exploration of the country, not only of the East India Company, but adjacent to the Red Sea and in Abyssinia. That service was swept away with scanty thanks or justice. He asked the right hon. Gentleman, out of his overflowing Budget, to temper justice with mercy, and to give the members of that profession some of the advantages which he was extending to the country which we had saved from anarchy and despotism. By what had that force been replaced? By the Royal Navy. And who paid the navy for this service? The taxpayers of England. Now, he would ask whether it was right that the taxpayers of England should send out a navy to do the business which should be done by the Indian Government, and enable the right hon. Gentleman to come down to the House with a flourishing statement about the revenues of India? Then, as to the alteration in the boundary between the East India Company's territory and the territories of the Crown. Formerly, when an officer passed the Cape of Good Hope, he came under Indian allowances. We had now established a command eastward of the Cape; we had established a naval command from the Cape of Good Hope to Singapore, where it joined the Chinese station. It was practically impossible to separate that portion of the sea from the territories of the Indian Government. The whole stream of our commerce went from the narrow neck round the Cape of Good Hope to the Southern Indian Ocean, and there ought to commence the subsidy of the Indian Government for the navy, and it was a practical injustice to this country to make it otherwise. It was a direct premium to the Admiral for spending the whole of his time in the Indian portion of his station. He wished to know how the right hon. Gentleman intended to deal with these matters. He understood that an important alteration was to take place with regard to the States Settlements, and he wished to know in what that change was to consist. When Sir Stamford Raffles established the colony of Singapore in 1819, it was guaranteed as a free port. He (Sir James Elphinstone) was there in the year 1820, and he had been there occasionally during the next seventeen years. A more extraordinary increase in any port had never occurred, except in some of the mushroom places in America, than took place at Singapore. The whole of the trade of the Eastern Archipelago had been centred in that port, and the progress of the colony was mainly due to its immunity from all port charges. He understood that it was the design of the Indian Government to introduce port regulations for Singapore. He wished to know whether or not that was really the intention of the Government; because, if so, that opportunity might be obtained in the next Session which was denied him in the present of opposing a policy likely to be so mischievous. Then, as to the taxes in India, and especially the salt tax. He looked upon the cotton cultivation in India as ephemeral. The war in America must, in the nature of things, end some time or other. There were in the South 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 of slaves, and half a million would be quite enough to supply this country with all the cotton it required.

The total destruction of the animals in Egypt had altered the position of that country, and instead of exporting large quantities of grain, Egypt was likely to become a great cotton field, and to import grain for its own consumption from the Black Sea. Under these circumstances, was it likely that we should take our cotton from a country 16,000 miles distant when we could get it from America and Egypt? India, no doubt, had benefited from the war in America, and as long as it pleased Providence that the war should continue India would be likely to benefit. But as soon as it came to an end the people of this country would fall back upon their old sources of supply. But since the people of India must consume a certain quantity of salt with their food, the salt tax, in his opinion, and in the opinion of those best acquainted with India, was the last tax with which the Government ought to interfere. He felt bound to enter his protest against the system inaugurated by the right hon. Gentleman of bringing forward his financial statement, when he might have acted far otherwise, at a time when the benches of that House were so empty. He should have been glad to see the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley) present on that occasion. It was the proper function of an Opposition not to allow questions of such importance to be slurred over as they were that evening, and he hoped the House would snpport him next year when he should endeavour to bring about a better state of things.

Mr. GRANT DUFF said, that of all the wonderful political performances ever enacted on this terrestrial globe, the most astounding was the performance of the right hon. Gentleman. It was not merely that the Indian Budget was brought in at the end of the Session, when they were all wearied and jaded, but that they were wearied and jaded from listening not to a speech, for it could not be called a speech, but to a sort of concatenation of broken, interjectional remarks and sentences, jerked out by a Minister to whom Heaven had denied not only the power of lucid statement but almost the gift of articulate speech. ["Oh, oh!"] Assuredly the noble Lord at the head of the Government could find a colleague who, while not inferior to the right hon. Gentleman in administrative ability, might possess the power, he would not say of laying before the House such a statement as that which the Chancellor of the Exchequer was in the habit of making from year to year with regard to the financial position of England, but a person who could make that sort of clear and intelligible statement which the country had a right to demand. ["Oh, oh!"] He had listened year after year to the speeches of the right hon. Baronet, and he had never heard him make a speech which would be in any respect satisfactory, even if it appeared as an anonymous article in the pages of a Quarterly Review.

Mr. AYRTON said, with regard to what had been said of the state of the House, he believed these Indian debates followed only the ordinary course of such matters, and if there was any peculiarity in this debate it was to be found in the circumstance that there was an almost entire absence of all the Members connected with the manufacturing districts who had ever taken an interest in the affairs of India. The only two persons present who could be said to represent the manufacturing districts were the hon. Member for Manchester (Mr. Bazley) and the hon. Member for Stockport (Mr. J. B. Smith), and they had expressed themselves as satisfied on the whole with the state of affairs. He attributed the peculiarity to which he had alluded to the circumstance that from repeated discussion they had arrived at a better appreciation of the relations of this country to our Indian Empire, and they felt that the causes of complaint upon which they had formerly dwelt had ceased to exist. They no longer looked for that enormous supply of cotton which they had formerly anticipated, nor did they attribute the deficiency to the causes of which they had so often complained. While regret had been generally expressed that the House had not before it the financial statement delivered by Sir Charles Trevelyan to the Indian Council in the beginning of the financial year, an hon. Gentleman spoke of it disparagingly, and said that it had sent every Member of the Council to sleep, except Sir Charles Trevelyan, who was reading it. He (Mr. Ayrton), on the contrary, had received a copy of that statement, and he must say he considered it as deserving to be spoken of with the utmost respect, and that it reflected the highest credit upon Sir Charles Trevelyan. In former years some gentlemen went out to India with the most inflated ideas of their position; they called themselves Chancellors of the Exchequer, and delivered speeches which were not worthy of being reproduced in this country and of being laid in an official form upon the table of the House. But there was a total absence of any such assumption on the part of Sir Charles Trevelyan. Considering the tone of Sir Charles Trevelyan's address, he was of opinion that some arrangement should be made by which such a document should be laid upon the table of the House by the Secretary of State for India; not that the document should be looked upon as binding the Secretary of State to everything contained in it, but merely as an expression of the opinion of the Government of India on the finances of that empire. It was most unsatisfactory that they should be passing Resolutions relating to a state of affairs past and gone when Sir Charles Trevelyan had published a statement which brought the finances of India up to the April of the present year, and estimated them to the April of 1865, and had added a financial criticism relative to the increase or diminution of the income and expenditure of that country. He thought that with such information the House would be able to arrive at a better conclusion than by merely receiving the accounts which had been laid upon the table. It was not his intention to enter into discussions extending from the Himalaya to Adam's Peak, and from the chronicles of Adam to the present time; but he could not help recalling the attention of the Secretary of State to a subject which he had brought to his notice last year, and which showed a tendency on the part of the Government of India to fall into the evil course into which the Home Government had fallen. A hundred years ago it was predicted that if the Government of this country could raise a revenue from the vices of the people by the spread of intemperance, they would address themselves to promote the consumption of ardent spirits rather than to diminish it, and that prophecy has been thoroughly fulfilled. He thought there was a disposition on the part of the Government of India to fall into the same error. Nothing could equal the horrors produced by stimulating the consumption of intoxicating drinks in India, and it became the Government seriously to consider whether some improvement could not be introduced into this system. He must also again press on the right hon. Gentleman the condition of the salt revenue. That revenue had been raised very much during the last few years; and while every step taken in the remission of revenue was for the relief of the wealthy classes in India, they were putting on a tax on the first necessary of life for the poorer classes. The increase of the salt tax had been attended with the most deplorable results. Those who are engaged in the curing of provisions had been compelled to reduce the quantity used, and the most lamentable evils, involving loss of life, had been the consequence. Serious effects had also been occasioned to cattle and agriculture. He was quite satisfied that the present amount of this tax was oppressive and ought to be reduced at the earliest possible period. With regard to expenditure, it was unnecessary to go into all the items that appeared in these accounts. He feared very little could be done in reducing the expenditure on account of the army and civil service. But there was one thing for which Sir Charles Trevelyan deserved the greatest credit. Instead of lending himself to the views of a few people in India who were desirous of carrying on a false system of finance, he had boldly applied himself to the proper appropriation of the surplus Indian revenue to the reduction of the public debt. That surplus had been created by factitious finance, and the debt ought never to have been created. Still, there had been a pressure put on the Government that the surplus should be applied to develop the resources of the country and the maintenance of a false system of finance. Every encouragement should be given to the Finance Minister in India in resisting that pressure. He had been placed in a position of the greatest possible difficulty, being surrounded by persons who fancied that the interests of India were coincident with their own, though these might be limited to the province or towns in which they resided, and by no means identical with the interests of the great mass of people for whose good government we ought to feel ourselves responsible. He thought the statement which had been made exceedingly gratifying. India was prosperous, notwithstanding the misfortunes of the Mutiny and in consequence of the war in America. Immense capital had been invested in India by the railway companies. There had been a vast increase in the value of its produce, which had tended to bring the finances of India into a more healthy condition. But he hoped it would not be thought, because we could collect revenue from a submissive people we should exact from them the last farthing they could pay short of driving them into rebellion, and that we were entitled to squander that revenue on anything that gratified the caprice of Europeans. They were now congratulating themselves on the great prosperity of India; but he would remind them that a few years ago Lord Dalhousie printed a Minute, in which he congratulated himself and the country on the prosperity which had resulted from his system of administration; and all concerned in that Minute—the Court of Directors, the Board of Control, and the Public Service in India—were extremely delighted by that state of things. But when the record came home it was found to be a factitious statement, and twelve months afterwards we were awakened by the astounding discovery that the statement was mere imagination; and that underlying our administration was a deep sense of injury and wrong, a growing state of dissatisfaction which burst out into open mutiny and sedition. Government would do well to consider what was the real state of India, and not build too much on the force they possessed, and the submissiveness of the people, for if they did, deriding Native prejudice and superstition, and exacting from the people the utmost farthing they could pay, without breaking out into open rebellion, the time would come when this country would be more startled than before, and would regret that it had not taken advantage of the pacific and humble disposition of the Natives of India.

SIR CHARLES WOOD was very much obliged for the views which had been expressed on this subject by hon. Gentlemen who had spoken in the debate, and the kind expressions which had been used towards himself. It had been stated by the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir James Elphinstone) that the Indian Budget had been postponed, as a dodge on his part, till so late a period that he might be enabled to make what sort of statement he pleased. Now, the real facts of the case were these—till he became President of the Board of Control no Indian Budget was ever laid before the House, and no more information about the affairs of India was placed before the House than of any part of the world with which we had no connection. He could therefore hardly be accused with justice of wishing to keep the House in ignorance of Indian affairs. But how much earlier could he make his statement? The accounts on the table, up to the end of April, 1863, were made up in India in March and April, 1864. The regular Estimates for 1863-4 were made up about the same time, and did not arrive in this country till towards the end of April. The form of the accounts had been settled by the House of Commons, and the day on which they must be laid on the table was fixed by Act of Parliament. That day was the 14th of May. Generally speaking, they could not be laid on the table more than a day or two before the time fixed by Act of Parliament. The accounts were laid on the table before Whitsuntide this year, and they were of such a detailed character that they could not be printed before the middle of June. No doubt it might be possible to change the whole arrangement of business in India and to alter the date of the Indian year, which had been fixed for the convenience of India, and not of this country. He might by this means be able to make his statement about India at an earlier period of the Session. The House must see that it was a matter of perfect indifference to him whether he made that statement on the 1st of January or the 1st of July. But the financial year in England had been changed from the end of December to the end of March in order that the votes for the great services might be got through before Easter. If even one night were taken for the Indian Budget before Easter it would interrupt the course of business in that House, and it was, therefore, necessary to appoint such a day as would least interfere with English business. The House of Commons, however, did not vote the taxes of India, nor did it in the first instance control the expenditure of India. The object of the statement now made annually by the Indian Minister was to lay before the House the general state of affairs in India and to enable those hon. Members who took an interest in Indian matters to make such suggestions or ask for such information as might be useful. The House was asked for no vote that influenced the taxes of India. He had listened with great attention to the various suggestions which had been made; but if he adopted the suggestions of some hon. Gentleman he should have very little surplus left. He had never thought it desirable to maintain a high duty on salt; but when recommendations of its reduction were made, hon. Members must think of the present state of Indian revenue. The surplus in India was estimated at £30,000; but there were miscellaneous receipts in England that brought it up to £257,000. It must be remembered in how large a degree the Indian revenue depended on opium, the income from which sometimes varied as much as £1,000,000 a year or even more, and how difficult it would be to make up any possible deficiency which might not improbably occur in that source. The evils of the salt tax had been, he thought, a good deal overrated, for he remembered a report from a medical officer attached to a hospital in Calcutta who examined his patients on this subject, and found that out of 100 persons only three said that they had ever suffered from the diminished quantity of salt which they were able to consume in consequence of the high price. The land revenue was a rent, and not a tax, and the only taxes the Natives of India paid were Customs duties on piece goods for clothing and the tax on salt. The people of India had always been accustomed to taxes on salt. They had a singular objection to a new tax, and it would therefore be most unwise to repeal the salt tax which had always existed in India, and substitute some other impost which the people of India had never paid before. It could not be said that the people of India were too heavily taxed. With regard to opium, he was ready to admit that the pass duty on Bombay opium was at present too high, and that it would be well that it should bear a fairer proportion to the amount of duty at Calcutta. The hon. Member (Mr. Henry Seymour) had not correctly understood the state of the case in regard to waste lands. What he (Sir Charles Wood) had stated, and that was on the authority of Lord Canning, was that he did not think a large amount would be available for sale in Bengal Proper; but that in Assam and the Neilgherries there was a good deal of waste land available for European cultivation. With reference to the telegraph, he did not see that he had been at all to blame. The Turkish Government insisted upon constructing the line in Turkey, and the Persian Government upon constructing that in Persia. He had completed all that depended upon himself, and had assisted those Governments as far as they would allow him in constructing the lines which passed through their respective territories. The complaints of the hon. Members for Stockport and Manchester as to the valuation of piece goods at Calcutta were not well founded. The duty was 5 per cent *ad valorem*, and as the value of the goods had risen, it was only fair that the rate at which they were charged should be increased. That had been done in concert with the Chamber of Commerce at Calcutta, which admitted that it was perfectly fair. The hon. Member for Stockport charged him with bad political economy in doing with reference to tea and the cinchona—that is to say, encouraging the introduction of those articles of produce—that which he refused to do with regard to cotton; but the hon. Member forgot that all that he was doing in the former cases had been done with regard to cotton ten or fifteen years ago by the East India Company, who, having introduced the best description of cotton and shown that it could be grown, handed the plantations over to private enterprize. Upon the subject of the duty on saltpetre, a letter had that morning passed the Council, and was about to be sent to the Government of India, informing them that saltpetre was being manufactured in Europe to a considerable amount from nitrate of soda, a fact which bore most importantly upon the duty, the existing rate of which was only justifiable upon the theory that India had a monopoly of the article. The inconvenience which had arisen at the mint of Bombay arose from the circumstance that in October last, there being then no bullion to coin, the old machinery was taken down for the purpose of substituting new and improved engines. While the establishment was in this crippled condition there came an extraordinary influx of bullion, which, of course, could not be immediately coined into money. The hon. Baronet the Member for Evesham had found fault with him for not going more minutely into the estimates of revenue and expenditure. On former occasions he had done so—in fact, had made an Indian Budget; and he had only omitted to take that course on the present occasion because the experience of the last year or two had induced him to think that it rather bored than interested the House. The speech of Sir Charles Trevelyan was not an official document, and therefore could not conveniently be laid upon the table. He did not quite understand what the hon. Baronet meant by doubting the existence of a surplus. So far as last year went, the surplus was an ascertained fact. That of the current year was, of course, only anticipated, and might or might not be realized; but he had confidence in Sir Charles Trevelyan's judgment on this point.

There must always be some uncertainty as to opium. As to the transport of troops, arrangements were now under consideration, in concert with the Admiralty, for sending them through Egypt. He was not so sure as he was at one time that the adoption of that course would lead to any considerable saving of expense, because the cost of building transports had been found to be much greater than had been anticipated. The troops would certainly be sent during the cool months of the year. Various suggestions had been made as to new taxes, but upon the whole he was inclined to believe that Indian finance could be better administered on the spot than by suggestions in that House. With respect to charges for the navy he would only observe that the external defence of India had always depended upon the Imperial forces, and the Indian navy was hardly more than a transport service. A question had been put about the Straits settlement which he scarcely understood.

Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE said, what he wanted to know was, Whether Singapore was to cease to be a free port, or whether duties were to be levied there by the authority of the Indian Government?

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, no alteration in the position of Singapore was intended; but questions had been raised by the Singapore Chamber of Commerce as to harbourmasters, and also as to moorings, and it was stated that no objection would be made to the levying of some small duty for the purpose of defraying any expenditure for these purposes. He believed that he had noticed all the points that had been raised, and had only further to thank the Committee for the patient attention they had given to his statement, and to thank hon. Members for the suggestions which they had made, and which he could assure them should receive his most careful attention.

Mr. TORRENS wanted to know, whether there was any probability of the plan he had suggested being adopted—namely, to close the Indian accounts at an earlier date—say the 31st of December?

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, he would communicate with the Government of India upon that subject, but he would remark that, even if he were enabled to bring forward the accounts earlier in the Session, he should not be able to make his statement earlier without interfering with the English business. The accounts before the Committee were for the year ending the 30th of April, 1863. The local accounts might be made up earlier in India, but the accounts for all India were not made up until March, and did not reach this country till the middle of April.

Mr. TORRENS said, the accounts of India were closed on the 30th April—he could not see why they could not be made up to December 31, or to any preceding date, so that they might be laid before Parliament early in the Session. He had great experience himself in relation to those accounts, and could see no obstacle to the plan he suggested.

Sir CHARLES WOOD admitted that the hon. Gentleman was better acquainted with the subject than himself, but he had spoken of the delay of arranging all the local accounts at Calcutta before reaching this country.

Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE thought that all the right hon. Gentleman had to do was to send out an order that the accounts should be made up to a particular day. With respect to the expenditure for barracks, he hoped attention would be given to that subject, as most of them were unhealthy and even pestilential; and if the Government would take the opinion of such men as Sir Sidney Cotton, they would soon learn where improvements were needed, and whether it would not be possible to do with some 20,000 or 30,000 less Europeans than were now kept in India. Then as to the Paumban Channel, he thought the expenditure of some £200,000 would be a most useful application of money, as it would greatly facilitate trade, and a small duty upon coasters would soon recoup the outlay.

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR said, that Sir Charles Trevelyan had made a statement in India of the estimate for next year, and yet the House was kept in ignorance upon the subject until the moment when the right hon. Gentleman spoke, and even then they were only informed of the general items, though the full accounts had been published in India. As to the home charges, that part of the accounts must be sent out from England; and why could it not be laid before the House? He complained also that the accounts which they had contained no column comparing the accounts with those of the previous year. The statement of Sir Charles Trevelyan was an explanation of the estimate of this year.

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, that if

his hon. Friend would look at the papers which had been laid upon the table he would find that the accounts for 1862-3 were actually compared, page after page, with the estimated expenditure for the year 1863-4.

MR. GREGSON said, he had not asked for the repeal of the salt duty, but for the reduction of it.

In reply to Sir HENRY WILLOUGHBY,

SIR CHARLES WOOD said, that measures were being taken to consolidate various treasuries, which were now unnecessarily multiplied.

SIR JAMES ELPHINSTONE gave notice that if the naval service was not placed on the same footing as the military service by next Session he should move the rejection of the Resolution.

Resolutions *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at Twelve of the clock.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: In moving that you, Sir, do now leave the Chair, I wish, with the permission of the House, to take the same course which I adopted last year, and that is to check—which I hope to be able to do in a few words — the figures set down in this Bill by a comparison with those I gave in the financial statement — to show the difference between the sums estimated and the sums as they actually stand; in fact, to place before the House the rectified statement. Since that statement was made certain changes have taken place in consequence of Supplemental Estimates which it has been found necessary to lay on the table. The charges on account of the Debt and the Consolidated Fund remain as they were. The charge for the Army, too, stands precisely as they were then stated. One of the most important changes is in the charge for the Navy, which in the financial statement was set down at £10,432,000, and is in the Appropriation Bill fixed at £10,708,000—thus making a difference of nearly £280,000. Of that sum about £60,000 was announced by me in general terms in connection with the changes which were then under consideration in the pay of certain classes in the navy, and a reserve of £80,000 was actually made, principally for that purpose. Independently of that, however, there has been another most important additional charge imposed on account of the service—I allude to the purchase of the two iron-clad vessels of which we have heard so much, and for which a sum, I think, of £225,000 was voted by this House. These charges will explain the difference between the estimate of £10,432,000 and the sum of £10,708,000, as stated in this Bill. Again, the Miscellaneous Expenditure was estimated by me at £7,628,000, whereas it appears here as £7,638,000. On the other hand the Packet Service, which was estimated to cost £883,000, has had actually voted for it only £860,000. Taking the entire of the changes made altogether, the result is as follows:—I estimated the Revenue for the present financial year at £67,128,000, and the Expenditure at £66,890,000, showing a surplus of £238,000; but while the estimate for the Revenue remains as I placed it—inasmuch as the financial proposals of the Government were adopted substantially as they were submitted to the House — the estimate of charge has been raised to £67,073,000, leaving on the figures as they now stand only a nominal surplus of £55,000. I do not think there is any reason to apprehend that there will be a deficiency on the balance of the year; but, at the same time, the estimated surplus has been reduced to a sum smaller than the Government would have been justified in submitting for the sanction of the House had they contemplated the additional charges which I have mentioned at the period of the financial statement. Almost the whole of the difference is caused by the purchase of these two vessels; and that is not to be regarded as a measure of finance as a measure of expediency for the protection of the public interest. It is possible—and, indeed, I hope not unreasonable—to express some confidence that the effect of the purchase of these vessels will be the reduction in the corresponding Votes of next year; but I am not able to give any definite estimate of the reduction upon these Votes in the present year, though I do not altogether abandon the hope of so doing. These, therefore, are the figures which express the ultimate finance of the year, and as far as the estimate of Revenue and Expenditure goes they show only a nominal surplus of £55,000.

Sir HENRY WILLOUGHBY said, it was clear that the surplus had more than vanished; but he wished to know whether there were not other charges to be deducted? Had the right hon. Gentleman taken into consideration the Supplemental Estimate for the Army, the charges for the Yeomanry, and the £20,000 for Sir Rowland Hill.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that the figures were taken from the Appropriation Bill as printed, and were therefore authentic.

Sir HENRY WILLOUGHBY thought it was unfortunate that the surplus had all vanished, and hoped that the right hon. Gentleman could give the House some assurance that the revenue was in such a state of buoyancy that there was every reason to expect a fair surplus.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, as far as he could judge, was in a position to give such an assurance.

Mr. WHITE wished to know if credit had been taken for the £500,000 which it was stated would be repaid to us by New Zealand if the House consented to the Guarantee of Loan Bill now before the House.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that if that sum were received it would go to increase the balance.

Mr. WALPOLE said, he was glad to find that the Chancellor of the Exchequer anticipated that the balance would be maintained if no other disturbances should arise. He could not help, however, looking with the greatest alarm at what was going on in New Zealand, and he thought it would well become the Government to make a fuller statement as to the charges which might be expected in case the war should continue.

Mr. AYRTON wished to know if it was competent for any hon. Member to bring on any question under the Appropriation Act arising out of the Votes appropriated by the Bill, or whether it was necessary to wait for the particular section of the Act to which the question referred?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. and learned Member will be perfectly in order in proceeding with the notice which stands in his name.

Mr. AYRTON said, he had given notice of his intention to call the attention of the House to the balance of power in Europe, for the maintenance of which most of the army supplies were voted. He said that one of the most important of the Votes was £15,000,000 which had been voted for the support of our standing army. In the Act which was passed at the commencement of the Session they were told that this standing army was supported for the purpose of defending our Colonies, for the safety of our own country, and for the maintenance of the balance of power in Europe. The amount voted for those purposes during the last five years was £84,000,000, so that, with the sums voted during the present Session, they had voted and were to spend no less a sum than £100,000,000 for those purposes. They had never been informed in what manner that enormous sum ought to be divided; how much for the protection of our Colonies, how much for ourselves, and how much for the balance of power; but if they were to divide it into three equal parts they would be able to appreciate the sacrifice which the people of this country were making for the attainment of some end of the nature of which they had no very clear idea. He had asked the noble Lord (Viscount Palmerston) a few days since a question which appeared to him to be of some importance, and he regarded the answer which he received as highly unsatisfactory. He had desired to know whether the Government had taken steps, in consequence of the course pursued by the kingdom of Prussia, to relieve this country from the responsibilities which it had incurred in 1815 towards that country; and the noble Lord by his answer suggested that he (Mr. Ayrton) was proposing a very gratuitous violation of treaty to which he could not lend his countenance. He regarded the view taken by the noble Lord as erroneous, because he did not look upon our withdrawal from the responsibilities of the treaty as a violation of our agreement if we believe that Prussia was now engaged in violating the treaty in essential conditions which affected the character of our guarantee. He might remind the House that during the great war which ended with the peace or treaty of 1815, Saxony took a very conspicuous part on the side of the French, and that the Great Napoleon always manifested the deepest interest in the welfare and maintenance of that kingdom. Saxony naturally became antagonistic to the other Powers of Germany, more especially to Austria and Prussia; and when Russia and ourselves had by dint of great sacrifices and exertions of power destroyed the supremacy of the French in Europe, Prussia became awakened, as it were, from the stupor into which she had fallen, and mustered up courage sufficient to take part in the conflict which resulted in the overthrow of Napoleon. But no sooner had the result been attained than Prussia, whose conduct resembled that of the jackal following in the footsteps of the lion, "eager to prey where she was powerless to conquer," assumed a remarkable attitude in the affairs of Europe, and immediately began to intrigue with Russia for the purpose of appropriating to herself the kingdom of Saxony. It required considerable diplomatic exertions on the part of England to frustrate these exertions; and ultimately Prussia was induced to relinquish some of her designs, and to content herself with the spoliation from Saxony of a portion of her territory. The result of these intrigues and negotiations was that England was induced to give a distinct guarantee, by the Treaty of Vienna, that Prussia should continue in possession of the provinces of which she had despoiled the kingdom of Saxony. That, I maintain, was a grave responsibility to incur, and one which we can only properly appreciate when we remember our insular position, and the fact that Saxony is situated in the heart of Europe. No doubt the conduct of this country was based upon the fact that we were making a great settlement which was to maintain the balance of power in Europe. But when Prussia accepted our guarantee she implicitly acknowledged that she was not strong enough to maintain her acquisitions by force without external aid. England in undertaking that guarantee must have felt and believed that she did so, not for the purpose of enabling Prussia to break the peace of Europe by attacking other States and countries, but in the conviction that Prussia was a peaceable Power, and that she would remain contented under the treaty which gave her so large an addition to her territory. The position, however, which Prussia had lately assumed was entirely at variance with the principles of the Treaty of Vienna. In these transactions we had been dealing with Prussia and Austria, not as part of the German Confederation, because they had been at some pains to impress upon us that they were acting as independent kingdoms in connection with the Germanic Confederation. Prussia could not screen herself by saying that she was merely performing a duty imposed on her by her obligations to the Diet. For her own aims she had chosen to act as an independent kingdom as well as one of the Confederated States of Germany, and in the attitude she had taken upon herself to break the peace of Europe. Under this very treaty the fundamental part of the Germanic Confederation was settled, and the article of guarantee was part of those provisions. Therefore the guarantee was an integral part of the territorial arrangements of the States of the Germanic Confederation in its internal and extra-territorial relations. It was equally clear by that treaty, Holstein alone was part of the Germanic Confederation, and that Schleswig had nothing to do with that arrangement. When Prussia therefore took on herself to invade Schleswig and Denmark Proper, she was entering on a course of proceeding entirely at variance with the Treaty of 1815, and was undertaking to break the peace of Europe, and unsettling the balance of power. He denied altogether the assertion of the noble Lord (Viscount Palmerston) that the acts of 1863-4 had nothing to do with the Treaty of 1815. They were intimately connected with each other; because it was impossible for any man to say what might be the consequences of those acts of 1863-4 in reference to the responsibilities undertaken by us under the Treaty of 1815. If Prussia had proclaimed to-day that there was to be a kind of parochial nationality, and that each parish and hamlet was to be asked whether it would belong to one kingdom or another, that feeling might spread, and what had taken place in Schleswig might occur in Saxony. The history of Germany showed that there was as much antagonism between the Bavarian and Prussian, the Saxon and the Austrian, as between the Hanoverian, say, and the Schleswiger; and if this new principle was to be acted on and enforced by war, without negotiation, the Saxons might apply the lesson taught by Prussia, and rally together, and it was impossible to tell what we might not be called on to do under our responsibilities of the Treaty of 1815. It was beside the question, therefore, to compare our position under that treaty with the question raised under the Treaty of 1852, when our Government justly told Prussia that she could not take advantage of the circumstances which had occurred to depart from the Treaty of 1815. We were entitled to say to Prussia, that if she were not content to rest her claims on the Treaty of 1815, and would not preserve the peace guaranteed by that treaty, we would no longer accept the responsibilities of that treaty. Instead of indulging in idle threats which the Prussians knew we should never perform, if the Government at certain critical portions of the negotiations had made such representations to Prussia, she would have been stopped in her course; whereas we had rather encouraged her by bluster, which she knew perfectly well we should never act upon. He had felt it his duty to take this opportunity of protesting in the name of the people of England, who had spent £100,000,000 within the last six years for the preservation of the balance of power against the imposition of such an enormous burden in favour of the Treaty of Vienna, and in favour of a Power which showed herself utterly regardless of treaties, and which, for its own purposes, had not scrupled to break the peace of Europe.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON thought the House ought not to separate without some remarks being made on the altered position in which this country stood with regard to her engagements in Europe. There were treaties older than 1815, by which we were bound, which might prove highly inconvenient to us if the novel doctrines recently laid down were to be maintained. The hon. and learned Gentleman, however, need not feel much anxiety as to what we should do about the Treaty of 1815, when older and more solemn engagements had within a very recent period been utterly disregarded and set at naught. Within a very few years the noble Lord at the head of the Government had referred to the Treaty of 1720, by which Great Britain guaranteed the possession of Denmark Proper and part of Schleswig as a binding engagement; and in 1848 he appealed to it, as giving England a right to interfere to prevent the invasion of Denmark by Prussia. In that House too he had admitted the obligations of that treaty, and our ambassador at Vienna had been instructed to make representations upon it. And yet, on the 11th of April of the present year, the Foreign Secretary said in the other House that the Government had not made up their minds whether we were bound by it or not; and up to the present time it had never been stated distinctly that we were freed from those obligations. By this time, however, they were pretty well forgotten. If the new doctrine that treaties were put an end to by one Power engaged by them being at war was to prevail, we should hear no more of them, and the Treaty of Vienna would probably not trouble us much more. The same might be said of other treaties, such as that of 1856, by which we guarantee the provinces of European Turkey to the Porte. Certainly the noble Lord had not given his assent openly to the new doctrines, but it had been stated without shame by the principal newspapers of the country, that if our commercial interests were not involved, treaties were to be treated as waste paper. Such a principle tended to weaken the influence of this country; and nothing could be more lowering to our self-respect and national pride than to have to watch one of the weakest of our Allies dying by inches with her back to the wall and her face to the enemy, and then to walk off without paying the slightest regard to our treaty obligations. He thanked the hon. and learned Gentleman for having brought the subject forward, but he did not think that our responsibilities under the Treaty of 1815 need give him the slightest uneasiness.

Viscount PALMERSTON: I am not going to follow my hon. and learned Friend in re-opening the subject of our recent discussions, and I can assure him that I am not going to stand up here as the champion of Prussia. My opinions as to the conduct of Prussia are pretty well known. But I cannot concur with him in thinking that because Prussia has made war on a country not belonging to the German Confederation, that on that account we are released from the engagements contained in the Treaty of Vienna, with regard to that portion of Saxony which was then allotted to Prussia. The two things have nothing whatever to do with each other. It was no part of the Treaty of Vienna, and no part of the guarantee which England—not alone, but with other Powers—gave, that Prussia should remain at peace for ever after that. The mere fact of Prussia having made war under such circumstances as those stated by my hon. Friend—objectionable as her conduct may be in every possible way—cannot release us from the treaty obligations which we contracted in 1815. It is quite true, as the hon. and learned Gentleman stated, that Austria and Prussia have started a principle of nationalities which, in its application, may become exceedingly inconvenient to themselves—more especially to

Austria; but that is not the question at present. All I rise to say is, I still maintain that the transactions which have recently taken place, as between Austria and Prussia on the one hand, and Denmark on the other, in no way release us from the obligations which we contracted, in common with other Powers, in guaranteeing to Prussia that portion of Saxony which has been referred to by the hon. and learned Gentleman.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 19 inclusive *agreed to.*

Clause 20,

MR. C. P. BERKELEY said, that the Vote referred to in this clause as "a sum of £18,355 for Civil Establishments on the Western Coast of Africa" included an item of £4,000 for the maintenance and repair of forts. Yet it appeared from official Reports that the forts at Cape Coast, Lagos, and other parts of the coast were in confusion and disorder, and in very bad repair. It was stated in a paper which he held in his hand, that if the Ashantees had marched on Lagos a few months ago they might have captured all the forts. As the £4,000 was not applied to the purpose for which it was voted, he begged to move the omission of the item.

MR. CARDWELL said, that the £4,000 was voted for "Forts and Establishments," and went in aid of the revenues of the colony, which amounted to only £7,000.

SIR HENRY WILLOUGHBY thought that £4,000 out of the £18,000 was specifically applicable to the forts.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE, speaking from an experience of several years in the Colonial Office, could assure the Committee that it never had been intended that the £4,000 should be applied to the repair of forts.

MR. COX observed, that in the Estimate on which the Vote had been moved, the £4,000 was stated to be for the "maintenance of Forts and Establishments."

MR. CARDWELL repeated that the Vote had not been taken for the repair of forts.

MR. DILLWYN thought it right that the opinion of the House should be tested as to whether these Votes were a farce or not.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE repeated that these Estimates were in the same form as they had been for several years past, and that this was in no sense a military Vote.

MR. COBDEN said, that this Vote was evidently intended to apply mainly to civil charges.

MR. WALPOLE said, he desired to speak on a point of Order. He had never witnessed the proposal of an Amendment to the Appropriation Bill, and he wished to know from the Chairman whether the Question could be put? When the House had granted £18,000 for a particular purpose, he wished to know whether it could be afterwards reduced to £14,000?

MR. COX said, that if the Resolution for the reduction of the Vote was carried, he apprehended that the hon. Gentleman would then move a clause appropriating the £14,000 according to the Vote.

THE CHAIRMAN said, this Bill was the last act of the House ratifying the Resolutions passed in Committee of Supply; and if it was the pleasure of the House, upon a revision of the Votes taken in Supply, to reduce any one of those Votes, he could not say that it would not be competent for the House to take that course.

MR. E. P. BOUVERIE said, the Under Secretary for the Colonies had shown that the appropriation clause was drawn conformably with the Estimate, and the hon. Gentleman could not, by the forms of the House, appropriate the £4,000 to any other purpose than that for which it had been voted by the Committee of Supply.

MR. AUGUSTUS SMITH trusted that the House would not relax its hold upon its privileges.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, if there had been any doubt as to the appropriation of the sum in Committee of Supply the objection would have been valid.

MR. C. P. BERKELEY, after the discussion which had taken place, would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read 3° *To-morrow* at Twelve of the clock.

NEW ZEALAND (GUARANTEE OF LOAN) BILL—[BILL 150.]—THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. WHALLEY thought, that if the Bill passed without further explanation, a very false and unfortunate impression would be produced in the colony. The statement of the Colonial Secretary as to the origin of the war in New Zealand had been perfectly satisfactory—namely, that it had originated not in the land question but owing to the massacre of British subjects; yet Member after Member had risen to declare that the war was discreditable to this country. Such declarations would be most distasteful to the colonists, and very discouraging to our soldiers and sailors who were serving in New Zealand. Now he begged to call upon the right hon. Gentleman to state whether he had not reasonable ground to believe that there were causes for this war which had never been openly dwelt upon, and whether the imputations on the colonists were wholly justifiable? He had seen it stated in a New Zealand paper, that wherever Sir George Grey went he traced the war to the machinations of the Roman Catholic priests. Instead of explicitly answering the question which had been addressed to him on this point, the Colonial Secretary met it by an evasion. A writer in a New Zealand newspaper stated that certain flags were captured from the rebels after an engagement, and every one of those flags had upon it a Roman Catholic cross. He looked upon it as a most remarkable circumstance, which ought to be inquired into. Two years ago the head of the Roman Catholics in New Zealand visited France, and took back with him twenty-five of the most advanced pupils of the Jesuit College. He wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he had any reason to believe that such impressions existed in the colony?

MR. HENNESSY said, he could corroborate the statement of the hon. Member that some ecclesiastical influence was at the bottom of these proceedings; for he found that a Bishop in writing to the Governor of New Zealand stated that the most likely way to insure peace was to show a better disposition towards the Natives, whom he described as treating the settlers well. That, however, was a Protestant Bishop. And the Rev. Leonard Williams, in a despatch to the Governor, said that the settlers did not want to see the British troops coming there, and that several of the settlers had gone to Auckland, leaving their wives and children in lonely, unprotected situations, relying with confidence on the character of the Native inhabitants. The writer, moreover, said there was no evidence of their having joined in any hostile scheme until the dread of invasion drove them into a hostile alliance with other chiefs, and it was only the desperation of their condition which kept them in arms against the British Government. He wished to know whether the rumour was authentic, that despatches had been recently received from New Zealand conveying the information that a proclamation of a most sanguinary character had been issued by the authorities, not only directed to the confiscation of the land of the Natives, but also to deprive them of anything like a fair trial when taken in war. This contrasted strongly with the words of a message which they sent to one of our officers on the 2nd of March last before an engagement, and in which they stated that wounded and captured men and all women and children would be spared. Now it happened that in an engagement in which the Native loss amounted to seventy killed and some wounded, there was a large number of women among the sufferers. This was, no doubt, owing to some accident, but it was a most unfortunate circumstance. In many of these battles the number of Natives, even when they were successful, was less than the British troops, and the British Generals bore testimony to the valour of the Natives. The hon. Gentleman near him had the other night described the war as unjust and cruel; and Lord Grey last Session spoke of it as being caused by the just discontent of the Maories. Some of the European population sold powder and shot to be used against the British troops. The British tax-payer was paying for a war in which no British interest was involved, but which seriously compromised the honour of this country. He moved as an Amendment that the Bill be read a third time this day three months.

SIR HENRY WILLOUGHBY seconded the Motion. Before the battle of Taranaki it appeared that a large quantity of stores and arms were supplied to the Natives, and he wished to know whether the Secretary for the Colonies could give any information on that subject? It was monstrous that any portion of the colonists should be engaged in such a proceeding.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day month."—(*Mr. Hennessy.*)

MR. CARDWELL said, he was convinced that there was no truth in the imputation that the colonists furnished their enemies in the field with munitions of war. A large portion of the Native population were friendly to the British people; some were hesitating between the two sides, and in only a limited portion of the Island a hostile feeling existed. In that great Island the hostile population could not be prevented by any vigilance on the part of the Government or the commanding officers from obtaining a supply of munitions of war; but it was absurd to suppose that the British population, all of whom in the province of Auckland were in arms for the protection of their homes, were engaged in furnishing materials for their own destruction. If he did not with the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley) attribute the origin of the rebellion to the Roman Catholic priests, neither did he, with the hon. Member for King's County (Mr. Hennessy), attribute it to the brethren of our blood who had settled in the colony. He would not take statements gathered from any accidental source, but he would take the words of the Governor of New Zealand. After describing the murderous outrage in which the war began, the Governor went on to say—

> "Just after these murders, plots were formed by the same people and their adherents in the Lower Waikato for an attack upon the settlement of Auckland. The Natives who formed these plots were all well armed, and had long been preparing themselves for such enterprises. They had drilled their men, dressed them in uniforms, and appointed them to different ranks. What would have been said of the Government which, having the then recent and lamentable example at New Plymouth before its eyes, had hesitated to provide for the safety of the Queen's subjects."

It was in that conspiracy that the war originated, and it was to put it down that we were then engaged in war. Reference had been made to the representations made by various persons on behalf of the Natives; but the object was not to justify the rebellion, but to obtain mercy and consideration for the Natives. Mr. Sewell, for instance, said—

> "The Manipotos, under their chief Rewi, a powerful and numerous tribe, are a lawless, turbulent set of men, living in a remote and difficult country, and ready to engage in any work of mischief."

Chief Justice Martin also said, we were stronger because we were avenging bloodshed, and that the conflict had not been desired or brought about by the Maori race, but by a turbulent minority belonging chiefly to one tribe. They brought no charge against the Maori race. They were dealing only with one set of rebels in one district of the colony. They were endeavouring to secure not only for the settlers but for the Maories the tranquil enjoyment of good order and prosperity. Such being the nature of the war, what had been Sir George Grey's policy? At that hour they would not desire him to quote despatches; and he would only say that Sir George Grey spoke of mercy being shown, whereever it was possible, after the war was concluded; and the instructions from the Home Government were based on the same principle. It was true mercy to bring this war to a speedy close; and when that had been accomplished, justice would be administered with mercy and consideration to the rebels, so as to restore tranquillity, and benefit both the British colonists and the great majority of the Maories. It was to further that view that the Bill had been introduced, and he hoped that at this stage the House would not withhold its approval. With regard to the question of the hon. Member for Peterborough, he could only say he was not aware of any statement of Sir George Grey's of the nature of that attributed to him by the hon. Member. There were some statements, however, in the despatches to which he deemed it desirable not to give any currency, as there was quite ill-feeling enough in the colony without adding to it.

MR. WARNER hoped the House would take an early opportunity of expressing an opinion against the pernicious practice of guaranteeing colonial loans. It was the colonists who reaped the whole of whatever benefits accrued from such wars as this, while all the burden fell on the mother country.

SIR WILLIAM FRASER said, that there never was an occurrence to which the term accidental could more justly be applied than to the deaths of the women which had been referred to. Due notice of the British attack was given; but the Native chiefs miscalculated their strength, and their resistance to our soldiers led to some shells being discharged which killed the women. He hoped the House would pass the Bill. As to the sale of weapons, the letter of the Natives distinctly asserted it.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question," The House *divided:*—Ayes 75; Noes 32: Majority 43.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read 3°; Verbal Amendment made. Bill *passed.*

FORTIFICATIONS (PROVISION FOR EXPENSES) BILL—[BILL 218.]

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, that he rose to make the explanation which he had promised when the House assented to the second reading. The Bill was the same as that of last year, with the exception of certain small changes in the schedule. The total estimated cost of the works remained unchanged, but it was arrived at in a somewhat different manner. For instance, in the "Sandown Bay defences," £10,000 more was put down this year, chiefly owing to engineering difficulties, arising from the nature of the ground at Fort Bembridge. There would also be an increased expenditure of £15,000 for the works at the Isle of Grain. There was a reduction in the estimates for the Hilsea Lines, in consequence of the manner in which it was now proposed that Portsdown Hill should be fortified. It was now proposed to abandon certain outworks, which would reduce the expenditure by about £20,000, and there would be a saving of £5,000 in the works at Picklecombe. It was not intended to enter into any new work which did not appear in the schedule, but he proposed to ask the House to vote £25,000 for works to the southward of Milford Haven, on the Pembroke station. The estimated cost of the works was £80,000, but no money had been actually asked for until the present year. At Spithead the contract was renewed last year, and the works had been recommenced. Great progress had been made with the Horse Sand Fort, and it was expected that the basement would be entirely completed and ready for the superstructure next summer. Upon No Man's Land the works were also advancing rapidly, although the basement would not be completed until the end of the year. The works at Spithead would be more expensive than was originally anticipated, as the special Commission appointed to consider the alterations requisite in the original plan for the defence of Spithead had recommended that works should be constructed on the Spitbank and on the Ryde Sand, about 1,200 yards to the southward of the Sturbridge Shoal. The works completed, or nearly so, were—on the Portsmouth station, the Needles, Warden Point, Puckpool, Eastney, and Lump's Batteries, Stokes Bay lines, Forts Grange, Rowner, and Brockhurst; on the Plymouth station, Drake's Island, Eastern King, Western King, Mount Edgecumbe, Whitesand Bay, and Cawsand Bay batteries, Devonport lines, and Fort Tregantle; on the Pembroke station, South Hook, Hubberstone, and Popton batteries; on the Portland station, a small battery on the Inner Pierhead; and on the Dover station, Dover Castle and the Western Heights. Considerable progress had also been made on other works at Portsmouth, Plymouth, Pembroke, Portland, Gravesend, the Medway and Sheerness, Dover, and Cork. Of all the works specified in the schedule only seven were not yet under contract.

SIR JOHN HAY asked, whether it was intended to fortify Pembroke after the Report of the Select Committee recommending the sale of that dockyard?

SIR MORTON PETO thought that before the site of the central arsenal was decided upon, the House ought to have an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon it.

Clause 1 *agreed to.*

Clause 2,

MR. C. P. BERKELEY complained of the lumping together of the items for the different ports.

SIR HENRY WILLOUGHBY inquired whether any calculation could be given of the number of men which would be required to hold all these fortifications. It was said that 40,000 men would be required for Portsmouth alone, and probably 250,000 for the whole of the proposed works.

LORD CLARENCE PAGET said, that the Resolution of the Committee recommending that Pembroke dockyard should be disposed of was carried by a majority of one only; and even assuming that hereafter that most magnificent dockyard was disposed of, which he trusted would not be the case for a long time, he sincerely hoped the House would not consent to leave one of the most magnificent harbours of the country undefended.

SIR MORTON PETO was surprised at the remarks of the noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty after the Report made by his own Committee. That Committee was at least entitled to have its recommendation respectfully considered, and he hoped the proposal as regarded Pembroke would not be pressed that night.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, it was not intended this year to ask the House to vote any money for the cite of the central arsenal, but it was fully intended to do so at a future time. There were at present as many works in hand as could be conveniently proceeded with at one time. With regard to Pembroke, he was quite unable to give any opinion as to the propriety of abandoning the dockyard there or not; but even if they did abandon it, it would be expedient to complete the works in progress there, for which the Vote asked this year was required.

SIR JOHN HAY thought that the explanation given by the noble Lord respecting Pembroke dockyard was most unsatisfactory. The noble Lord himself was Chairman of the Committee that decided against keeping up that dockyard, and the noble Lord himself suggested the reduction of its size. When the proper time arrived he (Sir John Hay) would certainly move the reduction of the Vote by £35,000, being the amount required for Pembroke dockyard.

LORD CLARENCE PAGET said, his report had referred only to the small dockyards, but he looked upon Pembroke as a most important one.

MR. E. P. BOUVERIE suggested that the reference to the central arsenal should be omitted from the clause.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, it was hardly necessary to strike out the words. The Act remained exactly the same as it had been. Hon. Members ought to accept the assurance of the Government on the subject. As to the estimated cost of the works at Spithead, he was informed that there was no doubt that the whole of the works could be executed for the original sum set down for the three works.

MR. ANGERSTEIN moved that the words which referred to the central arsenal should be omitted from the clause.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON said, he would consent to the omission of the words from the second clause, but not from the schedule, because the principle had been recommended by the different Committees who had considered the question. The Government had no intention this year to propose to purchase any land, nor could such a purchase be made without the sanction of that House.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause *agreed to,* as were the remaining clauses.

Schedule—

SIR JOHN HAY proposed to omit Pembroke. He could not consent to the Vote of £35,000 for works at that dockyard.

MR. SCOURFIELD said, the fortification of Pembroke was as important as any works upon the southern coast.

Amendment *negatived.*

Schedule *agreed to*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* at Twelve of the clock.

INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE BILL.
[BILL 213.]—CONSIDERATION.

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration."

MR. HENNESSY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Debate adjourned till *To-morrow* at Twelve of the clock.

SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CLERGY DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL—[BILL 161.]
THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. KINNAIRD moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Kinnaird.*)

The House *divided:*—Ayes 18; Noes 40: Majority 22.

Original Question again proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. WARNER moved the adjournment of the House.

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Warner.*)

MR. KINNAIRD * said, that the other night the hon. Member for the Elgin Burghs (Mr. Grant Duff) stated that the Church of Scotland did not object to the Bill, and quoted the authority of an eminent member of that Church, Dr. Lee. He (Mr. Kinnaird) would therefore, with the permission of the House, read some portions of a letter addressed by the rev. Doctor to himself. Dr. Lee wrote—

"I hold the same opinions (substantially) which you have so well expressed regarding the Scottish Episcopal Church Disabilities Bill. My friend Mr. Grant Duff, in alluding to my proceeding in this matter in the General Assembly, quite mistook my position and sentiments. My own opinion of this measure was never any secret. I have always regarded it as a violation of the Articles of Union, and as involving a virtual establishment of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, of which surely the Church of Scotland has reason and right to complain. This Bill reaches much further than its immediate and ostensible object, and it is not on account of its ostensible object that its concocters and promoters chiefly value it. They know well that it will serve for ulterior ends of far greater importance. I believe, however, that the Church of Scotland would hardly have succeeded, however early or strenuous her opposition had been; and the attempt on her part to raise opposition now would probably result only in injury to ourselves. The Bill seems to be on the eve of passing the Commons. I cannot help expressing my wonder that no Scotch Member except yourself has taken the ground which you have taken. In fact, neither the Church of Scotland nor Presbytery is in any sense represented in Parliament. Most of the Scotch Members appear to know very little more about Scotland than the English Members, and with few exceptions they regard such questions as this through the medium either of Episcopal feelings or of some form of Dissent. There can be no doubt that a large body of the most intelligent of our ministers hold the sentiments you have expressed, and generally speaking the ablest of them hold these sentiments most strongly."

Another leading minister of the same Church, referring to other real disabilities, which he hoped Parliament would consider another year, says—

"The Church of Scotland would no more think of re-ordaining an Episcopal than a Presbyterian minister. Let the law of the Church of England be rendered such as to permit her Bishops to recognize Presbyterian 'orders,' and one objection to the Bill will be removed. If the Bill pass in its present shape, the members of the Established Church of England will be allowed to acknowledge as ministers those ordained by a particular section of Scottish Dissenters, but not those ordained by the Established Church of Scotland. A more monstrous piece of intolerance it is impossible to imagine perpetrated in this country. . . . Nothing can be more unjust than the exclusion of Her Majesty's Scottish chaplains from the royal chapels of England, and there being no provision for the maintenance of Presbyterian worship in the British Court and Legislature when they happen to be in England. Constitutionally the Church of Scotland is on terms of exact equality with the Church of England, and if men are to hunt out disabilities, let them find one in the Scotch Members of the Legislature being summoned to England, without their being provided with such means of worship as are enjoyed by their Colleagues of the Episcopal persuasion. . . . Mr. Duff's account of what passed in the General Assembly was not correct. I am sorry I have not now a spare copy of the newspaper reports of the discussion, but both Dr. Robert Lee and I, though not agreeing in many things, expressed our opinion as opposed to that of the majority of the Committee, which was that the Assembly should not petition against the Bill.

P.S.—I find I have omitted another very serious Presbyterian grievance, which ought to be redressed. Chapels are built with Government money for army stations, and yet chaplains of the Established Church of Scotland holding Her Majesty's Commission are refused admission into them, with the troops under their charge, because these chapels have been consecrated."

Standing almost alone as he had done, he had been unable to stop this most mischievous and cunningly devised Bill; but he would fain hope that its originators had unwittingly awakened a slumbering feeling, which would not be hushed again till real disabilities were removed, and the Protestant Church of England was rescued from the would-be grasp of men who see a sister, though a corrupt one, in the Church of Rome, but a great schism in the National Church of Scotland.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. WHALLEY moved that the Bill be read a third time this day month.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day month."—(*Mr. Whalley.*)

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 34; Noes 10: Majority 24.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read 3°, and *passed,* with an Amendment.

The Order of the Day for the Third Reading of the Bill having been read about three o'clock in the morning, the discussion which followed was not reported.

Sir W. HEATHCOTE, The ATTORNEY GENERAL, Mr. GRANT DUFF, Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE supported the Bill. Mr. KINNAIRD, Mr. WARNER, Mr. NEWDEGATE, Mr. WHALLEY, spoke against the measure.

MASTERS AND SERVANTS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Cobbett, Bill to alter and amend the Law relating to contracts of service between Master and Servant, *ordered* * to be brought in by Mr. Cobbett and Mr. Cox.

Bill *presented*, and read 1°. [Bill 232.]

House adjourned at half past Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, July 22, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—*Report*—Highways Act Amendment * (No. 227); Railway Companies Powers * (No. 229); Thames Conservancy * (No. 226).

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension * (No. 231); Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues * (No. 232); Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan)* (No. 233); Contagious Diseases * (No. 234); Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)* (No. 235); Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* (No. 236); Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* (No. 237); Corn Accounts and Returns * (No. 238); Poor Removal * (No. 239); Westminster Bridge Traffic * (No. 240); Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment * (No. 241).

Second Reading—Harwich Harbour Act Amendment * (No. 210); Bank Notes, &c. Signature* (No. 217); Bleaching and Dyeing Works Act Extension * (No. 213); Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000)* (No. 224).

Committee—Railways Construction Facilities * (No. 222); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* (No. 214); Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* (No. 218); Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. (No. 219); Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex)* (No. 220); Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal * (No. 212); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements * (No. 211).

Report—Highways Act Amendment * (No. 207); Railway Companies Powers * (No. 121) Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* (No. 214) Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* (No. 218); Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. (No. 219) Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex)* (No. 220); Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal * (No. 212); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements * (No. 211).

Third Reading—Accidents Compensation Act Amendment * (No. 158); Burials Registration * (No. 144); College of Physicians * (No. 114); Inclosure (No. 2)* (No. 177); Trespass (Ireland)* (No. 202); Militia Pay *; Sale of Gas (Scotland)* (No. 152); Naval Discipline * (No. 205) [h.l.]; Local Government Act (1858) Amendment * (No. 190).

MIDDLE CLASS SCHOOLS.

PETITIONS.

Lord BROUGHAM *presented* Petitions from Birmingham and other places for the Employment of Certificated Teachers in Middle Class Schools. He had had the honour of introducing to his noble Friend the First Lord of the Treasury a deputation which urged upon him the prayer of the Petitioners, that the Government should apply its attention to the important subject of the education of the middle classes. There was no wish on the part of these persons to interfere with the middle class schools now existing. On the contrary, the Petitioners desired that those schools should be left entirely to themselves; but they were satisfied that if a system of supervision by Inspectors, who should have power to give certificates of character and ability, were established, there was scarcely one school in a hundred that would not voluntarily come under supervision for the very purpose of sharing in the great benefits which a certificate from the Inspectors would confer. The working classes in this country might be reckoned at 15,000,000; for the education of the children of those classes ample means were provided, and due inspection precluded objectionable and incompetent persons from teaching in their schools, and Parliament had voted not less than £5,000,000 for the education of the humbler classes. But for the education of the middle classes no provision whatever was made, no system of inspection was provided, nor any means taken to secure that the education given should be good. It was, however, estimated that the sums expended by the parents of the middle classes in schools for the education of their children amounted to not less than £4,000,000 yearly. The consequence of this entire want of supervision was that the quality of the education given at these schools was greatly complained of. The subject was one of great importance and deserved the gravest consideration on the part of the Government; and he (Lord Brougham) thought that a Commission to inquire into the subject might render great service.

Earl GRANVILLE said, he entirely concurred in the importance of the subject which his noble and learned Friend had brought under the notice of their Lordships. During the last few years great improvements had, no doubt, been made in the system of education in the schools supported by the State, and it was equally true that those improvements had been practically ignored by the middle class schools. But it was impossible that the education of the middle classes could be undertaken by the Government, both on account of the large amount of patronage which it would place in their hands, and the expenditure of public money upon those who could themselves afford to pay for the education of their children. A machinery of competitive examination had been devised by the Universities, which would be, he thought, of the greatest possible use in causing emulation among the larger middle class schools. He thought that a system of inspection for middle class schools might also be established, and that any school willing to place itself under inspection might claim an examination of its pupils by duly qualified Inspectors. There would be no objection on the part of such schools, he thought, to pay a small sum towards inspection, so as to make the system either wholly or in great part self-supporting.

REVIVAL OF THE HOLY ALLIANCE.

OBSERVATIONS.

VISCOUNT STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE rose to draw attention to the prevailing rumours concerning a supposed revival of the so-called Holy Alliance, and to inquire whether Her Majesty's Ministers have any information thereon which may be communicated to Parliament without prejudice to the public service; and said—My Lords, I rise to address your Lordships in pursuance of the notice which I placed on your Lordships' table some time ago. It was my intention to have brought forward the subject at an earlier period, but circumstances, independent of myself, have caused me to defer it until the present time. I need not tell your Lordships that the subject of my notice is of the greatest delicacy and importance. It may be said that the question which I ask your Lordships to consider is one merely arising from newspaper reports; but I think it may be shown that appearances are such that there is a reality which is well worthy of your Lordships' attention. It is now, my Lords, almost half a century since the Holy Alliance was first formed; but even now, at this distance of time, the impression that it made on the world is fresh in our recollection. It was thought a strange thing that three despotic Powers should have joined together in an alliance for purposes of personal understanding at a moment when so many of the States of Europe were engaged in settling the great questions which had been disturbed by the wars of revolutionary France. It was thought ominous that Powers of their immense extent and immense resources should have taken upon themselves to overlook the claims of other Powers, and that they should have embarked in a separate negotiation—and that, too, on principles which naturally created jealousy, distrust, and alarm throughout the greater part of Europe. The Treaties of Vienna and Paris that had been recently concluded had had for their object to compose existing differences, and to settle the affairs of Europe upon a permanent basis of justice and stability. Those great Powers were the principal agents in these negotiations; yet scarcely were the treaties put into action than it was found that those Powers were taking a separate position, and well-founded alarm was felt at the character of the engagements which they had contracted. It is very true that plausible explanations were given, and it is but fair to do justice to whatever may have been the good intentions of the Powers that founded that alliance. No doubt there were many people who thought that not much harm could result from that combination; but those who looked below the surface were well convinced that these engagements, whatever might be the intentions of the Powers who contracted them, were sure to degenerate into operations subversive of the liberty of Europe and dangerous to the independence of the weaker States. I must say, my Lords, while doing justice to those great Sovereigns who at that time rendered such eminent services to Europe, that they would have better consulted their own glory, and, perhaps, their own quiet, if they had been content to remain in concord with the other Powers without entering into any separate and more intimate coalition among themselves. The personal recollections of many of your Lordships go back to this period, and you may remember that the attention of Parliament was early called to this subject, and that, notwithstanding the votes of courtesy which accompanied its action, it substantially did its duty in the persons of many of its Members, who directed the public attention to the dangers and probable consequences of the so-called Holy Alliance, and raised their voices against it. I may appeal for confirmation to a noble and learned Friend of mine who took a prominent part in all the condemnations of that hour, and whom it is a great satisfaction to me still to see in your Lordships' House. I may call upon him to carry back his recollection to those times, and I shall be gratified to hear upon this occasion the well-known tones of his voice, which has been so often raised in the service of humanity, and which is always listened to both here and elsewhere with attention and respect. Courtesy prevented the Government of that day from expressing its opinion upon the course pursued by friendly Governments, but it declined to join the Alliance, and, seconded by the general feeling of the country, did what depended upon it to throw discredit upon it. The Alliance fell gradually into a state of abeyance; but that circumstance did not prevent it from showing, as occasions offered in subsequent years, what was its true character. Above all, upon the occasion which was referred to by my noble Friend opposite (Earl Russell) the other night, your Lordships will remember that in 1823, when Spain was struggling for its liberties, a French army—the army of the Restoration—commanded by the Duc d'Angoulême, and hounded on, I may say, by these potentates, disregarded the protests of this country (protests which proceeded from every party in the country) and succeeded in overpowering the efforts of the Spanish people for freedom, and placed King Ferdinand on an irresponsible throne. These things cannot be forgotten; and, therefore, when we witness circumstances which lead us to apprehend that there is danger of the revival of such an Alliance, we naturally take an interest in the matter, which, I believe, will not be confined to a few individuals in this House, but when the subject is understood, will, no doubt, be shared by the public at large. It may be said that this apprehension of a revival of the Alliance rests in the first instance on rumours which may have been of an evanescent kind, which passed from mouth to mouth, but may have had no solid foundation in fact. But circumstances have followed, which give importance to these rumours, which, I think, may fairly be brought forward, and which, in their combination, will show that there is, at least a plausible, though possibly not a clear and solid foundation for the apprehension of the revival of that Alliance. The newspapers have published statements echoing the public apprehension on this subject. I may be told that newspaper reports are little better than public rumours; but that I can hardly admit at a time when the public journals are conducted with so much skill and attention to facts, and when persons are employed by them abroad, who would do credit to the service of any Government—gentlemen of education, gentlemen who are not only capable of reporting what passes before their eyes, but of obtaining the greatest distinction by the exercise of their powers. The statements to which I refer must be fresh in the recollection of your Lordships, and although I have them at hand, so recent are their dates that it is perhaps hardly necessary that I should refer to them in a more particular manner. We all remember the circumstances which attended the mission of Baron Manteuffel from St. Petersburg to Vienna, and what remarkable occurrences followed upon that event. Scarcely was it known that he had succeeded in the object of his mission when it was perceived that the war in Denmark was taking a more aggressive character, the troops of Russia on a large scale were put in motion, and Austria, notwithstanding the line which she took last year, placed Gallicia and Cracow in a state of siege. When all these circumstances are put together and joined with others which were known at the time, hardly a doubt can remain that the communications which passed between the three Sovereigns at that period were of a nature which went far beyond the ostensible object of the mission. The conclusions which we must draw are of a nature to arouse apprehensions, and to justify the adoption of a serious view of this most important subject. There are also other circumstances which come in aid of these. I would allude particularly, with all due reserve, to that correspondence which has occasioned some communications in this House, and the authority of which has been on the part of one or two of the Powers concerned seriously denied. There are, however, parts of that correspondence, which is well known to your Lordships, to which, as far as I am aware, no formal refutation has been given. There are circumstances which give a great probability of authenticity to that correspondence, to which I will call the attention of my noble Friend the Foreign Secretary and the House. It is stated in a despatch, alleged to be from Prince Gortschakoff, that a certain line was taken, or was to be taken, with regard to operations in

Denmark; and the same thing is referred to in another despatch of a private character, in which it is mentioned that Her Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg was apprised by Prince Gortschakoff of that communication to the Prussian Government. Now, it would be the duty of Her Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg to communicate what passed on that occasion to his Government; and I would ask the noble Earl opposite whether, in his official correspondence with the Ambassador, there is any trace of such a communication having been made. There is also a reference in another despatch to a conversation between the Austrian Ambassador and the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. If that is true it may be a question whether, although the whole correspondence may not be accurately given, it may not be in substance correct, and well worthy of attention. There are other circumstances which confirm the belief, that although the whole of the published despatches may not be authentic, in substance the correspondence may be correct. The well-known policy of the three Sovereigns, the interests they have at stake, the spirit which pervades their conduct, all give an *à priori* notion of its credibility and a strong presumption of its substantial truth. Now, my Lords, if it should happen that that which rested on rumour in the first instance and on the occurrence of particular circumstances in the second place—not to mention the meeting of the Sovereigns, who might have done all that they thought fit by means of secret negotiation being accompanied by their confidential advisers—should turn out to be substantially correct, it is not, I think, going too far to say that we find ourselves in the presence of a great danger. What, I would ask, are those Powers to whom the intentions to which I have referred are ascribed? Your Lordships are aware of their resources, of the extent of their population, of the military force which they possess, and of the position which they occupy in Europe. They are strong in all those elements which give strength, particularly strength of an aggressive character. Suppose, then, danger to exist in the manner which I have represented, I can hardly suppose it to be greater than as it exists arising out of such a combination; nor is this danger confined to the power which may be wielded by those great Sovereigns. Neither is it confined to the community of interest by which they may be actuated. It extends to other points which cannot be overlooked. There is a provocative to popular reaction on the Continent of a very dangerous character. I would ask your Lordships whether the state of Europe and of the world at the present time is such that we can view the principles maintained by those great Sovereigns without a feeling of great apprehension for European society? If all the instruments of armed power were brought into play for the purpose of keeping down those who would naturally wish to vindicate their claim to better treatment, can that, I would ask, be done without stirring up a strong feeling of reaction throughout the world? This is a state of things which it has been the main object of our statesmen to avoid; yet we now see, day after day, despotism advancing on the one side and democracy on the other; despotism armed to carry its views into effect in the most oppressive manner, and democracy fostering a spirit which may rise into aggression. This Alliance may have the effect of bringing both these forces into action—for the extension of the aggressive power on the part of the Sovereigns would inevitably stir up a strong spirit of resistance over Europe. This very morning, when bearing in mind that I would have to address your Lordships this evening, I saw a manifesto of the revolutionary party in Italy calling on their fellow-subjects to prepare for some attempt, the nature of which was only indicated by the name of Mazzini. Surely I do not err when I say that we should be likely to find no place for our interests in either extreme. We in this country fortunately enjoy a constitutional form of government, to which we are attached. We have a throne, a free Legislature, and the means of preserving those privileges which we hold so dear. If the principles which are well known to belong to the Governments of which I have spoken should come into operation, or if, on the other hand, the popular reaction to which I have referred should take place, where shall we find an intermediate course to check the dangers on both sides? I know of no other except that which is to be found in war or in preparatory negotiation. So far as negotiation is concerned, I am not aware that we have anything to replace those earlier alliances of the last century, which gave us support on many pressing occasions; and it becomes a question whether the public obligations of our position are sufficient to demand that we should risk the hazard of war. I trust that if I need any justification in the eyes of your Lordships the apprehension of an alliance which would bring together certain Powers in a spirit dangerous to the world will justify me in laying the question before you, and in extending the scope of my observations to subjects which are connected with it, although they may not appear to have any direct bearing upon it. Considering the dangers to which I have alluded, it would be most satisfactory if we could see some system of foreign policy adopted in a direction favourable to the recovery of that position towards the other Powers which appears of late to have been considerably weakened — a position in which we might count on the support of other Powers, and above all on the support of that powerful neighbour so near to us in position, and brought so close to us by the sympathies of a generous competition. It would be a great satisfaction to know that Her Majesty's Government are not neglectful of the duty of keeping up a friendly understanding with the illustrious Sovereign of that country—a man who has deserved well of us on many occasions, and who has earned his position in Europe by the exercise of remarkable abilities—abilities so great as to throw into the shade those matters which in former times were justly considered to deserve censure. I should be glad if the principle of a friendly understanding with that great Power were reverted to, and also if the tendency of our foreign policy were such as to rely not merely on the effects of our wide-spread commerce to bring us nearer to those from whom we have lately been estranged. We are told that the interests of commerce may be relied on to bring together all countries, and to relieve us from all anxiety for the preservation of peace. My Lords, I cannot place my entire reliance on that doctrine. I say, on the contrary, that in proportion as our commerce increases we are exposed to greater risks of collision. We have ships in every port, and interests in every sea, and on one point or another we are constantly coming into contact with other Powers. Scarcely a month passes without something happening which may bring us into the danger of a difference with some other country. The state of our relations with more than one Foreign Power at the present moment justifies me in saying that. Therefore, although our extensive commerce is the source of great national prosperity, yet I recognize also in it a constant source of danger from collision with the interests of other countries. We always find ourselves under the necessity of being prepared to defend our fellow-subjects, and to defend our interests against the jealousies on the one side, and encroachments on the other, which may always be expected from the strife of human passions, and which we cannot hope to escape. We may wrap ourselves up in the intention of being just towards others, and of giving up what there was of encroachment in our ancient system; but we have to consider the disposition of other nations, and we have to consider what we are exposed to by our constantly coming into contact with nations of every kind, and interests of every description. I can see no means of making head against contingencies of this kind, except by maintaining our military defences, and by keeping our alliances in such a position that we may have something to rely upon on the day of trial. We are told that interference in foreign affairs is sure to bring us into the danger of collision with other countries. My Lords, this is altogether a matter of judgment. There are cases when a timely and wise interference is the best security against war, and the best preservative of the peace of Europe. It is entirely a matter of discretion and judgment with respect to the time and the manner of applying the principle of interference. We can no more dogmatize or indulge in general abstract professions of opinion on the principle of interference than on the question of peace or war. Of late we have heard opinions expressed which would make it appear that we are drifting into an attitude where the interests of our commerce are to supersede all other considerations. I have learned in my life that those who profess themselves most pacific are often most exposed to attack. If we wish to be safe and to escape that which has been the almost proverbial fate of all commercial countries, we must preserve that high spirit of nationality and that nobility of heart which tells us that our best interests are not based on mere sordid calculations of profit and loss. I am afraid that I have trespassed too long upon your Lordships' attention, and though I am conscious that I have not done it full justice, yet the importance of the question is such that it may be left with perfect safety to your Lordships' reflection. The noble Viscount concluded by asking, Whether Her Majesty's Ministers have any information with regard to the prevailing rumours concerning a supposed revival of the so-called Holy Alliance which may be communicated to Parliament without prejudice to the public service?

EARL RUSSELL: My Lords, the remarks made on this subject by my noble Friend are of very grave importance, coming as they do from one of his talents and high authority. My noble Friend cannot but be sensible that in calling the attention of your Lordships to this subject, and addressing you at considerable length with regard to the apprehensions which he appears to entertain, he must give force to similar apprehensions in the minds of others, and help to spread the alarm which he himself feels. Therefore, my noble Friend must excuse me, and I hope your Lordships will excuse me, if I enter somewhat fully into the subject on which he has spoken. This question of my noble Friend is, in fact, three questions. The first is as to the genuineness of the documents which have lately appeared in the public papers; the next is as to whether there is anything like a revival of the Holy Alliance; and the third is as to the amount of apprehension which we ought to feel, supposing the existence of such an Alliance to be a matter of fact. Now, my Lords, with regard to the first of these questions, I cannot say that I myself have any belief in the genuineness of the documents which have been published. My noble Friend has alluded particularly to two of those documents. There certainly is a despatch addressed by Prince Gortschakoff to the diplomatic representative of Russia at Berlin. That despatch was read by Prince Gortschakoff to Lord Napier; and the substance of it was afterwards communicated to me by the Russian Minister at the Court of St. James's. In looking over the accounts which Lord Napier gave me of that document, and comparing it with what has appeared in *The Morning Post*, I see but a very distant resemblance between the two; and my memory of what was read to me by the Russian Minister leads me to the same conclusion. It appears to me that any one conversant with the politics of Europe —either through the Courts, or by commerce—might have obtained such an idea of what was going on as would have enabled him, without seeing the original, to fabricate a despatch as closely resembling the genuine one. Another of the published despatches seems to have been fabricated for the purpose of making the English Government believe that the course of the Russian Government was one of fraud and duplicity. It appears that that despatch is altogether false. It is stated to be so, and I entirely believe the statement. The other document is one giving an account of a conversation between the Count Apponyi and Mr. Layard, the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Such a conversation did take place, and there is some resemblance, though not a close one, between the real conversation and the reported one, as far as the topics are concerned, but it is in some respects singularly erroneous—particularly in regard to dates. There are various circumstances which give an air of improbability to the genuineness of those documents. One of these circumstances is that the Foreign Minister of Prussia is supposed in this correspondence to have written to one of the representatives of that country, and in his despatch to have referred to a difference of feeling as between the King and himself. Now, that is highly improbable. There is another part of the correspondence which represents Austria, Prussia, and Russia as having come to an agreement that they would consider all questions relating to Poland as referring to internal policy, and therefore to a subject on which they ought not to be called on to render an account to any other Power. Now, such a proceeding on the part of the Sovereigns of those three countries would have been an unnecessary one; for if they had arrived at the conclusion that they would not fulfil their treaty obligations, they might have violated them without making that formal declaration. The next question is, supposing those documents not to be genuine, are there circumstances which give a certain support to the belief of some action of the kind having taken place, and a union having been formed between the three Powers? Well, there have been transactions within the past month which it is not very difficult to account for, and which do give a certain semblance of truth to the substance of those documents. For instance, it is well known that in Austria, Russia, and Prussia there is very extreme apprehension that those Powers are constantly expressing their desire that all the European Sovereigns should unite in order to resist revolutionary movements. But I believe that for the language represented by those documents to have been used on that subject, there is not more than that general foundation which might easily be obtained by commercial men who, for their own interest, are anxious to obtain the most recent accounts of what is doing in Europe, and may affect prices in the various markets. I am told that those documents were derived from commercial men. I now come to another question, which appears to be the gravest of those upon which my noble Friend touched——namely, what is this Holy Alliance, and what are the apprehensions which we should entertain if it were established? Looking back—but putting aside the "Holy Brotherhood" of 1815, which was rather a form of expression used by the Emperor Alexander of Russia, when expressing his anxiety for united action between Sovereigns—putting that aside as of no practical account, we know that in 1820 there was an agreement which has been popularly described as "the Holy Alliance." About December, 1820, an agreement was entered into between Austria, Russia, and Prussia. I shall read an extract from a circular issued to the Austrian, Prussian, and Russian Ministers at Foreign Courts, and dated Laybach, May 21, 1821, in order to show what the purpose of that Alliance was, and in order that we may be able to form an opinion as to whether it is likely such an agreement should be come to at the present time. The circular states —

> "Useful or necessary changes in legislation, and in the administration of States, ought only to emanate from the free will and the intelligent and well-weighed conviction of those whom God has rendered responsible for power. All that deviates from this line necessarily leads to disorder, commotions, and evils far more insufferable than those which they pretend to remedy. Penetrated with this eternal truth, the sovereigns have not hesitated to proclaim it with frankness and vigour; they have declared that, in respecting the rights and independence of all legitimate power, they regarded as legally null, and as disavowed by the principles which constitute the public right of Europe, all pretended reform operated by revolt and open hostility. They have acted conformably to this declaration, in the events which have taken place at Naples, in those of Piedmont, and in those even which, under very different circumstances, though produced by combinations equally criminal, have recently made the eastern part of Europe a prey to incalculable convulsions."

My Lords, when that circular was issued it became a very serious question for the Government of this country what part they should take with respect to a combination so formidable, and founded on such principles. The consequences of such a policy could not escape a man of the sagacity of Lord Castlereagh, and on the 19th of June, 1821, he wrote a circular on the subject. That circular was as follows:—

> "These measures embrace two distinct objects—first, the establishment of certain general principles for the regulation of the future political conduct of the Allies in the cases therein described. . . . . The system of measures proposed under the former head, if to be reciprocally acted upon, would be in direct repugnance to the fundamental laws of this country. But, even if this decisive objection did not exist, the British Government would nevertheless regard the principles on which these measures rest to be such as could not safely be admitted as a system of international law. They do not regard the Alliance as entitled, under existing treaties, to assume in their character as Allies any such general powers, nor do they conceive that such extraordinary powers could be assumed, in virtue of any fresh diplomatic transaction among the Allied Courts, without their either attributing to themselves a supremacy incompatible with the rights of other States, or, if to be acquired through the special accession of such States, without introducing a federative system in Europe, not only unwieldy and ineffectual to its object, but leading to many most serious inconveniences."

When Parliament met, this circular was laid before it, and it excited, as might be expected, great discussion. Lord Lansdowne brought the subject before this House, the noble Lord whom I see opposite (the Earl of Ellenborough) protested against the conduct of the Allies, and Lord Liverpool spoke strongly to the same effect. There was also a debate in the House of Commons, at the instance of Sir James Mackintosh, in which similar sentiments were expressed. But in spite of the protests of the representatives of England the plans of the Holy Alliance were carried into effect. A large Austrian army was marched to Naples, the existing Government was overthrown, and 40,000 Austrian troops put an end to all hopes of the revival of any popular spirit. The English Government, therefore, had no influence in regard to the practical measures adopted by the Allies. In 1823 another Congress met at Verona, and it was then considered that the revolution which had taken place in Spain and the constitution there established called for interference, and should be the subject of another armed intervention by the Holy Alliance. Upon that occasion my noble and learned Friend whom I see opposite (Lord Brougham) delivered a speech of such eloquence that there is not a greater to be found in the records of ancient or modern times. The feelings which my noble and learned Friend expressed were those which prevailed throughout the country. Lord Castlereagh said that this system was repugnant to the fundamental principles of British law; and Mr. Canning, who was Foreign Minister at that period, said that the system struck at the root of the British Constitution. There could be no doubt whatever, therefore, of the feelings which prevailed in this country on the part both of the Government and the Opposition. But there, again, the influence of England failed in producing any practical effect. An army of France was marched to Madrid, and afterwards to Cadiz, the Revolutionary Government was overthrown, and Ferdinand VII. was restored to absolute power. It might have been asked then, what was the use of those despatches of Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning? They might as well not have been written, for any practical effect which they produced. But, my Lords, my belief is that the assertion of sound principles—of the principles of freedom and justice—by a British Minister on the part of his Government, and their assertion also in the Parliament of this country, are by no means without effect. Although at any particular moment it may not be advisable to enforce those principles and sentiments by arms, yet, if they are just and sound, they will have their effect, and will finally pervade the general policy of Europe. Having adverted to what occurred on those occasions, let us now see what happened not a great many years after. In 1823 a French army was marched into Spain, where it remained for some time, and overthrew the Revolutionary Government. But in 1830 France herself was disturbed by revolution, the reigning dynasty was overthrown, and a Government founded on revolt was established. What then did the Holy Allies? Did they say that a Government founded on revolt was null and void? Did they attempt to suppress it as they had suppressed the Governments of Naples and Spain? No, they found the effort would be too great—that the power of the revolution was too strong for them to cope with. They did not acknowledge the new dynasty, which the Duke of Wellington, to his honour, acknowledged almost the next day after its creation. But, though they did not acknowledge, they did not attempt to overthrow it. And with respect to the changes which took place eighteen years afterwards, when a Republic was proclaimed in France, and a few years after that Republic was changed into an Empire, those Allies, who had declared that nothing was legal but what emanated from Sovereigns, that every other political change was null and void, and force must be used to suppress it, those Allies were powerless when the greatest country in Europe was in the throes of revolution, and when the people said they would have a Government according to their own views, and not according to the views of Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Well then, my Lords, I do conceive that, although the Government of England did not go to war, it by no means followed that those principles of the Holy Alliance were everywhere established, or that they had that success which their authors expected. On the contrary, from 1830 an alliance was formed between England, France, Spain, and Portugal in support of the dynasty established and favoured by the people. After 1848 other changes took place. Your Lordships will recollect that only a few years ago, when the French army had entered Italy, the Emperor of Austria gave up Lombardy, which was ceded to the King of Sardinia, who is now King of Italy, and that the Power which had attempted to interfere in Naples, in Tuscany, and in the Pope's territories, was obliged to retire into Venetia. Then, at all events, was given a great blow to the principles of the Holy Alliance. But it did not stop there, because, after the Treaty of Villafranca and the Treaty of Zurich, a question arose whether or not Tuscany and Naples should have a Government according to their own wishes—whether the existing dynasties should be maintained or destroyed? That question arose at the time when I first had the honour of holding the seals of the Foreign Office, and I had occasion to discuss with the Austrian Government the preliminaries of the Peace of Villafranca. Those preliminaries stated in general terms that the Grand Duke of Tuscany and the Duke of Modena should return to their States. Two different senses might be attributed to this article—either that any resistance on the part of the population of those States might be overcome by force, or that the Sovereigns should return only with the consent of the people. In writing to Mr. Fane, August 16, 1859, I said—

"I propose to discuss these two interpretations. With regard to the general question of interference in the internal affairs of other countries, Her Majesty's Government hold that non-intervention is the principle on which the Governments of Europe should act, only to be departed from when the safety of a foreign State, or its paramount interests, require it. But in the present instance they maintain that neither the interests of Italy, nor the interests of Europe, nor the real interests of Austria or France, require foreign interference in the internal affairs of Italy. The Treaty of Villafranca, as I have said, makes no provision for imposing a Government by force upon Tuscany or Modena, supposing the people of those Duchies to oppose the return of the Grand Duke of Tuscany and the Duke of Modena. A provision for the employment of French or Austrian forces, to put down the clearly-expressed will of the people in Central Italy would, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, not be justifiable. The people of Tuscany, for instance, have the right, which belongs to the people of every independent State, to regulate their own internal government. To interfere by force with the exercise of that right would not be defensible on any principle of public law. Neither the safety nor the paramount interests of Austria are menaced by the choice of a new dynasty to reign over Tuscany. On the contrary, the restoration of the Grand Duke of Tuscany or the Duke of Modena by foreign forces would be to return to that system of foreign interference which for upwards of forty years has been the misfortune of Italy and the danger of Europe. It may be added that for the last ten years the same system has been a cause of weakness and peril to Austria. It has afforded vantage-ground to her enemies, and has alienated her friends. Great Britain would, therefore, feel it to be her duty to protest against a supplement to the Treaty of Villafranca of that nature, if any such were in contemplation. She would equally protest against the practical application of foreign force to carry into effect the vague article of the preliminaries of Villafranca."

Well, then, in the former instance we have seen that in 1821, notwithstanding the protest of Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning, an Austrian army marched to Naples, Turin, and Tuscany; but in this instance the French Government, which before had connived at the act of the Austrian Government, not only held aloof, but it was generally understood that the French Emperor would oppose any attempt to restore the Dukes to their territories by force. In like manner, when a small force of a thousand men made a revolution in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, the plan of the Holy Alliance entirely failed, and the Austrian Government did not venture to interfere. Your Lordships will, therefore, see that there is no great reason for the apprehension that my noble Friend (Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe) has expressed, since the Holy Alliance of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, which was able to carry out its objects in 1821 and 1823, was not able to carry out its objects in 1859 and 1860 against the simple protest of this country. So far as Italy is concerned, an united Italy has been established by the people of that country, and the Holy Alliance has entirely failed to prevent it. Well, in regard to Spain, it has been much the same. In 1823 Spain was overrun by French forces, but the people of Spain now have the full power of making their constitution just as they please, and of regulating their internal affairs according to their own views. Therefore, it has happened by the great change of circumstances and events, that the influence which the Government of this country did not possess in 1821 and 1823 for the last five years they have fully possessed, and the people of different countries have established Governments according to their own notions of what is necessary for their own interests. The extract I have read referred to the affairs of Greece. One of the Allies—the Emperor of Russia—protested formerly in the most peremptory manner against the revolution established by the people against the Sovereign; but a year or two ago, when the revolt took place in Greece, the Sovereign reigning there by the choice of the protecting Powers was overthrown, a new Sovereign was called to the throne, and the Emperor of Russia and the Holy Alliance consented to acknowledge—and not only to acknowledge, but to guarantee—the throne of the new Sovereign. I hold, therefore, for all these reasons, that whatever the Holy Alliance may have been, its revival at this time need not give cause for apprehension. I cannot believe that those sovereigns, seeing the change of times, have any wish to do more than protect their own dominions and secure themselves against democratic innovations that may seek to overturn them. My noble Friend who began the debate spoke of despotism, and, unfortunately, all those Sovereigns who rule over despotic countries confound constitutional government with democracy. The party of reaction in Italy confound constitutional monarchy with despotic sway. But the influence of the English Government has always been used in favour of constitutional monarchy whenever the people of a country thought that the best form of Government for themselves. And now, my Lords, where is the danger that we have to fear from these alliances at the present moment? If we look to the South of Europe—to Italy and Spain—we find that the Powers which formed the Holy Alliance have given up every attempt to carry into effect those principles against which Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning protested, and there is, therefore, no danger either in Italy or Spain of the principles of the Holy Alliance being restored. Where, then, is the danger? The only country in which any question of the kind can now arise is in regard to the Duchies of Denmark. It is now said that an attempt will be made—and possibly it may be so—to dispose of the sovereignty of those Duchies according to the views of the Diet of Frankfort, should the King of Denmark consent to give up those Duchies to Austria and Prussia. I confess that that appears to me to be a question for Germany rather than for us to consider. If the King of Denmark should give up the sovereignty of those Duchies—and it is now said on good authority that the Duchies of Lauenburg, Schleswig, and Holstein are demanded by Austria and Prussia as the price of peace—supposing those Duchies are given up to the control of Austria and Prussia, it is for those Powers to settle with the people of Germany, and for the people of Holstein and Schleswig to say whom they will consent to obey. With respect to the part taken by ourselves in the late Conference, we showed what our principles were. We and the Government of France both said that these Duchies, if they were given up by Denmark, ought not to be disposed of without the consent of the people of the Duchies. The King of Denmark said exactly the same thing. The Swedish representatives were of the same opinion. At all events, we declared the views which we held. Our principle is a principle in which we concurred with the Emperor of the French, and on which we did not concur with Austria or Prussia. Now, my Lords, the consequence of this great difference of opinion with the latter Powers is, that we should draw nearer to France and be less connected with those Powers which declare that the sovereignty ought to be separate from the wish of the people. My noble Friend who has just spoken said it was our interest to be closely connected with France. It so happens that a question lately arose of great importance and delicacy—namely, what was to be done with regard to the Danubian Principalities? Her Majesty's Ambassador and the French Ambassador at Constantinople entirely concurred in the settlement of this question. The Grand Vizier and other Ministers of the Porte agreed upon a plan which was approved by the Conference, and thus a question that at one time threatened to disturb the tranquillity of Turkey, if not the peace of Europe, was amicably settled by wise and judicious negotiations. I cannot help remarking how much Her Majesty's Government, in co-operation with the French Ambassador, have been able to do in obtaining a settlement of that question; and the answer to my despatch read to me to-day from M. Drouyn de Lhuys expresses the hope that the accord which has existed between France and Great Britain on this important subject will be the harbinger of our agreement on other important subjects which may come before them. Her Majesty's Government heartily hope that this may be so, for there can be nothing more conducive to the peace of Europe than a cordial agreement between England and France. While that agreement exists there is not the least apprehension of the revival of a Holy Alliance, even if the Sovereigns who formerly belonged to it should be so ill-advised and so little aware of the state of feeling in Europe as to enter into so inauspicious a combination.

BISHOPRIC OF CORNWALL.

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

Earl NELSON rose to move for a copy of the Correspondence between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Sir George Grey in reference to the formation of a Bishopric of Cornwall. The noble Earl called attention to the necessity which existed for an increase of the Episcopate, and expressed a hope that during the recess the subject would engage the attention of Her Majesty's Government, and that before next year something would be done to add to the efficiency of the Church of England in this respect.

Moved,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Copy of Correspondence between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Sir George Grey in reference to the Formation of a Bishopric of Cornwall."—(*Earl Nelson.*)

The Bishop of LONDON inquired whether the noble Earl's Motion included the correspondence which had taken place with reference to the appointment of a suffragan to relieve the Bishop of Exeter of some of his duties?

Earl NELSON said, that his Motion did not include that correspondence, but he should be quite willing to add words which would do so.

Earl GRANVILLE said, that as this correspondence had been presented to the other House, there would of course be no objection to lay it upon their Lordships' table.

Motion *agreed to.*

POISONED FLESH PROHIBITION, &c. BILL—(No. 199)

COMMITTEE. REPORT.

House in Committee (according to Order); Bill *reported* without Amendment.

Clause 2 (Penalty for placing Poisoned Flesh in Fields, &c.).

Lord WODEHOUSE moved to leave out from Clause 2, line 14 ("any Poison or").

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill?" Their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 15; Not-Contents 17: Majority 2.

Motion *agreed to.*

CONTENTS.

Manchester, D.

Chichester, E.
Clarendon, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry*).
Granville, E.
Nelson, E.
Romney, E.
Russell, E.

Shrewsbury, E. [*Teller*].

Melville, V.

Denman, L.
Foley, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough*).
Redesdale, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde*). [*Teller.*]

NOT-CONTENTS.

Somerset, D.

Bath, M. [*Teller.*]

Airlie, E.
De Grey, E.
Powis, E.
Saint Germans, E.

Eversley, V.
Hawarden, V.

Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore*).

Abinger, L.
Chelmsford, L.
Churston, L.
Hatherton, L.
Monson, L.
Seaton, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Wodehouse, L. [*Teller.*]

Page 1, Clause 2, Line 14. After ("Meat") *moved* to insert ("or other Animal matter.")—(*The Marquess of Clanricarde.*)

On Question, "Whether the said Words shall be there inserted?" Their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 14; Not-Contents 18: Majority 4.

Motion *negatived.*

CONTENTS.

Manchester, D.

Clarendon, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry*).
Granville, E.
Nelson, E.
Romney, E.
Russell, E.

Shrewsbury, E. [*Teller.*]
Melville, V.

Denman, L.
Foley, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough*).
Redesdale, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde*). [*Teller.*]

NOT-CONTENTS.

Somerset, D.

Bath, M. [*Teller.*]

Airlie, E.
Chichester, E.
De Grey, E.
Powis, E.
Saint Germans, E.

Eversley, V.
Hawarden, V.

Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore*).

Abinger, L.
Chelmsford, L.
Churston, L.
Hatherton, L.
Monson L.
Seaton, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Wodehouse, L. [*Teller.*]

The Earl of AIRLIE moved the omission of the proviso exempting Ireland from the provisions of the Bill.

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE urged upon the noble Earl not to press his Amendment. He had received letters from the West of Ireland expressing alarm that if the Bill were extended to that country there would not be a lamb left.

Amendment *negatived.*

Amendments made: Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow*, and to be *printed* as amended. (No. 243).

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS AND OFFICE OF THE GENTLEMAN USHER OF THE BLACK ROD.

Select Committee *appointed:** The Lords following were named of the Committee; the Committee to meet on *Tuesday* next, at Three o'clock:—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. President, D. Richmond, M. Lansdowne, M. Salisbury, M. Bath, E. Devon, E. Carnarvon, E. Malmesbury, E. Chichester, Ld. Chamberlain, V. Eversley, L. Willoughby de Eresby, L. Colville of Culross, L. Ponsonby, L. Foley, L. Redesdale, L. Colchester, L. Wynford, L. Cranworth, L. Chelmsford.

House adjourned at a quarter before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, July 22, 1864.

MINUTES.] — Select Committee — *Report* — Bankruptcy Act.

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Naval Discipline* [Bill 233] (*Lords*).

Second Reading—Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia)* [Bill 231].

Committee—Cranbourne Street (*re-committed*)* [Bill 154]; Defence Act Amendment* [Bill 223].

Report—Cranbourne Street (*re-committed*)* [Bill 154]; Defence Act Amendment* [Bill 223].

Considered as amended—Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* [Bill 218].

Third Reading—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*, and *passed;* Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)* [Bill 226], and *passed;* Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* [Bill 211], and *passed;* Poor Removal* [Bill 222], and *passed;* Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment* [Bill 225], and *passed.*

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE BILL.

[BILL 213.] CONSIDERATION.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [21st July], "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration."

Question again proposed,

Debate *resumed.*

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered.*

Mr. HENNESSY moved a new clause enacting that any person, being a natural born subject of Her Majesty, who may be desirous of being appointed an assistant-surgeon in the said forces, shall be admitted to be examined as a candidate for such appointment. He believed that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for India and himself differed very little as to their opinions upon the subject; and his Motion, if carried, would only put into the Act what the right hon. Gentleman had declared to be the intention of the Government. His Motion was taken *verbatim* from the existing law, and would prevent the exercise of arbitrary power which would be warranted by the Bill in its present form. Although, therefore, his clause might not be exactly in conformity with the Bill, it ought to be inserted and become a portion of the measure. The present Bill was only a device to cover the misconduct of the Government in reference to their treatment of these officers, for in respect to rank, pay, and general position they had been so badly treated that there was a difficulty in procuring officers in that department of the service. He would quote the opinion of that day's *Lancet,* a high authority in such matters—

"Sir Charles Wood alleged on Tuesday night last in the House of Commons that competitive examinations for the army medical service had entirely failed, and has introduced an India Medical Service Bill which would do away with competitive examinations. We do not hesitate to declare that Sir Charles Wood has been completely misinformed on this subject, and has entirely misled the House. The examinations have been highly successful, and Sir Charles Wood could not have consulted either the civil profession or the army medical service, much less the examiners themselves, before he made the statement of their complete failure. They have only been a little too successful for the Government. They have interposed a check on the proceedings of the Horse Guards by affording an index of the depression in the quality and the number of the candidates which the uniform harshness, *morgue,* and injustice of that department have caused. They propose, then, to do away with competitive examinations; to destroy the index and silence the tell-tale. It is no doubt an ingenious device to cover the injury which they have done and are doing to the army; but it can only serve to increase the defect in the quality of the candidates, and to damage the efficiency of the service by admitting indiscriminately those whom the competitive examinations would have rejected, and such as were utterly inefficient. If the House of Commons would take the trouble to investigate the question at all, we feel assured that it would never consent to abolish competitive examinations for the Army Medical Department. Mr. Longfield and Mr. Hennessy have rendered a public service in offering a spirited opposition to the progress of the India Medical Service Bill in its present form; and we hope that Mr. Hennessy will further master the details of the question, which will show how greatly such an abolition would be opposed to the best interests of the army."

As regarded the system of competitive examination, Sir John Lawrence in 1860 or 1861 said that its results had been within his own experience eminently successful. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman distinctly, whether he was of opinion that the competitive examinations ought to be kept up? He wished to have an explicit answer, because they must not put their faith in Princes, much less in Secretaries of State.

Colonel SYKES seconded the Motion. He could not understand the objection which his right hon. Friend entertained towards the clause, because it was almost word for word a portion of the Queen's Proclamation to the people of India. He was glad to find that his right hon. Friend had removed many of the grievances under which the old service had laboured. He thought that the new officers should be grafted upon the old service. He had heard that day that a Native had been appointed to the office of Judge of the High Court of Bombay. That appointment did the right hon. Gentleman great credit, and such a course would do more to conciliate the people of India than the presence of 80,000 bayonets, and for each such appointment the Government might rest assured that they might remove a regiment.

Clause (Any person, being a natural born subject of Her Majesty, who may be desirous of being appointed an assistant surgeon in the said forces, shall be admitted to be examined as a candidate for such appointment,)—(*Mr. Hennessy,*)—*brought up*, and read 1°.

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, he could not allow the hon. and learned Gentleman to imagine that he was averse to the principle of competitive examination, because he was the first to introduce the principle into this branch of the service, by an Act which he passed in 1853. The hon. and learned Gentleman did not seem to understand what the object of the Bill was. Previous to 1853 assistant-surgeons were appointed by the East India Company, and there was never at that time any deficiency in the supply of able candidates. In 1853 the service was thrown open to competition. The system had not answered as regarded India. In eighteen months—from July, 1859, to December, 1860—there were 90 vacancies and only 72 candidates, of whom only 52 succeeded in passing; so that the supply for eighteen months had fallen short of the demand by 40. Now, what he proposed by the Bill was to enable the assistant-surgeons of the Queen's army, all of whom obtained their appointments by competition, to volunteer, if they so pleased, into the Indian service. The quotation which the hon. and learned Gentlemen had read from *The Lancet* referred, not to the Indian service, but to the Queen's service, with regard to which open competition had answered exceedingly well. With that service he did not propose to interfere—he only wished to be enabled to form a staff medical corps out of assistant-surgeons who had entered the Queen's service by open competition. As regarded Natives, he was not prepared to state what course he should adopt, but on that point he would consult the Government in India. Some remedy was absolutely called for; but the Motion of the hon. and learned Gentleman did nothing but restore a system which had already been found a failure. The matter was one of great importance, because he had just received a communication from Sir John Lawrence, stating that the medical service in Bengal was short twenty officers, and that the deficiency elsewhere was still greater. He believed the Bill in its original form would be of great benefit to India, and he could not, therefore, consent to the addition of the clause proposed by the hon. and learned Gentleman.

Colonel NORTH believed that the argument used by the right hon. Baronet would be a very good one if our own army found no difficulty in obtaining medical officers. But, so far from that being the case, the Government had been compelled to extend the age of admission, first to 25, and latterly to 40; and now they had been compelled to introduce a new class of officers, entitled acting assistant surgeons. The failure in the number of the candidates had partly arisen from the hard and unnecessary examinations which the candidates had been compelled to pass. On a former occasion he had been told that the system would be changed, and an increase of pay given to the medical department. He could not see how the deficiency in the Queen's service could be obviated by the assistant surgeons in that service volunteering into the Indian army.

Mr. BRADY said, that if there was any difficulty respecting the supply of medical officers, it might be easily removed. All that was required was that the profession should be treated with more liberality.

Sir JOHN TRELAWNY had no fear that the right hon. Gentleman would take any steps prejudicial to the principle of competition. The Bill only gave the Secretary for India power to carry out a step which he thought for the benefit of India. He should support the Bill as it stood.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Clause be now read a second time."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 11; Noes 31: Majority 20.

Bill to be read 3° on *Monday* next.

SPAIN AND PERU—THE CHINCHA ISLANDS.—QUESTION.

Mr. MAGUIRE said, he rose to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he is aware if the seizure of the Chincha Islands by Spain has led to demonstrations of sympathy, or offers of material aid, in favour of Peru, on the part of any and what other States of South America; and if he is aware whether the Republic of Equador has proffered the use of the Harbour of Guayaquil or other assistance to the Spanish authorities?

Mr. LAYARD said, in reply, that the seizure of the Chincha Islands had, no doubt, caused great excitement and demonstrations of sympathy among the other States of South America, and he believed that one or two of these States, including Venezuela, had declared that if these Islands were permanently taken possession of by Spain they were prepared to give material aid to Peru. But the Spanish Government stated they had no intention of retaining the Islands, and that as soon as certain claims which they had upon the Peruvian Government were satisfied, they would restore them to their original owners. He understood that the Republic of Equador had offered the use of the Harbour of Guayaquil to both parties for the purpose of coaling and refitting their vessels.

VANCOUVER'S ISLAND.

QUESTION.

Mr. ARTHUR MILLS said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, If he has received a Despatch from the Governor of Vancouver's Island, conveying a Resolution of the Legislature to the effect that the offer of the Imperial Government to transfer to the Colony the Crown Lands did not afford an equivalent for the Civil List asked; if it is true that the Legislature has refused to provide the necessary residence for the Governor; and whether any representations from Vancouver's Island have been made to the Colonial Office respecting the Indenture of 1862, by which the Imperial Government confirmed to the Hudson's Bay Company the appropriations of Lands and Minerals which the Company had made on that Island?

Mr. CARDWELL replied that he had received a despatch from Vancouver's Island, containing the expression of a desire on the part of the Colony that it should be more or less closely united with British Columbia, for the purpose of saving expense. The answer of British Columbia upon that subject had not yet been received, but he had reason to believe that that answer was not likely to be a favourable one. He did not despair that the Representatives of Vancouver's Island would yet enter into a proper arrangement with the Governor.

Mr. Maguire

ARMY—THE ARMSTRONG GUNS IN NEW ZEALAND.—QUESTION.

Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE said, he rose to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, If, during the recent conflict in New Zealand, the Troops were not exposed to considerable danger during the bombardment by the dropping of the lead coating of the Armstrong shells?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON, in reply, said, he had not received notice of the Question of the hon. Member in sufficient time to enable him to refer to the papers relating to the subject. But he had been informed by a person who had seen the despatch from the Officer commanding the Royal Artillery at the last battle in New Zealand, that it contained no mention of any such occurrence as that stated by the hon. Gentleman. It appeared, on the contrary, that no Armstrong guns had been used by the Royal Artillery upon that occasion. But it was true that one 110-pounder and two 40-pounder Armstrong guns had been used by the Naval Brigade; and his noble Friend the Secretary to the Admiralty might have received some information upon that subject. A private letter had been received from Sir William Wiseman, who commanded the naval force upon that occasion, and in that letter the performance of those guns was spoken of in the highest terms.

Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE said, that he would on Monday put a Question upon that subject to the noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty.

TURKEY—PRINCE COUZA AND THE PORTE.—QUESTION.

Mr. GRANT DUFF said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government has itself expressed, or allowed Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople to express, either directly or indirectly, any approval of the recent *coup d'état* of Prince Couza, or of any arrangements into which he has entered with the Porte, in so far as these arrangements are contrary to the Convention of 1858; and whether, if there are any papers on the subject, he would object to lay them upon the table of the House?

Mr. LAYARD said, in reply, that neither the Government nor the British Ambassador at Constantinople had expressed directly or indirectly approval of the course taken by Prince Couza. No doubt the change made by that Prince in arbitrary manner in the constitution and laws was opposed to the Convention of 1858; but Prince Couza had been invited to Constantinople, and arrangements had been entered into there with the Sublime Porte, carrying out to a certain extent the views of Prince Couza and other parties in the Principalities. The arrangement that had been come to overthrew what his hon. Friend called the *coup d'état* of Prince Couza, and terminated the serious complications which had in consequence arisen in the Principalities. Sir Henry Bulwer deserved great credit for the manner in which he had brought about this settlement, for it was mainly due to him. With regard to papers, he could not at present lay any on the table. There would require to be a new Convention, to which all would have to be parties who were parties to the old Convention, and when it was concluded he would lay that and other papers before the House.

MR. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, he wished to know, Whether Sir Henry Bulwer has given no approval to the *coup d'état?*

MR. LAYARD: None whatever.

Afterwards—

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he would beg to ask, Whether it was to be understood that the arrangement to which the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had alluded was entered into between Prince Couza and the Porte alone, or whether it was referred to the other Powers?

MR. LAYARD said, in reply, that the arrangement come to at Constantinople in regard to the Principalities received the sanction of all the parties who had to do with the Convention of Paris.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE—KAFFIR WAR.

QUESTION.

MR. WARNER said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether, since the last war at the Cape of Good Hope, any arrangement has been come to with the Colonial Government as to the expenses of possible future wars; or whether, in the event of war with the Natives, the Imperial Government would be exposed to the same risk now as on former occasions of being compelled to bear the greater part of the burden?

MR. CARDWELL replied, that no arrangement had been come to with the Colony of the nature referred to by the hon. Gentleman. Perhaps the House would be interested to know that he had that day received a despatch from the Governor of the Cape, which was to the following effect:—

> "You will be gratified to find that the expectations I had formed of the continuance of tranquillity were well founded. You may rest assured that I will spare no pains to overcome by all legitimate means the feelings of distrust and discontent by which some of the Chiefs appear to be animated. Since I last wrote the Commander of the Forces has arrived in Grahamstown, and agrees with me as to the inexpediency of any advance by the troops."

The despatch is dated Grahamstown, June 16.

In reply to Mr. ARTHUR MILLS,

MR. CARDWELL said, that there was no reference in that despatch to the annexation of any new territory, but there was in other papers.

THE WINE LICENSING SYSTEM.

QUESTION.

MR. COX said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will next Session bring in a Bill making it compulsory on Magistrates who, sitting in Petty Sessions, refused an application for a "Gladstone" Wine Licence, to state the grounds of their refusal, so that their decision may be appealed from to the Quarter Sessions?

SIR GEORGE GREY said, in reply, that the reasons were now stated for refusing such an application; and the only question was, whether an appeal should be granted on the occasion of a first application. He had communicated with his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon the subject, and he thought it right that such an appeal should be allowed.

WAR IN NEW ZEALAND.

QUESTION.

MR. ARTHUR MILLS said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether he will lay on the table before the Prorogation the Despatches from New Zealand not already published; and whether, by the last mail, he has received a copy of a Proclamation on the part of the local Government which threatened the rebels with severe penalties?

Mr. CARDWELL said, in reply, that no copy of any Proclamation was enclosed in the latest despatches. A notification had, however, been received which led him to believe that a Proclamation of a different nature from that referred to by the hon. Member, and calculated to satisfy the Natives, was about to be issued. The despatches would be laid on the table as soon as possible.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till Monday next."

GOVERNMENT MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS.—RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. COBDEN * rose to move certain Resolutions in regard to the great extension of the Government Manufacturing Establishments. He said, I regret that, owing to the necessity which lay on many of us to postpone the notices of Motions which we had on the paper a fortnight ago, I was not able to bring this subject earlier under the notice of the House. The Question is important, not only in a financial sense, but in its bearings on the defence and security of the nation. In advocating the view that the Government of the country should not undertake to manufacture for itself that which can be purchased from private producers, I am advancing no new doctrine in this House. On the contrary, this has always been the policy of the House, and the opposite system pursued during the last few years has been in defiance of the reiterated expressions of the opinion of Parliament. I might go back to the celebrated speech of Edmund Burke on economical reform, who so long ago as 1780 laid down in language which it is impossible to surpass, the reasons why the Government should not resort to the manufacture of its own supplies, but should depend on the competition of individual manufacturers. In 1828, before the Reform era, a Committee of the House of Commons put forth a Report in which there is a paragraph to this effect—

> "The Committee are not disposed to place implicit reliance on the arguments which have been urged by some public departments against contracts by competition, and in favour of work by themselves. The latter plan occasions the employment of a great many officers, clerks, artificers, and workmen, and not only adds to the patronage, but to the appearance of the importance of a department. Nor can the Committee suffer themselves to feel any prejudice against the contract system, by references to some instances of failure. They believe that most cases of failure may be attributed to negligence or ignorance in the management of contracts, rather than to the system itself."

Now here is the gist of all I have to say. I shall only amplify this passage, and in doing so I hope I shall not be accused of more illiberality towards the officials than was exhibited by the Committee of 1828. On various occasions this question has been partially raised in reference to particular articles, and an exceptional ground has always been alleged why we should give, for some special branch of production, a preference to the Government manufactories. The consequence has been that step by step the departments have taken upon themselves an immense increase of manufacture. I have asked myself how is it that while we have for twenty years, in our commercial policy, been acting on the principle of unrestricted competition, believing that that is the only way to secure excellence and stability of production, and when the private industry of the country is more equal than ever it was to the demands of the Government, how is it that the departments have been allowed to raise up these gigantic Government monopolies? I believe it is in consequence of the weakness of the Executive Government. For many years past there has, I fear, been very little control exercised by the Treasury, over the various departments of the Government, and the rein being loosened the heads of departments have taken the power into their own hands, and embarked in vast manufacturing undertakings, contrary as I cannot but believe to the intention of this House and the country. The result of my experience is, that there is little use in the House undertaking by Committees to correct the failures of the Executive Government. By interfering in the management of the details of the Government you infallibly do more harm than good. You lower the Executive in the estimation of the permanent officials; and you attempt what is impossible, for the departments laugh at the idea of Parliament superintending the details of the administration. Moreover, the Government by allowing Parliament to attempt to control these details, virtually abandons its own duties and responsibilities. During the last few years we have had Committees of this House on

Ordnance, on plating ships, and on various other branches of Executive administration connected with the safety and defence of the country. In the early years of my experience in Parliament, when Sir Robert Peel was Prime Minister, he would have resisted the appointment of such Committees as tantamount to a Vote of Want of Confidence. He would have said, "If you think the administration is not satisfactorily conducted by me, then you must find somebody else to undertake it." My view is that the House can interfere with great advantage in prescribing the principles on which the Executive Government shall be carried on; but beyond that it is impossible for the Legislature to interfere with advantage in the details of the administration of the country. The principle I advocate is that the Government should not be allowed to manufacture for itself any article which can be obtained from private producers in a competitive market; and that, if we have entered on a false system in this respect, we ought, as far as possible, to retrace our steps.

To give the House an idea of the extent to which the system of which I complain has grown, I will quote a few figures. In 1849-50 I sat upon a Committee to inquire into the Ordnance, and we found that the whole amount of wages then paid to artificers and labourers in the United Kingdom and the Colonies on the Ordnance Votes was £141,330. This year I find that we have voted in corresponding Votes for the wages of our manufacturing establishments, including the clothing factories, a sum of £584,000, being more than four times the amount of the sum voted in 1849-50. The wages voted for the gun factory at Woolwich this year were £144,000, which exceeded the wages for all the departments in 1849-50. Down to and including the Crimean war, the British Government never cast an iron cannon, or made shot or shell. Our ordnance was purchased from the Carron Works in Scotland, from the Low Moor Company, or from the Gospel Oak Works of Messrs. Walker. At the outbreak of the Crimean war my right hon. Friend the Member for Limerick (Mr. Monsell) was Secretary to the Ordnance, and I am afraid that I must charge him with having deposited the nest-egg which has produced the pernicious brood of which I am complaining. From the evidence given by the right hon. Gentleman himself in 1854, I find that he and Captain Boxer of the Laboratory Department at Woolwich laid their heads together and said, "If we spend £7,000 in putting up machinery we can make our own fusees and bouche our own shells." That was the beginning of those acres of costly machinery which may now be seen at Woolwich. No very long time elapsed before Captain Boxer said, "We are now prepared for making fusees and bouching faster than we can get shells; therefore, let us make shells," and accordingly they laid out £10,000 in the erection of machinery for casting shells and shot. There is a very interesting narrative in the evidence before the Sebastopol Committee, and I find that the right hon. Gentleman was arraigned before that Committee for acting without the consent of his Colleagues. I do not blame him for that. We were at war, and he and Captain Boxer displayed a commendable energy; but I mention these facts to show you how establishments of this kind grow. The next step, after setting up machinery for casting shot and shell, was to erect turning and boring machinery for making the guns. It was resolved that instead of obtaining cast-iron cannon from the Low Moor Company, they should purchase from that concern solid blocks of iron, and bore and turn them at Woolwich. Another suggestion immediately followed:—"We had better cast our own guns rather than buy these blocks from Low Moor," and so the machinery was set up for that. Now came a difficulty. There are, as I have said, but two or three concerns in England from which it is safe to buy ordnance, of which the Low Moor Works are one, and the Gospel Oak Works of Messrs. Walker another. When casting a 68-pounder at Low Moor they not only take selected qualities of their own iron, good as it is, but they use coal of a particular kind, fresh from the earth, to smelt it. That firm would not sell pig-iron to the Woolwich establishment, and the result was that, having got the machinery for casting the guns, there was no iron fit to cast. They went into the market and purchased the ordinary kind of pig iron, and they made about 100 guns, but it is believed that not one of the hundred ever went into the service. They were pronounced rotten and were never used. After £200,000 had been spent in this way, the establishment at Woolwich for casting guns was abandoned.

Then came the second part of the performance. It had become necessary that the Government should obtain a supply of rifled cannon. No sooner did this necessity arise than there were men of genius such as Mr. Whitworth, Sir William Armstrong, Captain Blakeley, Mr. Lancaster, and Mr. Lynall Thomas preparing to supply the want. The reasonable course would have been to have said to these inventors, "Go on and improve your system. Manufacture some guns, and to whichever is most successful, we will be your customer;" but the establishment at Woolwich wished to secure the manufacture of rifled ordnance, and those in authority—some of them in very high authority — seem to have lost their heads altogether, and to have gone almost crazy over Sir William Armstrong's gun. An illustrious Duke is reported to have said that Sir William Armstrong's gun could all but speak, and another eminent officer declared it was equal to anything in the tales of the *Arabian Nights.* I will venture to offer a suggestion. When we have in future to make a choice of ordnance, our high officials in the army should pursue the same course they do when they hold a court-martial — let the younger officers speak first—because when the Commander-in-Chief utters such an emphatic approbation it is hardly likely that junior officers will be found to dissent. I would further suggest that the authorities should in these matters follow the commercial system, and not begin to praise and puff an article before they buy it. The result in this instance was, that Sir William Armstrong—then Mr. Armstrong—resolved to make a present of his patent to the War Office. And a very costly present it was. It was assigned over to the Secretary for War, and an arrangement was entered into which to this day I can hardly understand. It seems that Sir William Armstrong was to receive, for ten years, a sum of £2,000 a year for superintending the working of the patent. That arrangement was antedated three years, and £6,000 was paid down, upon which he became superintendent of the Royal gun factory, and chief engineer of the rifled ordnance department. A business was set up at Elswick, in Northumberland, by the War Office—an establishment which previously belonged to Sir William Armstrong—and we made advances in a mysterious manner to the extent of £85,000. Immediately afterwards our officials at Woolwich set up a manufactory of the same kind, and they set it up apparently with a view of controlling the price at Elswick. It is most amusing to see the *naïveté* with which the leading men at Woolwich came before the Committee appointed by this House, and tried to show that they were producing the gun cheaper at Woolwich than at Elswick, forgetting that the two were one and the same concern; that they were both started by the Government with the nation's capital. The Committee were evidently unable to understand the accounts of the Woolwich factory, and in their report they passed a resolution begging them to amend them. I believe that the right hon. Member for Limerick will admit that this is a fair statement of the origin and progress of the rifled Armstrong gun. It was to be made of wrought-iron, was to be breech-loading, and built up on the coil principle with bars of forged iron. It is no disparagement to Sir William Armstrong, who is a man of great mechanical genius, to say that the general impression of scientific men has been unfavourable to his invention—unfavourable to the breech-loading principle, and unfavourable to the material of which he proposed to construct his gun. But the point to which I desire to call the especial attention of the House is this, that the Government set up a manufacture and installed as its head the author and patentee of a particular gun. The consequence was that Mr. Whitworth, who was then in the field, found that he had virtually to submit his gun to the inspection and approval of his great rival. There were other men as well who were candidates, but I mention Mr. Whitworth especially, because every one who knows him will allow that he is one of the very foremost practical mechanicians of the age, and everybody will admit that any system which excluded that gentleman from competition in a matter to which he had devoted his attention must be a wrong system. It was not merely the mechanicians who were thus excluded. The general impression was, and is, that the great problem to solve is not so much a pattern of rifling or a form of gun, as the material from which a gun is to be made; and we have for the last ten years been travelling in a direction which will no doubt ultimately land us in this position, that we shall have it in our power, whenever we find it advantageous, to apply steel to every purpose for which we now use iron. Mr. Bessemer was in the field with his invention for cheapening steel. We have it in evidence before the Committee on Ordnance, from Captain Scott, that Mr. Bessemer told him he should have liked the Government to try his principle of homogeneous metal, which he and many others believe will be found better than wrought iron, but that when he found Sir William Armstrong in possession he gave up the idea. There is also evidence that the Messrs. Walker, of Gospel Oak Works, who produced some of the best cast iron guns, made the same remark, that finding Sir William Armstrong in possession, they should abandon the manufacture of guns. Well, a Committee of this House upon Ordnance was appointed and sat in 1862-3, and I must say that on reading the details of the evidence taken before it I was astonished at the levity with which that evidence was allowed to pass into oblivion without having been brought under the notice of the House. I call my right hon. Friend the Member for Limerick, who was Chairman of the Committee, to account for the omission; and the other Members of the Committee are not altogether without blame. The evidence adduced before that Committee was of the most important and even the most portentous character; for it transpired that we had between 2,500 and 3,000 guns upon the principle of Sir William Armstrong; that there is a confessed expenditure of 2½ millions on these guns; but I believe it was very much more; and it was admitted that 100 of these guns, of the largest size, were made before a trial or experiment was entered into. That there may be no cavilling about what the result of that Committee was, I will read a few words. The Duke of Somerset, the head of the Admiralty, in his evidence said last year—

> "The whole science of gunnery is in a transition state, and when I was this year asked what gun I approved for the navy I was obliged to say that I really did not know."

Recollect, this was after nearly 3,000 guns had been made on the Armstrong principle. His Grace also declared that we had nothing better now for close quarters than the old 68-pounder made at the Low Moor Works. And the Committee report—unanimously, I suppose—that the old 68-pounder is, therefore, the most effective gun in the service against iron plates. The Committee finally say—

> "The Armstrong 12-pounders, although stated by some of the witnesses to be too complicated a weapon for service, are generally approved;" but that "the preponderance of opinion seems to be against any breech-loading system for larger guns."

They recommend that the different systems should be experimented upon. And they also recommend that the accounts of the Woolwich gun factory should be kept in a more intelligible manner. ["No!"] These are not their words, but that is their sense. They say they cannot understand the accounts. I would just add a few words from a naval officer who has given considerable attention to this matter. Writing on the 30th of last June, Admiral Halstead thus summed up—

> "The result is that the largest and most costly fleet of the world, intrusted with the security of the largest maritime empire, has long been presented to all but England's eyes without a gun fit for the special warfare of the day, and with special guns fit for no warfare whatever."

I ask, is that a satisfactory state of things in which to find ourselves after spending, perhaps, three millions of money, and making nearly 3,000 of these guns? Admiral Halstead, in another letter, calls this "the great blind jump of 1859." What has been the result of the Committee? The consequence is that you have had set up at Shoeburyness a stunning competitive contest between Sir William Armstrong and Mr. Whitworth; and thus, after this vast outlay of public money upon the invention of one of the competitors, you are trying which of the two has got the best gun. There might, however, be some consolation in this, if the Armstrong guns were now really being tried against Mr. Whitworth's; but what is the fact? If I am rightly informed, the original gun which we took up and have got in stock—that is, the service gun—is not the gun which Sir William Armstrong is trying. I am told that the original breech-loader, of which we have nearly 3,000 on hand, has been abandoned in this competition, and that there is another gun of an improved construction substituted. I saw it stated in a report of the trial in *The Times* the other day that the original breech-loader is withdrawn from the competition. That is not a very consolatory circumstance in the condition in which we find ourselves. I beg the House to consider what is meant when we are told that we have no naval gun. We have 12-pounders for the field if we chose to go to war in New Zealand or China; but you are not to reckon on the contingency of an enemy landing here to fight you. When I speak of your having no naval guns, I mean guns to fight with. I observe that Captain Cowper Coles talks of the Armstrong 110-pounder as something to do for a chase, or, in nautical phrase, "to tickle up a runaway." Now, let us realize the full force of the admission that we have no gun adapted for modern naval warfare. The hon. Member for Stirling (Mr. Caird) stated the other day—and we could have no higher authority—that half the people of this country during the last three years have been fed with grain and food brought from abroad. We are in the position of a garrison depending for subsistence upon our communications being kept open. If after all your expenditure you have no guns for your ships to contend with against an enemy, do you suppose that your foe would be so foolish as to attempt an invasion with a view of fighting you on land? No, if they had the command of the sea they would blockade us and starve us into submission. Our life as a nation depends on our having the mastery of our communications by sea. And yet this is the way in which those who govern us take care to keep open our communications. Well, the whole secret of the failure is this:—The Government do not understand the functions of a buyer; the whole difficulty of their position arises from their not being able to fulfil the duty of a purchaser, in a common-sense and judicious manner. The true course to have pursued with all these scientific men, when they came with their improvements in artillery, was to have encouraged them to go on, and to have promised their custom to the most successful, or, perhaps, a very small amount of help at starting. I believe that Sir William Armstrong only asked for £12,000 to begin with, and that Mr. Bessemer would have commenced making his steel guns with £10,000; and I have no doubt that for less than £100,000 the Government might have set half-a-dozen establishments to work, competing for the prize of supplying them with guns. That is a matter which the Government will never comprehend till this House insists that they shall buy their commodities instead of making them. If they are not capable of buying their commodities in the market, do you suppose they are competent to fulfil the far more difficult task of manufacturing them? I wish to show you the position in which we, as a nation, are placed by these proceedings. We are in danger of seeing foreigners supplied with better armaments than ourselves from our own private workshops. The very individuals whom the Government have rejected and would not have dealings with have set up manufactories of ordnance for themselves. Mr. Whitworth has founded an ordnance company for the manufacture of guns. I am told that Sir William Armstrong, having closed his connection with the Government at Elswick, and received £65,000 as compensation, has set up a manufactory of guns at Elswick; and, being no longer connected with the Government, I am told that he is actually manufacturing his 600-pounders for Foreign countries. Within a quarter of an hour's drive from this spot, I saw, a few days ago, an establishment where steel guns—600-pounders—are being bored; and this firm, which was rejected by the Government, is, I am told, receiving orders for these monster guns by the dozen, while you are in this experimental mood down at Shoeburyness over the 70-pounder and the 110-pounder. I have now said all that I intend to say respecting this gigantic ordnance failure.

Then, as a still farther proof of the necessity for the Government to know how to exercise the functions of a buyer, let me refer to small arms as an illustration. Down to about ten years ago, we bought all our muskets from contractors. The Government did not make a rifle even during the Crimean war. I may here remark that the ordnance supplied during the Crimean war was of a very satisfactory character. The ordnance and small arms were supplied by private contractors to the army and navy, and they were spoken of in the highest terms in the Report of the Sebastopol Committee of 1855, which, at the same time, contained condemnations of the commissariat, of the medical, and other departments. As I have said, previous to 1855 we bought our small arms from private contractors. How does the House think the Government managed their purchases? I mention this as an illustration of their incompetency as a buyer. If hon. Members refer to the evidence given before the Small Arms Committee of 1854 they will find that the Government were in the habit of buying their muskets in component parts. They contracted, at Birmingham and Wednesbury and other places, for the stock with one maker, for the barrel with another, for the lock with a third, and so on, until they had about a dozen separate contracts for the component parts of a musket. All those various parts were sent to the Ordnance Depôt, and from that depôt they were given out to a distinct body of contractors, named "setters up," who fitted them together and made up the musket. Thus they who completed the musket never came in contact with the contractors for the component parts — a system most ingeniously contrived to prevent all improvement. Mr. Whitworth and Mr. Nasmyth, both eminent men, who were examined before the Committee, spoke of the absurdity of this practice, when large capitalists were ready to undertake to supply the completed article. The Government complained that they could not get muskets fast enough, because there were sometimes strikes among the workmen. They were asked in return, "Why do you not give orders to capitalists, who will set up machinery for making the entire musket?" and it was shown that the system of contracting for the separate parts multiplied the risk of delays from strikes, because if, for instance, the men struck who made the locks, they put a stop to the supply of the complete musket. The Government, however, could not be made to comprehend this, and what was the remedy they proposed for the grievance of which they complained? Instead of improving their mode of purchasing, they thought it would be easier for them to manufacture muskets, and therefore the Ordnance Department came before the Committee of 1854 with a plan for erecting an enormous Government manufactory of rifled small arms at Enfield. The Committee were decidedly against that project, and I am glad to see present the hon. Member for North Warwickshire, who was a Member of that Committee. They said, "If you wish to see better machinery introduced for the manufacture of small arms, that is one question; but it is quite distinct from the question whether you are to have a Government factory;" and, in their Report, they speak decidedly against the Government setting up this enormous establishment, because, they say, you will thereby extinguish private trade, which it would be well to preserve for your future necessities. The result was that the Government sent to America to procure machinery. Colonel Colt, the American, had been in this country for twelve months at that time, and he had set up his machinery; but the Government rather than encourage a Birmingham or a London house to enter into the trade to supply them, rushed into what has become the Enfield rifle manufactory. That establishment which then contained sixty or seventy workpeople has since grown into the employment of from 1,200 to 1,500. I am not about to contend that the rifle factory at Enfield has, up to the present time, done its work badly, or that it has not been profitable. If you set up machinery which is almost self-acting, and if you give it constant employment, it is not easy to make a concern otherwise than profitable; but, while doing this, you have been driving out of the trade all those who would have set up the manufacture upon an independent and more durable basis. But the future of this establishment cannot be estimated from the past, for what is now becoming the fate of the Enfield factory? You have no longer full work for it, for you cannot continue to make the one pattern which you have been continuously at work upon—the pattern of 1853. A Committee has decided that Mr. Lancaster's rifle is a better weapon; public competition showed that Mr. Whitworth's was superior; and the consequence has been that the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho) has moved, in the present Session, the rejection of the Estimate for making Enfield rifles, because they were of an inferior kind, and therefore the manufacture ought to be suspended. If, then, these rifles are to be discontinued, and others are to be made, you will be confronted with the difficulties which await you in every Government manufactory where you are your own and your only customer. During this transition period, as your production falls off, the cost of each article increases, owing to the larger proportion of the permanent fixed charges which it has to bear. To evade this, and also in order to find employment for your workpeople, you will always be liable to the temptation of going on making things which you do not want, in order to employ the people about you, and the result will be that you will be overstocked with articles which your better judgment would induce you not to buy, if you had to purchase them in the market from private producers.

I have said I do not mean to argue that making one article, and having constant employment, this Enfield establishment has not paid itself. But here are the balance-sheets relating to the rifle factory and the gunpowder manufactory adjoining, which have been laid upon the table, and upon which I wish to make one or two observations. I see they are signed "Hartington," as Under Secretary for War, but I would advise the noble Lord not to put his name to any more of these balance-sheets, as I can assure him they would not pass the

Bankruptcy Court. They are not creditable to him, and they are still more discreditable to a commercial nation like this, of which he is a representative. I wish to call attention to some facts connected with these balance-sheets. In that which is dated the 31st of March, 1863, it is stated that the articles produced in the year cost at Enfield £199,177, while if they had been purchased from the trade the cost would have been £356,378, showing a saving of £157,201. Among the items are 71,590 rifles, for which it was stated the private trade would charge 63*s.* 1*d.* each. Now, a gentleman who is at the head of the trade in Birmingham informs me that a tender was actually made this year to the Government to supply rifles at 50*s.* each, or 13*s.* 1*d.* less than it is said the private trader would charge. Then, again, it is stated that 13,780 short rifles made at Enfield would have cost 94*s.* 7*d.* if bought of the private trade. The same gentleman informs me that a contract was made last January for the Turkish Government through our War Office, to supply the same weapons at 65*s.* 9*d.*, or 28*s.* 10*d.* less than is said here to be the trade cost. Then there are 13,000 carbines put down as costing 63*s.* 7*d.* in the private trade, but which this gentleman tells me could have been had for 50*s.* The amount of these overcharges upon these three items alone is £75,000. It may be objected that the balance-sheet is for 1862-3, while the prices of the private trade which I have quoted are for this year. I put that point to the gentleman on whose authority I have spoken, and he said the articles might have been had at about the same price last year, if anybody had applied for them.

I find that you can never make the conductors of these Government establishments understand that the capital they have to deal with is really money. How should it be real money to them? It costs them nothing, and whether they make a profit or a loss they never find their way into the *Gazette.* Therefore to them it is a myth — it is a reality only to the taxpayers. Throughout the inquiries before Parliamentary Committees upon our Government manufactories, you find yourselves in a difficulty directly you try to make the gentlemen at the head of these etablishments understand that they must pay interest for capital, rent for land, as well as allow for depreciation of machinery and plant. There is an immense capital employed in the Enfield Rifle Manufactory. The fixed and floating capital invested in materials, buildings, machinery, and land, appears from the balance-sheet to amount to £350,000. The private manufacturer, of course, in the shape of either rent or interest, would charge himself on the whole of the amount, or if he did not he would soon find himself in the *Gazette.* There is more than want of self-respect in the departments which publish such accounts. It is an insult and an outrage to private trade to pretend to show by such fallacious balance-sheets how much the articles cost, and how much they would have cost if they had been bought of private traders, and to make it appear that we have had all these rifles for £199,177, while if we had bought them of private traders we should have had to pay £356,378, or £157,201 more. The whole amount of wages paid during the year was £135,700, and we are asked to believe that there has been a saving of £157,201 as compared with what would have been paid to private manufacturers. Now, we all know that for everything but labour the Government go to the same source of supply as private manufacturers do. They have not as yet established coal or iron mines of their own, and for all raw materials they have to go into the market and buy on the same terms as private establishments buy. Yet the Enfield Rifle Factory professes to have saved more than the whole amount spent in wages during the year! We all remember the story of the two gipsies who sold brooms. Says one of them to the other, "I can't conceive how you afford to sell your brooms cheaper than I do, for I steal all my materials." "Ah!" says the other, "but I steal the brooms ready-made." Now I should like to know from the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington), whom I shall persist in holding responsible for these accounts, to which he has appended his name, how he manages this great feat of commercial legerdemain.

Turning over two pages in this Report on the Government factories, I come to the Waltham Abbey Powder Manufactory. That is an establishment with 160 acres of land upon which they profess to grow wood for their charcoal, with water-power of immense extent, with large buildings for business and for dwellings, and, of course, with a great amount of machinery. Their business is not a large one. They return themselves as having produced in the year 14,526 barrels of powder, which they value at £34,747. Then, after the usual memorandum that this is exclusive of interest of capital, depreciation of plant, &c., they show that these 14,526 barrels of gunpowder if supplied by private makers would have cost £79,933, so that they have effected for the Government a saving of £45,185. Now I say, that for a country calling itself a commercial nation to have such accounts published and signed "Hartington" is monstrous; and it only shows the utter valuelessness of anything that the noble Marquess may say at that table on this subject. The noble Marquess has shown that he possesses too much ability to make these statements on his own authority; but it is clear that he recites anything that is put into his hands, and therefore what he may say at the table is not worth the slightest attention. Now, let us see how all this is managed. The capital represented by buildings, water-power, machinery, and rolling stock is £300,000, and no interest is charged on that. The land is worth £20,000, but there is no item for rent. Nothing is allowed for rates and taxes, and nothing for insurance. Now, I asked a very well-informed gentleman what the custom was in the private trade with regard to the charge for insurance on a gunpowder manufactory. Of course the Royal Exchange, or the Phœnix Company, would not like such risks. So I find that private traders are in the habit of allowing about 25 per cent for insurance. Nothing of the sort is allowed for here. Enough has probably been said to show that the system on which these Government manufactories are conducted is wholly unsound, that there is an utter absence of responsibility, that there are none of those motives for saving money or avoiding losses which private individuals have; and that, wanting the motives which are necessary for human action, it is impossible that these establishments can be carried on properly.

Let me just touch for a minute upon another matter—the great clothing establishments. Earl De Grey and Ripon, as the head of the War Department, is not only the largest manufacturer of ordnance and of small arms, but he is the most extensive tailor in the world. [*Laughter.*] You laugh, but all these tailoring transactions are carried on in his name, and he is responsible for everything. [*Laughter.*] You laugh at the idea that Lord De Grey should overlook all these details; but is it not a serious thing for the country to have an immense business of this kind carried on virtually without control? About ten years ago, the system of clothing the army was changed, and instead of clothing-colonels we had clothing by contract. For a few years that system continued, and the right hon. Gentleman (General Peel) introduced an improvement in the purchasing department. Down to this time the custom was to contract for the clothing by piecemeal, getting the buttons, braiding, and clothing separately; but the gallant Officer had contracts made for the whole garment. We were told in evidence before the Army Organization Committee by the gallant Officer, by the Commander-in-Chief, and by another witness, that the system worked very well. But there was a plot all this while to divert the manufacture of army clothing from private makers into the hands of Government officials. The plot was stealthily carried out. A small establishment was first set up at Woolwich for making clothes for the Artillery and Engineers. That establishment was to go no further. Then a small manufactory was started at Vauxhall for making clothing for the Guards. As one more illustration of the fallacious grounds on which these Government manufactories are established, I will give a brief extract from the evidence given before the Committee on Contracts, which sat in 1858, by Sir Benjamin Hawes, then permanent Under Secretary at the War Office—and we all know that a permanent official often knows more than his chief. He handed in what he was told to give as the cost price of a soldier's garment. There happened to be a man of business on the Committee, my hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle-under-Lyne (Mr. Jackson), and he, mistrusting the calculation, took the subject in hand, and cross-questioned the witness—

> "You have given the Committee the actual cost to the Government of the clothing and the making of the clothing for one man?—Yes. Independent of all departmental charges, and so forth?—Yes. These charges would be plus salaries? — Yes. Plus interest of capital?—Certainly. Plus rent?—Certainly. Plus damage and every other contingency?—Yes. And carriage and ink, and pens and paper, and all necessaries for conducting the business?—Yes. Therefore that is not a fair return of what it costs the nation, because if you have to pay those charges in addition, those prices are not the actual cost to the country?—They are not. So that the return is a fallacious one?—It is not a complete one."

I will read another extract from the evidence of the same witness. In justice to my late friend, Sir Benjamin Hawes, I must add that he never contemplated the creation of a Government clothing establishment on its present gigantic scale. Alluding to the manufactory of clothing for the Guards, which had been established the previous year at Vauxhall, he recommended only a slight extension of the factory, so as to supply a regiment or two of the Line. He is asked—

> "As I understand you, it is not proposed that that establishment should be extended so far as to make all the clothing for the army, but only a portion of the clothing of certain regiments, in order to give you a test as to the price ?—Certainly; I hope never to see a great Government establishment for clothing the army. The more such establishments are used for the purpose of obtaining information and obtaining models the better; but I look with some apprehension upon all great Government establishments. . . . . It is very desirable that a Government establishment should produce the minimum, and the private trade of the country should produce the rest."

At the very time this evidence was being given, when the House would have refused to sanction a large extension of the clothing establishment, the plot was all laid for getting into the hands of the War Department the manufactory of the clothing of the whole army, with a slight exception. An enormous building has been erected at Pimlico—put up, I believe, upon most costly ground, the item of ground-rent being between £2,000 and £3,000 a year—and they now make there the clothing of every regiment, and manufacture everything, with the exception of the tunics, for about fifty battalions, which comprise, perhaps, one-tenth of the whole supply of clothing for the army: I suppose this exception is maintained in order to enable the noble Marquess to tell this House that the Department has not a monopoly. The accounts rendered of this Clothing Department are most fallacious. I find that about £15,000 a year for fixed charges and interest of money have never been brought into the account at all, and that there is no allowance for rates and taxes. Taking into consideration the waste and fraud to which an establishment for a trade like that is so peculiarly susceptible, when the materials used are cut up into pieces, I must say that it is one of the most unwise and injudicious undertakings that could have been entered into. I have already said, you never find with respect to those establishments that anything is put down for rates, taxes, lighting, or charges of that kind. There is a fallacy in this. If the tailoring business is carried on by the Government, somebody else is deprived of it, who would have paid rates and taxes, including the income tax. Let us suppose the extreme case, that all the manufactures of the country were carried on by the Government, and that they were all exempt from taxation, how would the Chancellor of the Exchequer get his revenue ?

I now come to the management of the Royal dockyards, to which the remarks I have made apply with greater force than to any other department. We have had repeated debates on that subject, and Committees and Commissions have reported on it without end. The tendency of our debates during the last few years has been to prevent, if possible, the Admiralty from continuing to make things which we knew were of no use — to prevent them from building wooden ships, when everybody knew that iron ships would be wanted— and great three-deckers, when all scientific men were aware that they would be mere slaughter-houses if opposed to modern combustible missiles. What, in the meantime, has been the tendency at the Admiralty ? The heads of the dockyards have been endeavouring to counteract Parliament by securing votes for timber in every possible way, and even by buying timber with money voted for iron ships, in order that, having the timber on hand, there may be an excuse for using it for the purpose of building obsolete vessels of war. I have spoken plainly with respect to the right hon. Member for Droitwich and the noble Lord the Secretary of the Admiralty, and I hardly know which to blame the most for bringing in Estimates which they must have known entailed an improper waste of money. I blame the noble Lord most, because I know that he knew better. But, after all, there is probably something to be said on the other side. If you will have these enormous establishments employed for one customer only, you are always in danger, in seasons of transition, of having a great number of workpeople thrown out of employment. This operates on the feelings of humane men, responsible for their subsistence, and induces them, under the guidance of their feelings, and against their better judgment, to manufacture articles which ought not to be made at all. There is no doubt that we have been spending millions of money on the construction of valueless vessels, and that you have from 50 to 100 great wooden ships which ought never to have been in existence, and will never be of any use, but which were in great part built because you have a system which compels you to find employment for your men. If, instead of being builders, you had been buyers of ships, does any one suppose that you would have purchased one of those obsolete and useless wooden vessels? I speak to hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House in the confidence that they will co-operate with me on this occasion. They are said to favour large Votes for the military and naval services. But no party in the House is interested in the waste of public money on these establishments. They find me but little disposed to vote money for the army and navy; but I am always for paying the men well, and I would give them more money than they get now, though I should certainly be satisfied with fewer of them; but you cannot indulge in more liberality towards the men while you tolerate the waste and extravagance of keeping up these large manufacturing establishments; for all these charges come under the head of army and navy, and swell up in the eyes of the country the amount expended on the services.

I wish to ask why we should not take advantage of the present time, when passing from wooden ships to iron ships, and do with the hulls of vessels what you do with your marine steam-engines—buy them, keeping up the Government dockyards only, as far as might be wanted, for repairs. Where would be the risk or inconvenience from such a change? Do you think that the shipbuilders in private yards could not perform the work as satisfactorily as the Admiralty? There are, I believe, at this moment, upwards of 500,000 tons of shipping building in private yards; and during the last year there have been building in this country fifteen ships of war, of an aggregate of nearly 40,000 tons, for the Governments of the following countries:—Denmark, Italy, Spain, Russia, Turkey, China, Prussia, Peru, Portugal, and two rams supposed for the Confederate States. With the exception of a small vessel of 500 tons, which is of wood, all these ships, I am told, are being built of iron. Do you suppose that the private builders who are constructing ships to this enormous extent cannot build the hulls of your vessels of war? Why, you already procure from private manufacturers the most important part of your steamers, that which requires the greatest skill and the most reliable probity in its production. You get your steam-engines wholly from private establishments. I remember sitting on a Committee upon the Navy in 1848, when we were just in time to prevent the Government dockyards from commencing the construction of steam-engines. The rule laid down, and ever since acted upon, was that the Admiralty should repair their engines but not make them. This has been found to succeed most admirably; it is the only branch of your naval construction about which you never hear any complaint. No Committees of this House have been called for, no blue-books have been required, for improving the construction of marine steam-engines. The difficulties in the dockyards have been in connection with the building of the hulls of ships. Why should not the plan which has worked so well with the engines be equally applicable to ships? This is a most opportune time for making the change, just when the armour-clad vessels are coming into use. At the present moment you have no means of making iron-plates for the armour-ships, but I have no doubt that if the House permitted, the authorities of the dockyards would get up plans for having iron rolled in those establishments.

There is an old plea for maintaining these Government establishments upon a small scale, on the ground that you may be able to manufacture a little so as to serve as a test and a check upon contractors. Such a course might have been to some extent unobjectionable formerly, when there were few competitors; but we live now in a time when such a check is unnecessary; for are not great shipbuilders, great gunmakers, and large tailoring establishments, better checks upon each other, through the force of competition, than you can possibly be upon them? If the accounts in the Government establishments are honestly made out, then you will find that the Government, carrying on a small business without the usual motives for economy, produces things at a very dear rate, and the contractors will expect to be paid at this price, which you say should be the model one. If, on the other hand, the accounts are made out like those to which I have referred, and private producers are expected to compete on such terms, then every respectable manufacturer will throw aside the invitations for contracts with disgust and scorn, and refuse to have anything to do with such departments. But is not the fact of the perfect success of your marine engines, without any such check as is proposed, a sufficient answer to this plea? Surely the great waste which we know to have been so long taking place is a sufficient motive for a change. I was talking the other day to an eminent practical shipbuilder on this subject, and this is the substance of what he told me—

> "There has been expended in wages to artificers, naval stores, for the building, repairing, and outfitting of the fleet, steam machinery, and ships built by contract, new works, improvements, and repairs in the yards, from 1859 to 1863 inclusive (five years), £24,350,000. Taking into account the values of all the iron-clads built and building, and giving a large sum for useless constructions of wooden ships, and making a liberal allowance for equipment and repairs, still there will be left more than ten millions out of the above sum for the expenditure of which a private shipbuilder could assign no rational purpose."

I remember the noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty saying, some time back, that he could not trace several millions of the Estimates, in any results to be discovered in the dockyards, and I suppose my friend the shipbuilder has been engaged in a similar search.

It has been said that if we retain the powers of production in our Government establishments, and a war breaks out, we shall have the means of bringing all these powers to bear on the preparation of our armaments. There is, I think, a great deal more to be said on that score, in favour of my plan of giving the work to private establishments. If our private shipbuilders were employed by our own as well as by Foreign Governments, then we should have a dozen or a score of large firms engaged in constructing ships of war not only for ourselves, but for half the world. In the same way if the Government merely kept the factory at Woolwich for repairs, or let it, and gave orders to private houses for the supply of their artillery and ammunition, you would have half-a-dozen or half-a-score, as the case might be, of great establishments producing these articles for our own and Foreign Governments. In the present very low state of civilization, in which no country feels itself safe, particularly if a weak Power, but when, fortunately for humanity, there is a principle developing itself in mechanical science which gives a great advantage to those who act on the defensive, especially against an aggressor from a distance, I am inclined to think there would be constantly a very great demand for munitions of war by foreign countries—South America, for instance, Japan, and others, who would arm themselves in order to be safe against attack. And I am not prepared to say they would not do well in thus arming themselves, because the stronger a Power is the less temptation does it offer to outrage. What, then, if you pursued the course I recommend, would be your position? In case of a war breaking out you could prohibit the exportation of ships of war and munitions of war, and you would be instantly put in exclusive possession of the whole of the resources of all the private establishments which were previously working not for you alone, but for Foreign Powers as well; while, on the other hand, the Foreign Governments would find themselves cut off from the supplies on which they had been relying. I can imagine no contrivance by which you could place yourself in so advantageous and economical a state of preparation for war as this.

There is, however, another reason why the two systems of partially manufacturing for yourself as a Government, and partly purchasing from private traders will not harmonize. The heads of your manufacturing departments must virtually be the buyers of such commodities as their departments want. Colonel Dickson, the head of your rifle manufactory at Enfield, or somebody under him, practically makes all the purchases of small arms; and there have been repeated complaints from Birmingham of the unfairness of a rival manufacturer being constituted the "viewer" of the rifles supplied by private contract. At Woolwich there was an extraordinary example of this state of things, when Sir William Armstrong had to judge the quality of the productions of his competitors. The head of a manufacturing department has always an interest in giving a preference to his own productions or inventions, and disparaging those of outside rivals. There was the case, for instance, of Captain Cowper Coles's turret ship. That was the invention of an outside man; and there is no doubt there has been an unseen but a felt reluctance on the part of the dockyard people to carry it out speedily. I live near Portsmouth, and have myself observed what has been going on. It is nearly four years since Captain Coles proposed his plan to the Government. It is more than two years since they began to cut down and plate the *Royal Sovereign*, in order to convert it into a turret ship. In the meantime Mr. Reed comes into power. I will not say a word in disparagement of that gentleman. I have no doubt he is a man of talent. We, who sometimes complain of routine, have no right to object to an outside man stepping into a high place in the service on account of his assumed abilities. Mr. Reed, however, must be more than a man, he must be an angel, if he did not feel that his importance and value at the head of the construction department of the navy would be enhanced by his producing something which should be better than Captain Cowper Coles's invention, and should be completed earlier. So he sets to work on the *Research.* I am no authority on these matters; but I hear an universal opinion that Mr. Reed's immovable square battery is anything but an improvement on Captain Cowper Coles's revolving turret. The world have decided that question, as is shown by the course taken in America, and by the orders received here from foreign countries. But what are the facts? Mr. Reed's vessel, the *Research*, though designed later than that of Captain Cowper Coles, was launched and at sea considerably in advance of the *Royal Sovereign.* Now, I am not making any attack on individuals; I am only illustrating the working of a system. If instead of a construction department in your dockyards, you had a buying department, then Mr. Reed, or Admiral Robinson, or whoever were the heads of it, would seek out such men as Captain Cowper Coles, or the hon. Member for Birkenhead, and confer with them, would look abroad and avail themselves of inventions and improvements as they arose, without any feelings of rivalry arising from their own personal interest as inventors.

Before I conclude, I must impress on the House the absolute necessity there is for a thorough reform of the buying department of the Government. Do not call it a contract department. That is the old name which was used as an excuse for ignorance and incompetency, when officials gave out contracts according to a red-tape rule, taken, perhaps, from a pigeon-hole where it had lain for fifty years, and scarcely to be understood by the modern manufacturer. If a firm was doing a prosperous business with private customers, it would have nothing to say to such a contract, and it went to some one who had nothing better to do, and who hoped he might possibly make something of it. A person sent me from Manchester a copy of the specification for a tender for tarpauling, in which the most minute particulars were set forth in a tone of dictation, that, if it were not ludicrous from its ignorance, would be really insulting to any respectable manufacturer. It was just such a circular as a man of large business would throw into his waste-paper basket; and it contained a requirement that the canvas should be sent for inspection before being tarred. So that, as my correspondent said, he was expected to send all the canvas from Lancashire to London, and then to convey it back again, when, if it had been required that a strip should have been left untarred, it would have answered the purpose. Why should they not have devised a means for clearing off part of the tar themselves? This is a specimen of the way in which the Government contracts are entered into. I would have all that altered. But my plan involves no disparagement of the services of those able men now in your employ; you will want all the brains you have in your constructing department for your buying department. I have no doubt that Colonel Boxer, Mr. Reed, and the other heads of the different manufacturing departments, would make most excellent buyers. If they are not competent for that I would employ men who are, and I would pay them on a far higher scale than you pay the heads of your departments, for you cannot have men fit to be trusted to go into the market and buy things in the way in which they ought to be bought unless they are placed in a position to be above all temptation. Therefore, I would have men of the utmost capacity; but I should lay down this condition, and insist upon it—that if you cannot in England buy what you want, it is you yourselves who are to blame and not the producers of the country. England is now sending abroad £150,000,000 sterling worth of productions every year. There is not a shilling's worth of that produce that would be bought here if it could be obtained better and cheaper elsewhere, and yet it continues to be bought in larger quantities every year. If you hear anything disparaging to our modern mode of conducting business, that such and such articles are not made so strong and durable as they were at former times, laugh at all such shallow criticisms. The manufacturers here produce for others just what they wish to buy, although, in consequence of the more rapid changes of fashion, it is certainly not the habit of our daughters to wear silk dresses of the strength which were worn by their grandmothers. Then I say that, if in a country which produces every year £150,000,000 sterling of manufactured articles for exportation, the Government fail to obtain the £10,000,000 or £15,000,000 sterling worth of goods which they want, be assured that it arises entirely from their incapacity to buy them. You must have men selected for their ability to buy the commodities you want. If you consult such great wholesale houses as Leaf's and Morrison's in the City, whose buyers purchase millions' worth of articles in the course of the year, they will tell you at once, "We can do with comparatively inferior men to sell our goods, but we get the best men we can to buy them."

I will conclude with a remark in reference to the present state of our armaments. When I consider what has been done in the Armstrong guns, and our armaments generally, I regard it as a deep discredit to the Government of the country, and of itself it ought to compel a change in the system. You have invited this disgraceful state of things by undertaking to do that which you ought never to have attempted. We are governed in this country—I do not use the word invidiously—by a class, and it is a very narrow class indeed, which forms the *personnel* of our administrations. I do not complain of that, inasmuch as our manufacturing and trading community do not seem disposed to educate their sons to compete for the prizes of official life; but I wish you to bear in mind that by such a neglect and mismanagement as you have fallen into in regard to your artillery and ships you may produce the most serious consequences. I know of nothing so calculated some day to produce a democratic revolution as for the proud and combative people of this country to find themselves, in this vital matter of their defence, sacrificed through the mismanagement and neglect of the class to whom, with so much liberality, they have confided the care and future destinies of the country. You have brought this upon yourselves by undertaking to be producers and manufacturers. I advise you in future to place yourselves entirely in dependence upon the private manufacturing resources of the country. If you want gunpowder, artillery, small arms, or the hulls of ships of war, let it be known that you depend upon the private enterprize of the country, and you will get them. At all events you will absolve yourselves from the responsibility of undertaking to do things which you are not competent to do, and you will be entitled to say to the British people, "Our fortunes as a Government and nation are indissolubly united, and we will rise or fall, flourish or fade together, according to the energy, enterprize, and ability of the great body of the manufacturing and industrious community." The hon. Member concluded by moving his Resolution.

COLONEL BARTTELOT, in seconding the Motion, begged to thank the hon. Member for Rochdale for the able and temperate manner in which he had brought the subject under the notice of the House. As guardians of the public purse, it was their duty to see that the money voted was properly, fairly, and honestly expended. He thought that the taxpayers of the country would read that debate with pleasure, because they would see that the House was not inattentive to the way in which the Votes were expended by the Government. If they attended to that point the democratic revolution hinted at by the hon. Member would be averted by the independent Members of the House. He wished to call attention not only to the question, whether the money voted by Parliament had been properly expended, but also to the question whether the results of the expenditure were such as the country had a right to expect from the outlay. In the first place, he had to remark, that notwithstanding all the money we had spent, they had not a gun—certainly not a naval gun—such as a great nation like ours ought to have. Considering the amount spent in the dockyards we were not so well provided with iron-clads as we ought to be. Long since the Admiralty were warned that wooden ships would be of little or no use; nevertheless the Admiralty persisted in building them and had neglected to provide a number of iron ships sufficient to cope with the navies of other nations. In 1854 the Duke of Somerset (then Lord Seymour), in speaking on the Ordnance Estimates, stated that the opinion of several Members of the Government was that it was not advisable that the Government should be manufacturers, except to a small extent—that the general system ought to be one of contract, and that no one believed in the cheapness of Government establishments. Circumstances had certainly not changed since then, and what was objectionable in 1854 was quite as objectionable in 1864. Of late years a manufactory had sprung up at Pimlico, upon which a vast sum of money had been expended with the most unsatisfactory results. It was true our infantry regiments were better clothed than they were some years ago; but that might have been as well accomplished by contractors under proper superintendence—the expense was nearly double; and with regard to the cavalry regiments the new system had entirely failed. In Ireland there was a contractor who competed with Pimlico, and whose price for a tunic was 16*s.* 4*d.*; but he had been informed that whatever his price might be the Government would produce the article at a penny lower. It was the duty of the House to see whether or not the Government manufactories could manufacture at a cheaper rate than private individuals, and if not to adopt some better arrangement. When the Crimean war broke out numerous establishments of this kind sprung up, owing, in the first instance, to the outcry that arose because the gunboats were found to be rotten. In the panic that existed during the Crimean war recourse was had to contractors for building gunboats. Called upon suddenly, the contractors had to build them of the first wood they could lay hands on. These boats were placed high and dry in the yard at Haslar, and a Vote was taken to put them under cover. He had himself gone to see them, and had put his stick through the bottom of one of them; on which an old man in the yard remarked that that was not wonderful, as the boats were out of their element. So that was a useless expense. It was, he thought, the duty of the House to inquire whether the work done in the Government yards could not be done better and cheaper by our private shipbuilding firms. He thought that the recommendation of the Dockyard Committee deserved attention, and whether instead of increasing their dockyard accommodation, they might not subsidize some of the large shipbuilding concerns, and help them to construct large graving docks. Supposing one of those graving docks to cost £100,000 for a subsidy of £15,000 or so towards that sum, we might easily secure a prior claim to the use of the dock in the event of our going to war. In that way we should possess all the facilities we required for the repair or construction of our men-of-war. No one in that House, with perhaps the exception of the Secretary to the Admiralty, could tell the cost of any ship that was built. No account was laid before the House as to the particulars. The same observation applied to the Ordnance Department, and the Pimlico establishment. They ought to have laid before them such accounts as any private firm would place before its partners every year, showing in all its details the cost of everything manufactured, taking into consideration the outlay upon land, buildings, machinery, and charging 5 per cent for floating capital. Unless that were regularly done, they would have no accurate mode of comparing the cost of the articles made by the Government establishments with the contract prices for the same things. At present the head of each department got the money he wanted—it was expended—and often articles were manufactured which, when peace came, were useless, and were then sold. The taxpayers of the country had a right to know that their money was properly expended. Moreover, unless these public establishments paid taxes the returns would be fallacious, because they interfered with the setting up of private manufactories, which would otherwise have been paying large sums into the Exchequer. The noble Lord the other night lauded himself on account of the prosperity of the country, but the noble Lord had not told them what had been expended during the last five years. During the last five years they had spent £350,000,000. The present Parliament had been called a prodigal Parliament, but that word was more applicable to the Government than to the Parliament. There was ample room for retrenchment and economy, and it was not too late for the Government to mend their ways. Reform and Retrenchment used to be the watchwords of the noble Lord and his Friends. Whatever he did with Reform, he hoped the noble Lord would stand to the principle of a wise retrenchment. If the noble Lord would only turn his attention in that direction he would deserve the thanks not only of the House but of the country.

Moved,

"That the recent great extension of Government manufacturing establishments calls for the attention of the Government. That it is expedient that steps be forthwith taken to place each separate establishment as nearly as possible on the footing of a private manufacturing concern or a public company, by taking a valuation of the fixed and floating capital employed, including the value of the land; and that upon this basis there be an annual stock taking; when, after making all the customary deductions for depreciation of buildings, machinery, and plant, interest of capital, rates and taxes, and other charges, such a price be charged to the Government Departments for articles supplied as shall preserve the capital intact, and that these accounts, with a balance-sheet, be laid annually on the table of this House."

MR. MONSELL said, he wished to address a few remarks to the House, as the hon. Member for Rochdale (Mr. Cobden) had specially alluded to what had occurred during the time he (Mr. Monsell) had the honour of holding office in the War Department. His hon. Friend had passed an undiscriminating censure upon all Government manufacturing establishments. In that sweeping censure he could not concur, because there were marked distinctions between various establishments; but in some points, and especially in that part of his speech which referred to the Armstrong guns, he entirely agreed with him. The question was put to him by the hon. Member for Rochdale, why he, as Chairman of the Committee upon Ordnance, had not brought forward a Motion upon the subject in the present Session? His reply was, that the Government had now done precisely that which, under the circumstances, it appeared to him it was their duty to do—they had entirely abandoned the manufacture of the large guns, and had instituted, as the Committee recommended, a series of experiments in order to find out which was the best gun. It was to be regretted that those experiments had not taken place before the enormous expenditure upon Armstrong guns had been incurred; but as the Government had now taken that course he did not feel himself called upon to make any Motion upon the subject. There was one difficulty which presented itself at the outset of the hon. Gentleman's observations. The hon. Gentleman called in question the accuracy of all the calculations and the balance-sheets that had been submitted by the different departments, and he accused the Treasury of having taken no part in arranging these balance-sheets upon a satisfactory system, so as to reveal to the House the true cost of the articles produced by the different establishments. To that statement he (Mr. Monsell) must give an emphatic denial. In every step he took while he had the honour of holding office—and the amount expended was large, £600,000 in machinery, a large sum in buildings to contain it—in every step he took he had the inappreciable advantage of being in close communication with Sir Charles Trevelyan, who was then at the Treasury, than whom nobody could be more competent to form a judgment on such matters. A Committee was appointed by the Treasury to go to Woolwich to investigate the system of accounts, and after a close inspection they reported it to be entirely satisfactory. He might remark that the Treasury was rather a fault-finding department, not very much disposed to take too favourable a view of the proceedings of other departments. But beyond the Treasury there was an office within the department itself—the Accountant General's office—where every transaction was investigated in the closest manner. In addition to all these examinations a Commission was appointed a few years ago, on which the hon. Member for Manchester (Mr. Turner) was a member. That Commission thoroughly investigated the system of accounts, and expressed complete satisfaction with them. He had dwelt upon this point because he wished to show that his hon. Friend had no ground for the charge he had made respecting the accounts. The fact was, the hon. Member had got hold of a principle which he considered as of unvarying application, and which he could best illustrate by a reference to *Hume's Essay on Miracles.* Hume said it was more easy to believe that the evidence was wrong or mistaken than it was to believe that the miracles had occurred; and so the hon. Member for Rochdale declared that it was more easy to believe that all the people who were most conversant with the subject were ignorant and were deceived than it was credible that the Government could manufacture articles in an economical manner, and with benefit to the country. It must strike every one that the question of cost, although important, was not the only, nor even the principal consideration. The real question was this—"Do the manufacturing establishments at Woolwich and Enfield contribute to the honour and dignity of the country; do they add to its strength, and are they to be considered in the same category as iron-clad ships and fortifications? Are they an important part of the defences of the country?" Certain principles had been laid down by his hon. Friend in which he entirely concurred, and one was that articles in ordinary use that were capable of being rapidly produced and effectively tested should be procured as a general rule from the private trade. Again, he quite agreed with his hon. Friend that if Government establishments were not carried on upon a good system they must be failures. But he said that these establishments produced articles that did not enter into ordinary use, and were, as a rule, conducted on good principles. The system laid down when he was in office was the wise system of individual responsibility.

Absolute and entire control was given to the head of each department, who was allowed to select those men whom he considered most fitted for the work on which they were to be employed. His hon. Friend had inferred that Government encouraged manufactories in a great measure in order to obtain patronage. Now, the Government in this instance had given up patronage. They said to the head of the department—"We hold you individually responsible for the work you perform. Choose your own instruments, and remember that after we have given you that authority we have a right to look to you for everything." He admitted that the clothing department, developed to its present extent, sinned against the principle which had been laid down, that the State should not supply articles which could be easily got and tested. In that matter he thought the Government were wrong. As to the accounts, though in his opinion they were well kept, he thought that Parliament ought to be made acquainted with every detail connected with them, and that the watchful eye of Parliament was essential to the working of the system in order to see that the departments did not degenerate into the state they were in before the Crimean war. Now, he thought the best way of answering the charges of his hon. Friend would be to state what was the condition of things at the breaking out of the Crimean war. His hon. Friend had given the House to understand that everything was going on well at that time. Speaking from personal knowledge, he could say that the very reverse was the fact—that the system of having no Government establishment, or very small ones, completely broke down; that the then existing establishments were most inefficient, and that if a war had been carried on demanding any great expenditure of ammunition and of the different appliances of war, the system would have broken down disgracefully, and we should have been very near some serious disaster. With respect to the question whether we were well supplied or not with military stores at that period, he would first refer to the supply of shells. Mr. Anderson, who was then inspector of machinery in the Royal Arsenal at Woolwich, reported that at the commencement of the war the several factories were carried on as a general rule, with most unproductive implements, and he went on to express his belief that the old system was very inadequate to supply the demands of the service. His hon. Friend said that not a single shell manufactured at Woolwich was fired at Sebastopol. This was a complete error. A large number were fired there, and he hoped that they did good service. But now look at the contracts for shot and shell entered into during 1854-5. An order for 200 tons was given, and they were to be delivered in two weeks; but they were really not delivered till January, 1856. A similar agreement was made with another firm, but there was no delivery till June, 1855. Another firm undertook to deliver 150 tons of shot and 150 tons of shell by the 7th of January, 1855, and the same quantity weekly afterwards. The first delivery took place in June, 1855. In another case six months' delay took place. There was no reason to suppose that things were altered now. It might be supposed that in a manufacturing country like ours it would be easy to obtain a sufficient supply of shot and shell. Experience showed that it was not so. We were now secure, for a quantity of shot and shell equal to the whole of that expended at Sebastopol might be produced at Woolwich within six weeks, and the whole of the cartridges fired during the siege might be produced in three weeks. Surely the safety and the influence of this country were increased by such a change? In talking of the expense of keeping up the departments, his hon. Friend had made no allusion to the fact that, as we had the means of producing so readily this vast quantity of *matériel*, an enormous saving was effected, because it was now no longer necessary to keep such immense supplies in store. When his hon. Friend talked of interest upon machinery and plant and so forth, he might have instanced this saving. Another point to which his hon. Friend referred was the manufactory of small arms at Enfield. He was surprised at his hon. Friend's remarks upon this head, because he thought the whole world acknowledged the complete success of that establishment. His hon. Friend entirely broke down in his attempt to show any error in the calculations at Enfield. As only one article was manufactured there, the calculations were easily made, and unless there was the grossest dishonesty on the part of Colonel Dickson, one of the most honourable of men, the true state of the case must of necessity appear in the balance-sheet. At the breaking out of the Crimean war the difficulty in procuring small arms from the trade in

England was such that the Government were obliged to submit to the disgrace of ransacking the world for the purpose of procuring them. They sent to Liège, to America, to St. Etienne. Orders were given for 20,000 small arms within some limited period, and they were not supplied for months and months afterwards. The same difficulty was experienced in getting 2,000 artillery carbines, and an enormous length of time elapsed before they were supplied. He would come now to the question of cost. The Minié rifle manufactured at Enfield cost 37*s.* 4*d.* ; the contract price from the trade was 65*s.* His hon. Friend said that some gunmaker had stated that he could produce it for 50*s.* But had any gunmaker ever done so? If there was, it was only because of the Government establishment at Enfield. Was anybody so "green" as to think that gunmakers, if the Government depended only on them, would not do now what they had done in 1852, 1853, and 1854, and charge the same prices which they had charged then? But his hon. Friend had said, "Oh, but you are going to change your pattern of rifle." However that might be, he could inform his hon. Friend that nothing could be easier than to change the machinery at Enfield in such a way as to produce the new pattern, and that a change of pattern would be attended with much less expense than if the Government had no factory at Enfield. His hon. Friend had talked about the smallness of the establishment prices being caused by the omission from the estimate of the taxes and the rent of the land; but he ought to have put down to the credit of the department the saving which they effected by producing an article for 37*s.* 4*d.*, which otherwise would cost 65*s.* When they took into account that on an average 50,000 or 60,000 rifles were made every year and in some years 70,000 or 80,000—[General PEEL: More than that]—it would be found that the saving effected would pay two or three times over for the cost of the factory since it had been established. It was only a one-sided view of things which his hon. Friend took, for he could not believe it possible that an establishment provided with the best machinery could produce the same articles infinitely cheaper than they could be produced at Leeds or Birmingham. That brought him to a very important matter—the cost of shell—and he was glad to see that his hon. Friend had just entered the House. Colonel Boxer had distinctly stated before the Military Organization Committee, of which the right hon. and gallant General (General Peel) was a Member, that in the course of some two or three years there had been a saving in the cost of shells produced at the factory of more than £200,000. Over that Committee presided Sir James Graham, and he was unable to break down Colonel Boxer's evidence on that matter. [Mr. COBDEN: It is ridiculous to compare times of peace and war.] Well, then, his hon. Friend admitted that in time of war Government factories were good things. If not, what did the interruption mean? He maintained that the £200,000 saving had paid three times over for the expenses of the foundry, and whether that saving was effected in time of peace or war made not the slightest difference in the world. As to the contractors, the shell supplied at £9 a ton, they charged £14 for on the breaking out of the war, and then they did not supply as fast as was required. The Woolwich and Enfield establishments were as much a part of our defences as our fortifications and iron-clads. But in the eyes of his hon. Friend everything was black in the Government establishments, and the contractors were white as snow. It was a remarkable fact which was stated by Sir Benjamin Hawes, referring to the time of the Indian mutiny, that the greatly increased power given by the Government establishments had compensated for the absence of stores. He (Mr. Monsell) was therefore borne out in the statement which he had made, that the existence of these factories rendered it unnecessary for us to keep enormous supplies of stores, which otherwise would be indispensable. His hon. Friend then passed to the question of the Armstrong guns. But it had been distinctly proved that, so far from the establishments at Woolwich having been a cause of expense to the country in the production of these guns, both guns and ammunition were produced there more cheaply than at Elswick. Then the hon. Member said that an enormous sum of money had been spent on a cast-iron gun foundry without producing a single serviceable gun. This was not the fact. Only a few cast-iron guns were made, because soon after the foundry was completed the Armstrong gun was introduced into the service, and that with the exception of the moulding and the casting boxes, costing £6,700, the whole of the building, machinery, and so on was applied to the manufacture of the Armstrong gun. The assertion that the cast-iron guns produced there were expensive, because just at the time they were getting into work the system was changed, was as absurd a thing as to say that the Charing Cross Railway was a failure, because during the few months it had been at work it had not produced enough money to pay the cost of construction. The only loss on that gun factory had been £5,664. But what were the conditions under which it started? His hon. Friend seemed to think that it was some invincible desire on the part of the Government to extend their factories which led to the establishment of this factory. But the real reason was that the 13-inch mortars when tried against Sweaborg had burst, and so also had two others; and on the 5th of September, 1855, Colonel Wilmot, a most able officer, wrote to this effect, that he was firmly convinced, in common with most officers who had considered the subject, that it was absolutely essential to the security and efficiency of the service in this most important particular, that England, following the example of other nations, great and small, should have a foundry for iron ordnance on such a scale as might enable the Government to feel certain as to the supply of serviceable ordnance. The cost of the building, erected in consequence, was £60,707, of the machinery £37,500. The whole was afterwards applied to the Armstrong factory, which produced guns so much more cheaply than elsewhere; and the whole loss was only £5,664, although 249 guns had been cast in the factory. With regard to the clothing department, he had already admitted he should be glad to see it reduced to smaller dimensions. There were, however, certain articles the goodness of which could not be tested unless the process of manufacture was watched, and these articles ought to be manufactured by the Government. He was anxious that the House and the public should be acquainted with the true state and condition of the Government manufacturing establishments, and the cost at which the various articles were produced. Considering the interest which the subject excited in the public mind, he should look with the greatest satisfaction on the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into this subject and make a report. [Mr. COBDEN intimated his dissent.] He should like to see his hon. Friend upon the Commission. The late Sir James Graham had the same prejudices as the hon. Gentleman with regard to Woolwich. But he paid a visit to Woolwich, he looked into the matter for himself, and the result was that he changed his opinion. If his hon. Friend would only sit on a Commission he predicted that the same result would follow. It was of the highest importance to this country that the Government should have in their own hands the means of manufacturing the appliances of war. He had in this matter felt his way step by step. He began when he was in office by establishing a small foundry, and then when he was satisfied with the results he went on to a larger one. He believed that the Woolwich factory was not only a source of strength to this country, but that it had also saved the country large sums of money, and instead of discouraging by his criticism the able officers who presided over it, his hon. Friend ought rather to have given them the credit they deserved. He believed that the experiment which he (Mr. Monsell) had made had succeeded, but it would not have been a success except for the remarkable ability and zeal of the heads of departments at Woolwich.

MR. ALDERMAN ROSE said, he could not agree with the hon. Member for Rochdale—he thought it would be extremely bad policy for the Government to throw itself unreservedly into the hands of contractors. In the matter of guns the Government had of late years become their own manufacturers, and by that means we had obtained what was for the time the best weapon in the world. He was intimately acquainted with the commander of the Buffs in China, and that officer had told him that a number of Frenchmen had at one time got into a position of considerable difficulty, that he had offered to dislodge the enemy, that the French officers had treated that as an impossibility in consequence of the distance which separated the two forces, but that he had brought the Armstrong gun into play, and to the astonishment of our gallant Allies had completely succeeded in that object. When the Crimean war broke out there were miles of Low Moor iron guns in store at Woolwich. That gun, however, was found so defective and unsuited to the wants of modern science that the Armstrong gun was produced. The latter gun was so great an improvement that the Government did quite right to purchase the patent, and to manufacture it for themselves. He (Mr. Alderman Rose) thought that great advantages had accrued to this country by the manufacture of the Enfield rifle in the Government factories. The hon. Member for Rochdale said the small arms ought to be manufactured at Birmingham, where a musket used to go through twelve different hands. But there was a great advantage in completing all the parts of the process under the same roof, and to have the manufacture under control, so that the Government might produce any number they required. He thought that the amount saved by the Enfield factory had not been fairly and candidly represented by the hon. Member. Then it was said that the Government ought to depend upon private dockyards for building the ships they wanted. They did depend upon private yards for the gunboats required during the Russian war. He believed that the Admiralty required impossible conditions from the private builders. He was credibly informed that when they were applied to to send in contracts for the gunboats they frankly replied that the timber specified in the conditions did not exist—that it must be got through Russia. They were nevertheless told to send in their contracts, and to do the best they could, and the authorities would "carry them through." He believed the officers had not the candour to explain these circumstances when complaints were made that the gunboats were built of unseasoned timber, and not otherwise according to contract. It was extremely desirable that we should not be wholly dependent on private contractors; and we were manifestly in an improved position when we could ascertain by practical experience the cost of every article we required. The result of the Crimean war was to produce a strong opinion in the minds of some people, and apparently in that of the hon. Member for Rochdale among others, that war could be carried on by contract. In his opinion that was altogether an erroneous idea, because in war you had not the conditions which existed in time of peace. A Government to carry on war with effect ought to be self-supporting, self-sustaining, and self-reliant. As a means of checking and controlling expenditure, the contract system was of great value, but it was not desirable that the Government should become entirely buyers instead of manufacturers.

Mr. WHITE said, he believed the lucid and admirable speech of the hon. Member for Rochdale would sink deep into the minds of the people, and by its delivery he had added to the debt of gratitude which the country already owed him. His hon. Friend had confined himself principally to the economical view of the question. He (Mr. White) should address himself to its moral and political view. He gave his most unqualified adhesion to the principles which his hon. Friend had laid down as to unrestricted competition. He regarded the existence of manufacturing establishments of such magnitude as those which the Government now possessed as a positive anachronism, and a contradiction of those principles of unrestricted competition of which we were supposed to be the great representatives throughout the world. Great as was the wastefulness of this system, it was but trifling compared with the political and moral evils resulting from it. Our bureaucratic system created an accumulation of discontented officials — for where could you find an official who was not discontented? That House was continually pestered, vexed, and besieged by the petitions of Government officials. Make a man a Government servant and you made him a discontented man for the rest of his life; and yet these places were such objects of ambition that people were always to be found struggling for what they thought the *euthanasia* of a Government employment. It was the duty of honest statesmanship to eradicate this growing bad principle from the minds of the people. In the year 1780 Mr. Dunning moved his memorable Resolution as to the growing influence of the Crown; but since then the public establishments and the number of Government servants had greatly increased. He was old-fashioned enough to look with great distrust and jealousy upon any augmentation of the power of the Executive by the multiplication of offices and the increase of their patronage. In the year 1822 the number of *employés* in the Civil Service was 18,500; in 1862 it was 43,163. During the 40 years which elapsed between those dates, the population of the country had increased at the rate of only 40 per cent, while the increase in the number of civil servants had been at the rate of 120 per cent. During the last 10 years the population increased 10 per cent and the civil servants 20 per cent. When we looked at the increase in connection with our army and navy, and the number of Englishmen employed in the public service in India, it would be found that we had at the present time 130,000 men more engaged under Government than we had ten years ago. Now, all undue increase of the power of the Executive was attended by a proportionate diminution of the legitimate influence of the people. Our ancestors could use scarcely any term implying greater reproach to a man holding any office or situation under the Government than to call him a "placeman." Lord Brougham, he might add, remarked in a debate which took place in 1822, that he spoke the language of the Constitution when he asserted that placemen were objects of distrust; and yet the manufacturing system, which was the subject of the present discussion, produced those placemen in the largest possible degree. He, for one, was of opinion that no man would venture to say that the public money was judiciously employed or frugally expended as matters now stood, and he maintained that it was the duty of the Government to limit as far as possible the tendency to keep up overgrown establishments. He hoped that next Session some such system as that suggested by the hon. Member for Rochdale would be adopted, with the object of repressing this growing evil.

MR. CORRY wished to make a few remarks on the subject before the House, in consequence of the observations which had fallen from the hon. Member for Rochdale with reference to the course taken by the Government of Lord Derby in the construction of wooden ships of the line and frigates. The House should bear in mind the state of the question as regarded iron-plated ships at that time. When the Government of Lord Derby succeeded to office not a single armour-plated ship had ever been tried. A vessel of that description —*La Gloire*—was being built in France, but she was the only one at the time even in contemplation. It was true that some iron floating batteries had been constructed during the Crimean war, and we followed the example, and sent two of these vessels to the Black Sea. Their performances, however, were unsatisfactory. So far, therefore, as practical experience went, the Government of Lord Derby had then no encouragement to embark in the construction of armour-plated ships. Under the circumstances it would, indeed, have been nothing short of insanity to enter upon their wholesale construction. At that time it would have been a jump in the dark. The Government of Lord Derby did that which was a good deal wiser—they built the *Warrior*, and thus made a very successful experiment; and after that the present Government built the *Black Prince*, the construction of which had been ordered by the Derby Government. It might be said that, as matters stood, they ought to have stayed their hands and done nothing. But what, he would ask, was the state of our navy at that time? About the period to which he was referring, a very remarkable paper appeared in the columns of *The Times*, extracted from an encyclopædia which was published at Leipsic, in which the writer, a German, spoke in terms of regret of the decline of the English navy, observing that France, with her enormous military power, was actually superior to us on the sea. And that was the fact. When Lord Derby's Government came into office in 1858 it was stated before a Committee called the "Treasury Committee," that France was equal to us in screw line-of-battle ships and was superior to us in frigates. Now that, it was felt, was not a safe or a satisfactory state of things for this country—for the hon. Member for Rochdale himself admits that our navy should always be superior to that of France—particularly when the aspect of our foreign relations was borne in mind; for it was the period at which the French colonels were beseeching their Emperor to allow them to appear at the Bar of the House of Commons and dictate the course of legislation which it should adopt. The Government of Lord Derby would in such a position of affairs be, in his opinion, most culpable if they had not done something, and they accordingly, by a complete and economical process of conversion, obtained a considerable force of line-of-battle ships and frigates. By that means they restored England to her proper place as a naval Power. The engines supplied to the ships then converted were of so admirable a description that when they became obsolete the engines would be available for armour-plated vessels. He should be glad if all our ships were armour-plated; but if now, unfortunately, we should be engaged in a war with France, we had not a single wooden line-of-battle ship which we should not be obliged to send to sea, for it was impossible that we could with our armour-plated ships defend our commerce, and we must, therefore, use the former until they were replaced by the latter. As to the question of building vessels in our dockyards or by contract, he perfectly admitted that the case was one in which the introduction of iron made a very material alteration. Formerly, in the case of wooden ships, the worst thing that could be done was to build them by contract; but it was a question whether iron ships could not be built as well and cheaper by contract. Many years ago, when he held office under the late Sir Robert Peel, he found that the cost of a line-of-battle ship built in the dockyards, the average age of each vessel being taken at 25 years, was £70,000 for building, and £40,000 for repairs in 25 years; whereas the contract vessels cost £55,000 for building and £59,000 for repairs in 12 instead of 25 years; so that the latter cost £114,000 in 12 years, while the former cost only £110,000 for more than twice that time. He must also express his belief that the work done in the dockyards was, as a general rule, better executed than that done by contract, and therefore contract-built ships were not necessarily cheaper than dockyard ships. He hoped, however, to see the contract system with regard to iron ships extended. With regard to our naval guns, he must say that the Admiralty did not appear to be fortunate in that respect, and he trusted they would during the recess give their earnest attention to ascertaining the best mode of arming our ships of war. He agreed with the hon. and gallant Member for Wakefield (Sir John Hay), that the kind of gun required was a 12½-ton gun, which would fire either round shot or the rifled elongated shot.

Mr. CHILDERS said, he thought the House was much indebted to the hon. Member for Rochdale for the clearness with which he had brought his views on this subject before the House. For himself, having been barely three months in office, it would be presumptuous in him to give a decided opinion either one way or the other on so important and interesting a question, and his only object in rising was to submit a few facts and considerations to the House by way of suggestion to guide them in their decision on it. In regard to the manufacturing establishments in the dockyards, the hon. Member for Rochdale seemed to lay down the principle that we ought to repair and not to manufacture—that we ought to do with regard to the hulls of our ships what since the Committee of 1848 had been the rule with marine engines—purchase them new from private makers, and only repair them. Before coming to a conclusion on that point it would be well to see what actually was purchased from the private trade and what was manufactured in the dockyards. As a rule our ships were manufactured in the dockyards, and the Government put on board of them all articles necessary for their equipment; but in coming to look more nearly into the matter and considering what articles were manufactured in the dockyards and what purchased, it would be seen that there was a great distinction to be drawn which made the matter not quite so simple as the hon. Member had represented it. Our wooden ships, with very few exceptions, had all been built in the dockyards; but coming to the present state of things, when we were building armour-ships, it would be seen that there was a great limitation to building in the dockyards. Beginning with the *Warrior*, there were now either built or building twenty-five armour-ships, of which twelve were iron and thirteen were wooden ships plated. Out of twelve iron ships ten had been constructed in private yards, and only two in the Government dockyards. The wooden ships, plated with armour, had been built in the dockyards; but nearly all of them were originally wooden line-of-battle ships which had been converted. In the Government dockyards we manufactured wooden masts, sails, ropes, boats, copper sheathing, capstans, mixed metal articles, bolts, lead pipes, a few boilers for engines, and a few propellers. For the iron ships, on the other hand, the whole of the armour-plates were purchased from the private trade. Iron masts, iron beams, wire rigging, large pieces almost exclusively, anchors, chain cables, all heavy forgings, and all engines and boilers for new ships were manufactured by the private trade. So that at present with regard to a large part of the fittings of these ships they were purchased from the private trade. What had led to this diversity of practice? The hon. Member for Rochdale laid it down as a sort of canon that nothing which could be bought in an open competitive market should be manufactured in the dockyards. But the soundness of the rule was open to great doubt; and he did not think that any such general rule could be laid down decisively. The Government might have several firms willing to supply them with the articles they required; but, on the other hand, if the Government was the only purchaser of those articles, would they be quite sure of getting fair play, and would they derive all the advantages of competition? There was also another consideration. The lives of the crews, and even, it might be, the vital interests of the country might, under certain circumstances, depend on the efficiency of the component parts of one of Her Majesty's ships, and in view of such a contingency the mere consideration of expense sank into nothing. Therefore to the hon. Gentleman's rule must be added these exceptions—that the Government should not be the only purchaser of the articles, and their quality must be such as to stand some test which would not destroy them. The further exception must be made, that we ought to manufacture such articles as could not readily be supplied in time of war. The question of comparative cost was, no doubt, important; but with respect to the manufacture of the hulls of armoured ships there did not exist up to the present time fair means of comparison. There were now five iron ships afloat armour-clad on the principle of the *Warrior* and the *Black Prince,* all of which had been purchased from private yards; and the only ship of the kind which the Government was building, the *Achilles,* was not yet finished. There was not, therefore, as yet a sufficient basis on which to calculate the relative cost. Respecting the wooden ships, iron-plated, no fair comparison could be instituted. The nearest approach to a comparison possible to be made was between the iron-armoured ship the *Hector,* built in a private yard, and the wooden converted ships, the *Royal Oak* and *Prince Consort.* The *Hector,* of 4,089 tons, cost £286,718; the *Royal Oak,* 4,056 tons, and the *Prince Consort,* 4,045 tons, cost respectively £259,658, and £249,064. But there could be no conclusive comparisons until they had ships in the same condition built in the Government and in the private yards. There was another serious question, and that was as regards the time occupied in construction, and, as far as that went, the evidence was in favour of the Government dockyards. Of the iron ships at present incomplete, the *Valiant* was to have been completed in March, 1863, but she was not yet finished. The *Prince Albert* was to have been completed in June, 1863, but she was not yet delivered. The *Minotaur* and *Agincourt* were also incomplete at the appointed time. He did not mean to say that the contractors were to blame for the delay, and it might be turned to account by enabling us to take advantage of the latest improvements. He wished to call the attention of the House to the experience that might be derived elsewhere. There was no country like England for the ample supply of iron, for cheapness of labour, and for other circumstances facilitating the construction of ships; but, at the same time, it must be admitted that the United States with respect to wooden vessels were ahead of this country, and before the year the English commercial marine was being gradually driven out of the field by the effective competition of American ships. Consequently, American experience could not altogether be set aside in respect to the building of ships in public and in private yards. The following were extracts from a Report of the Secretary to the Navy in the United States, dated December, 1863:—

> "In order that we may have at our command a navy which shall fulfil these unexampled and exacting conditions of efficiency, a commensurate public establishment for its construction and preparation is indispensable. A navy yard on a large scale, and in many respects of a new plan, amply furnished with all the proper facilities and aids for its operations, where machinery for steamers can be manufactured, iron vessels constructed, iron armature made and tested, and repairs of every description executed, is an absolute necessity. In view of these facts I had the honour on successive occasions to urge this matter upon the attention of the last Congress, and the omission of that body to take even the preliminary measures towards the procurement and formation of such an establishment is a misfortune which the country is now made to feel. The limited facilities for manufacturing and repairing steam machinery at the public navy yards render them totally inadequate to meet a moiety of the demands upon them. Even with the aid of private establishments, no inconsiderable portion of our naval force is waiting, unemployed, and detained from active service to the injury of the country. Proposals were issued for an iron-clad ship of the largest class (under the authority contained in the Appropriation Bills), but the cost, as shown by the propositions received for a ship of the necessary magnitude, was so great that it was deemed advisable to enter into no contract involving so large an expenditure, except by the express sanction of Congress. There are no parties in this country fully prepared to build iron vessels of the magnitude and description proposed, and the present high prices of material and labour unavoidably enhanced the cost. The Government itself is unprepared to execute any such work, having no suitable yard and establishment, and is consequently wholly in the hands of private parties to demand what they think proper, and prescribe their own terms. On former and repeated occasions, and elsewhere in this Report, the Department has fully expressed its opinion of this policy, and the necessity why the Government should be prepared to build iron vessels and the necessary machinery of the largest class. Prompt and judicious action by the legislative branch of the Government upon this subject is, in my judgment, urgently needed, and will, when it shall have been

had, be carried into effect by this Department with all possible activity."

Then came another Report from the Secretary to the American Navy, dated May, 1864, which was even stronger than that to which he had just referred. That functionary stated—

"I subjoin a schedule of iron-clad gunboats of light draught in the process of construction, which, in anticipation of the state of things which now exists, were designed for service in the sounds and rivers of North Carolina, and the shallow interior waters elsewhere on the coast. These boats were contracted for as soon as it was possible to do so after the necessary appropriations for their construction were made by Congress, and it will be seen by the data given that most of them were to have been completed last year—some of them as early as September. Not one has yet been delivered, and it will be some weeks before one can be made available for service. I have felt it my duty on repeated occasions to call the attention of Congress to the necessities for a yard and establishment where iron and armoured vessels could be constructed for the Government, but the preliminary steps for such an establishment have not yet been taken. In the meantime, the Department and the Government are wholly dependent on contractors, who, if they have the will, do not possess the ability, to furnish these vessels promptly. Conflicting local controversies in regard to the place which shall be selected and benefited by the proposed important national establishment for an iron navy, such as the present and future necessities of the Government require, have contributed to delay action on this important subject. Having in view economy as well as the public necessities, I have at no time recommended that the number of our navy-yards should be increased on the Atlantic coast, but it is my deliberate opinion that no time should be wasted in establishing at a proper place a suitable yard where iron ships can be made and repaired. We feel its necessity in the emergency which has called forth the present inquiry, and not a single contractor is able to meet his engagements, even for one of this class of small vessels. In the event of a foreign war with one or more of the principal maritime Powers our condition would be most unfortunate, with no Government establishment for the construction or repair of armoured vessels such as modern science and skill are introducing. The omission to make provision for such an establishment, on which the Government can always rely, is to be regretted. Had we such an establishment at this time, I should not have been compelled to make this exhibit of a want of light-draught armour-boats for such an exigency as that which now exists in the waters of North Carolina, nor is it probable that the exigency would have occurred."

He thought that those extracts pointed to this conclusion—that in America the application of the principle embodied in the Resolution of the hon. Member for Rochdale as sound for this country had proved to be unsound as applied to that country. With respect to France, the orders given to private yards had unquestionably placed the French Government in considerable difficulty, for they were suffering from the imperfect delivery of ships. He did not wish at the present time to carry this question further; but as far as the experience of other nations was concerned, it did not point in the direction of the Resolution before the House. It did not, however, follow, that because such a course of proceeding did not suit the Americans, it would not suit this country; but he did not believe that the experience of large establishments even in this country pointed to the conclusion, that those who required a very large plant must in no case be manufacturers of that plant. In the railway world it had been found expedient for companies to undertake not only the repair but the manufacture of a considerable part of their plant. The largest Company of all, the London and North Western, manufactured their entire plant, and with perfect success. With regard to the accounts generally, he did not understand the hon. Gentleman to express any distinct disapprobation of the system. His remarks related solely to the manufacturing accounts of the War Office, for which his noble Friend the Under Secretary was ready to answer fully. As a very great improvement had recently been made in the accounts of the Admiralty it would be a pity to introduce another change until the new plan had had a fair trial. The principle which the hon. Member laid down was that before arriving at a correct statement of the cost of an article an allowance should be made for the interest on capital, depreciation of plant, and other charges which would fall on a private contractor. That was true; but the primary object of the Admiralty accounts was to exhibit the result of the cash transactions, and the introduction of these uncertain elements suggested by the hon. Member would tend to diminish their usefulness in this respect. He proposed however, during the recess, to see whether they could not, on the first day of the next financial year, take stock of their plant in the factories and manufacturing establishments; and attach to subsequent accounts statements embodying the allowances for interest on capital, wear and tear, and so on the footing of ordinary mercantile accounts. To the cost as exhibited in the rate book could then be added the increase attributable to interest, depreciation of plant, and other expenses. The House would thus be put in possession both of the cash accounts and of manufacturing accounts, based on strict commercial principles. More than this he was not now prepared to undertake, but he need hardly say that his inclination was to put the business accounts of the transactions on the Admiralty on the same footing as other business, so far as it could be done without producing fallacious impressions.

COLONEL DICKSON said, he had never hesitated to express his opinion of the impropriety of carrying the Government manufacturing establishments to their present extent. At the same time he thought that they should be maintained to such an extent that the Government would not be altogether dependent upon private enterprize when any emergency should occur. The whole weight of the argument seemed to be to him on the side of the hon. Member for Rochdale. His hon. Friend had instituted a comparison between the cost of constructing ships in the Government yards and by private contract, and nobody could say that he had overstated his case; and he had also shown that the present system of keeping the accounts was a perfect absurdity. What, then, must the case have been when there was hardly any reckoning at all. His hon. Colleague (Mr. Monsell) had given as a reason for not depending altogether on private manufacturers, that when shells were wanted during the Crimean war the contractors took advantage of the necessity of the occasion by increasing largely their price; but that was not the fault of the contractors—it was the natural consequence of the principle of supply and demand. If a war were to break out to-morrow the Government would be compelled to increase the wages of even their own dockyard labourers, as well as to pay an increased price for the materials. The hon. Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers), in his defence of the Admiralty, quoted the Report of the Secretary of the United States Navy in support of his views; but it should be recollected that it was the interest of all Government officials to favour their own institutions—and, moreover, the circumstances of the United States were peculiar owing to the suddenness of the emergency, so that he (Colonel Dickson) thought that that part of the hon. Gentleman's arguments fell to the ground. Turning to the clothing establishment at Pimlico, to which he had devoted considerable attention, he found that it had increased to a greater extent than could be readily conceived. Between the years 1858-9 and 1862-3 there had been spent in repairs and buildings £51,892, and for machinery £4,859. The amount paid as wages for labour in that establishment was upwards of £44,000, and for superintendence the charge was £15,000, or nearly 35 per cent. At the clothing establishment at Woolwich exactly the same rate of increase was going on. It might be said by the noble Lord (the Marquess of Hartington) that the army was better clothed now than before these establishments were set up. Well, nothing could be worse than the clothing was previously; but they must not attribute the improvement of the article to these establishments. They must attribute it to the fact that the eyes of the country were opened by the Crimean war, and that the public began to care for that army of whose existence they seemed before almost entirely ignorant, or, at all events, to care but little. Then the noble Lord said that the clothing was cheaper. But that was owing to the decreased price of cloth. When the red drummers' cloth was first introduced into the army its cost was over 9*s.* per yard; but, according to the last contract, the price was only 6*s.* 6*d.*, so that the diminution of cost must be attributed to the enterprize of the manufacturers. He gave the officers who conducted these establishments credit for zeal and a desire to render them efficient; but they could not expect matters to be carried on on strictly mercantile principles when they were directed by officers who had no mercantile experience. He maintained that the system would be much better carried on if they trusted in a great measure to private contract. On a former occasion he was assured by the late lamented Sir George Lewis, that it was not intended thus to swallow up all the army clothing in these establishments, and that it was intended to give out the trousers to private contract; but, up to this time, the only articles not manufactured there were the tunics for fifty battalions. His right hon. Friend (Mr. Corry) said that ships could be better built in the public dockyards than in the private yards; but his own opinion was that some of the finest ships they had seen had come out of private yards; and he instanced the *Himalaya.* He thought these Government manufacturing establishments were carried on to an absurd extent—that they ought to have far greater recourse to private enterprize — that the system of accounts particularly required revision, and that the enormous waste and extravagance which had taken place lately was highly culpable and reflected very much upon themselves. He would support the Motion of the hon. Member for Rochdale.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I shall detain the House for only a short time; but I feel bound to make a few observations in consequence of the hon. Member who brought forward the subject having alluded to me somewhat personally in connection with the question. It seems to me that the hon. Member has selected a rather extraordinary period for bringing this subject under the notice of the House. He has had on the paper for a long time the notice of his intention to call the attention of the House to the great extension of our manufacturing departments. I think his notice points to "recent" great extension in these departments; but I believe that, on reference to the Estimates and accounts for the last ten years, it will appear that this year we have spent less for buildings and machinery, or any extension of these establishments, than in any other year of that period. The hon. Member sat still while the Government were largely increasing their buildings and machinery, and it is only when they have reached a limit which it is not contemplated by any one to extend, he calls attention to the fact that our manufacturing departments have extended. What the hon. Member proposes to do I can scarcely discover. In order to make a *primâ facie* case he was obliged to fall back on the assertion that the Government were not only bad manufacturers, but had been driven to manufacture because they were such bad buyers. I cannot but think he did not support that assertion by any distinct proof. He brought forward two cases, one of them that of small arms; but he did not at all enter into the question whether the inability of the Government to buy on favourable terms was owing to an inherent defect in their arrangements, or to the fact that there must always be great difficulties in the way of Government purchasing on good terms which do not exist in the case of purchases by private individuals or private companies. It is the disposition of contractors—and I do not mean to say they are worse than other people—to supply articles cheap rather than good; and I do not see how it is possible to guard the interests of the public, and the lives of our soldiers and sailors, which may very often depend upon the excellence of the articles supplied to them, except by a minute and rigid inspection of the articles contracted for. It is to that close and rigid inspection, I believe, the contractors object. At the conclusion of the war it was alleged that the contractors were harassed and vexed by needless requirements on the part of the heads of departments; that, owing to their ignorance of business and their want of commercial habits, they worried the contractors by all sorts of needless objections. As far as the Government could, they removed that source of complaint. They did what the hon. Member seems to suggest. They secured the services of a gentleman known for the integrity of his character, and also for acquaintance with commercial matters; and I can assure the House the system which prevails in the departments is not an old one, but a new one. There is now an Inspector of Contracts, whose duty it is to see that the contractors are dealt with in a commercial manner, and not harassed by a vexatious and too stringent inspection. It is possible that still further improvement may be made in that direction; but still I say that I cannot see how the interests of the public are to be protected without a minute and stringent examination of the articles supplied by contract. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Limerick (Mr. Monsell) answered very satisfactorily all that part of the statement of the hon. Member for Rochdale which referred to the great extension of our laboratory during the time of war. It is all very well for hon. Members to say, that during the last few years the manufacturing resources of the country generally have so extended that private manufacturers must be capable of supplying the Government with whatever they may require; but there are facts to prove the reverse. At the time the war in the Crimea was going on there was hardly a sufficiency of warlike stores in the arsenals, and the Government called for contracts for all the warlike materials they wanted, totally regardless of price. They were perfectly willing to pay any price the contractors might demand; yet those stores which were absolutely required could not be got. The hon. Gentleman referred to shells which he said had never been fired. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Limerick has shown that to be a mistake; but supposing it were not, what would it prove?

The war might have continued and extended; and if that had happened, would it not have been a matter of the last importance to have our army well supplied with ammunition? As to the extension of the laboratory at Woolwich, without now going into the cost of it, I must say that was a work of absolute and positive necessity. It was a matter of absolute necessity to erect these buildings and purchase that machinery, because the articles were wanted and could not be got in any other manner. The right hon. Member for Limerick has, I think, successfully defended the establishment of the gun factory at Woolwich. A good deal has been said with respect to the Armstrong guns; but I cannot see how the mere fact of possessing a Government manufactory renders us answerable for any failure in those guns. The hon. Member for Rochdale says the proper course would have been to invite Sir William Armstrong, Mr. Whitworth, Captain Blakeley, and other inventors, to make guns and supply them to the Government; but if that had been done the Government must have been prepared to take any description of guns which might have been sent in. The hon. Member admits that he is not acquainted with military affairs; but he must be aware that it is essential that the armament of the country should be of a uniform description, and not an armament consisting partly of Armstrong guns, partly of Whitworth guns, partly of Westley Richards' guns, and partly of Captain Blakeley's. The hon. Member seems to think that the Armstrong guns have proved a failure; but if that was the case, which I do not at all admit, it would not be the system of having manufacturing departments that would be answerable for it. The hon. Gentleman says it was a great mistake to subsidize the Elswick Works, and he pointed to the fact that Sir William Armstrong, who had been connected with those works, became the superintendent of the factory. I am not here to say whether that was a good arrangement or not; but, again, it has nothing to do with the system of having manufacturing departments. Of course it was competent for the Government, having decided that they would adopt the Armstrong gun, to ask for tenders for making it; but the hon. Member is mistaken if he supposes that tenders in such a case would have come in in any number. What was the case with regard to the old cast-iron guns? In the face of open competition there were only two, or at the most three, manufacturers who ever supplied cast-iron guns to the Government at all. That was not on account of the prejudices of the Government, but simply because only two or three firms thought it worth while to go to the necessary expense of obtaining the right sort of iron. In the case of the Elswick Company we must either have guaranteed the repayment of a certain portion of the expenditure in plant, or we must have ordered from the Company such a supply of guns as would have repaid them for their first outlay. It is not unimportant that from the first day that the manufacture of the Armstrong gun was commenced, Sir William Armstrong and others engaged in the manufacture have been constantly improving it; but if we had entered into a large contract we should have been obliged either to content ourselves with guns according to the first sample, or to pay the Company an enormous sum in the shape of compensation. I will not enter at any length into the case of the Enfield Factory, but I have referred to the debates [see v. 144] which took place at the time that factory was established, and I find that the only persons who objected to it were the hon. Member for Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) and the late hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. G. F. Muntz). Of course the reasons which induced those Gentlemen to oppose the erection of the Enfield Factory are obvious. The hon. Member for Rochdale says, the reason we did not get rifles as rapidly from Birmingham as we wanted was that the Government had such an absurd way of contracting for them. He says they contracted for each portion of the arm separately, and that great delay arose in putting them together. But that was not a system invented by the Government; on the contrary, it is the system in use in Birmingham now, and in every other place where firearms are manufactured. Indeed, it is absolutely necessary, if the Government is to exercise an efficient inspection over the rifles supplied to the troops, that that inspection should be made before the rifle is finished, and should take place in every stage of the construction of the weapon. The Birmingham trade was asked to supply rifles; but it did not supply anything like the number required, and papers which have been laid upon the table will show how very far short of those promises the performances of the trade were. It is sometimes said that the Government are behind the trade in introducing improvements into machinery; but it was the Government and not the trade who brought over the improvements from America. The Government, having determined to establish a factory, sent over inspectors to America, who brought back the machinery, and this having been put up at Enfield, was soon copied by the trade at London and Birmingham. There is one establishment which has found no friend in the course of this debate, and that was the clothing factory at Pimlico. The hon. Gentleman who last spoke seems to have taken all the expenses of that establishment, and put them down as the expenses incurred in working the factory. That is not so, as a great part of the expenses is not incurred for the factory, but for the establishment at Pimlico for the inspection and storing of clothing. When we gave up the system of clothing the army through the agency of the colonels of regiments, it became necessary that we should obtain a supply by contract or else manufacture ourselves. If we get them by contract we must have some place to store them in, and some efficient establishment in which they could be inspected, and a large portion of the expenses set down for the Pimlico factory is chargeable to the Pimlico clothing establishment as a whole. It has been said that the price of clothing has been reduced since the establishment of the factory. That is quite true; and it is erroneous to attribute that to the decrease in the price of cloth. In 1859 there were three contractors who made infantry tunics, and the average price was £1 0*s*. 8*d*. the price of cloth being 7*s*. 10*d*. a yard. In 1862 the price of a tunic was 16*s*. 6*d*., the price of cloth being 7*s*. per yard. Therefore, allowing for the diminution in the price of cloth the contractor's price was 3*s*. less in 1862 than in 1859. The Pimlico factory was not established without a full inquiry and due deliberation. With regard to the Woolwich factory, I may remind the House that the Commission appointed to inquire into the system of contracts and of providing stores for the army, reported, in reference to Woolwich, that the establishment was well adapted for clothing the soldiers well, expeditiously, and economically; but they gave no opinion whether it was cheaper or not. That experiment was so far satisfactory that I am not surprised it was extended and the factory at Pimlico established. I do not say that an equal necessity exists for the Government manufacturing army clothing as for its manufacturing war materials. It is not likely that such an extension of the supply will be required in the case of clothing as in the case of war materials; but I nevertheless believe that the system now pursued of manufacturing part and allowing the remainder to be provided by contract is the best which can be adopted. At Pimlico clothing is made for forty battalions of the line, and shell jackets and trousers for the rest. The contractors still make the clothing of fifty-three battalions, besides all the clothing for the Post Office officials, for the Metropolitan Police, and others, which, however, is passed through the army establishment to be inspected. There is only one contractor for the clothing still existing, and I believe he is a constituent of the right hon. Member for Limerick. He has succeeded in driving every other contractor out of the field, and it seems to me that if we were to relinquish our manufactory we should be left entirely in the power of this one contractor, or one or two others. The balance-sheet with my name attached to it, to which the hon. Member has referred, was not prepared with the view of making an accurate comparison between the prices of articles made by the Government and the price of those supplied by contract. The object of that balance-sheet, on which much time and trouble have been bestowed, is to give the House, as well as we can, an accurate account of what the work done at the establishment was, and it certainly was not designed in the first instance for the purpose of comparison with the articles made by contract. The form of account which the hon. Member wishes us to render would, I think, be purely fictitious, and, if adopted, I feel sure that he would be the first to accuse us of something like cooking accounts. He desires that we should make a charge against our establishments for rates and taxes. We do not pay rates and taxes, and therefore the charge for them would be merely imaginary. The hon. Member also wants us to fix a charge for the value of the land. But the land at Woolwich when bought by the Government was almost valueless, and its present value is very much to be attributed to the works we have erected upon it. What the accounts therefore aim at showing, and do show, is the actual expenses incurred; they show accurately and fairly what the cost to the country of an article is when once we have erected the buildings and bought the machinery. We give the House all the information we are able to give. We state what sum has been expended in past years upon buildings and machinery. Hon. Members can draw their own deductions from the accounts and put such a further percentage on the price of the articles we manufacture as they may think proper, but I do not see how we could present the account truthfully in a different form. The hon. Member took great exception to the Enfield balance-sheet with respect to the price which certain articles would have cost if obtained from the trade. Now, great pressure has been placed upon the Government during the last year or two from the gun trade for extensive orders to be given to them; yet surely when we have got the Enfield manufactory, and the House has voted the money for the buildings and plant, it becomes the duty of the Government to see in what way by the outlay of the money they can get at the cheapest rate the articles they require. And I say that the account presented by Colonel Dickson gives an accurate comparison for the purpose for which it was intended. That officer says that if you give him so much money he will produce so many rifles, and that if the same quantity had been supplied by the trade it would have cost so much more, including the expense of proving. The saving between the two sums stated appears to me to be the actual saving to the country, now that it has gone to the expense of erecting factories and purchasing machinery. It is quite another question whether it was economical to establish the factories in the first instance; but for the purpose for which the account is placed before the House it is perfectly correct. There was a great deal of discussion before the Ordnance Committee last year as to the system of accounts. I cannot pretend to speak with authority as to whether the system now pursued is the best that could be adopted; but I will say that no one is more anxious than the War Department is to have the accounts kept in as sound and accurate a form as possible, and to have them so laid before the House. The hon. Gentleman says he has no faith in appointing Select Committees on this matter; but surely on a point like this, which does not involve a principle, but only the simplest and most known commercial axioms, some practical men of business might with advantage inquire into the system on which these accounts are kept, and might present a report that would be useful to the House as indicating whether these accounts are to be trusted or not. Every one connected with the establishments, and all the accountants who have been sent to Woolwich to investigate the system, give their opinion that the system is correct. Would it not, therefore, be better for the hon. Member to institute inquiry by commercial and practical men, rather than upon his own mere authority to say the accounts are not worth anything whatever? I am glad, Sir, that this question has been brought forward, because it has given rise to a most interesting and useful discussion. I think that the long and painful investigations which have preceded the speech of the hon. Member for Rochdale have not been of more value to any other Gentleman in this House than to the hon. Member himself. I recollect an occasion when the hon. Gentleman spoke in very sweeping terms indeed of the waste and extravagance with which all the Government manufactories were conducted, and when he said that any practical man would tell you that at least one-half the money spent upon them was wasted. He has confessed, at least, in the case of the factory at Enfield, that he believes it has been worked at a profit; and I do not think that in any other case he has proved or attempted to prove the assertion which he then made, that at least one-half the money expended in these factories is wasted. If the money is so wasted it must be by the mismanagement of the factories, and he has not pointed out the mismanagement. The Government factories have the advantage of working upon a large scale; they have the advantage of a constant demand; they have not to make a contractors' profit; and, if they do not, they ought to produce the cheaper of the two. I believe they do supply us at a cheaper rate than the contractors. At all events, I do not think anything has been said to-night which proves that they do not do so. And instead of such a Resolution as all must have anticipated from the hon. Member—namely, one of sweeping condemnation against all the Government factories, the hon. Gentleman has contented himself with laying on the table a Motion which, if it had been made, would only have amounted to a recommendation for the adoption of a somewhat modified system of accounts.

MR. CHILDERS explained that what he had said was that in laying down a rule as to purchasing or manufacturing, one element for consideration was whether the Government was the only customer.

Sir MORTON PETO said, he should content himself with referring to that portion of the Resolution of the hon. Member for Rochdale, on which the hon. Member had himself more lightly touched. The right hon. Member for Limerick (Mr. Monsell) had stated that the charge for shells and other missiles at the breaking out of the Crimean war entirely justified the erection of the extensive works at Woolwich. What were really the facts? That the orders so suddenly given to the contractors in that emergency compelled them to go to largely increased expense. Taking, for instance, the Low Moor Company, he could prove that in order to execute the commissions for the Government the Company had to erect extensive buildings, and when the Government orders ceased those buildings became useless, and actually the land and buildings had been presented to the town, and baths and washhouses had since been erected on the site. A sudden pressure of that kind, which demanded extra exertions, had a corresponding effect upon prices; but it did not justify the allegation that the new factory for shells had been a great success in an economical point of view. The noble Lord who had just spoken (the Marquess of Hartington) had put forth as a justification for Government establishments that rigid inspection was absolutely necessary. It was true that rigid inspection should be exercised over all articles of Government consumption; but that was equally true whether the articles were manufactured by Government or simply sold to them. The noble Lord had referred to the Armstrong contract as proving that the Government might sometimes be properly its own manufacturers; but the Government had ultimately paid Sir William Armstrong £65,000 to be quit of their engagement, while Sir William Armstrong was set free to make guns for all the world. This was done after the Government had spent between £2,000,000 and £3,000,000, and he believed they would now willingly get rid of the stock they had on hand in consequence of that contract. With respect to the accounts, he thought his hon. Friend the Member for Rochdale was right, for the accounts rendered from Enfield were no accounts at all; they were a mere insult to the common sense of the House. Then, with regard to iron-plated ships, if, as had been said by his hon. Friend (Mr. Childers), five-sixths of the iron armour-plated ships had been supplied from private yards, it was hardly possible to understand the large expenditure in our dockyards during the last year or two. Then it was said that it could not be safe to rely upon private yards for ships in time of war when the Government would be the only purchaser. For himself he had no personal interest in the matter, but he was enabled to state that there was one private yard producing a larger amount of work for Foreign Governments, and for our own Government, than was turned out in all the Government dockyards, and from all the private yards in which work was done for them. Thus, the Government was not placed in the position of being the only purchaser.

Mr. CHILDERS said, what he referred to was that a great consideration was that the Government was the best customer.

Sir MORTON PETO said, he accepted the explanation, but what he wished to show was, that if the Government were steady customers they would always be supplied with what they wanted at the cheapest rate, but that if they applied to the trade only in time of war, they could not be cheaply supplied. With respect to the accounts of ships, he agreed with his hon. Friend that it was very difficult to institute a comparison between them. Out of the twenty-three ships ordered by the Government, he believed eighteen were different in size and structure. But as all early efforts were mainly experimental, it would be unfair to make a rigid comparison of cost. As a test of the capabilities of the private yards, he might refer to the magnificent yacht recently built for the Sultan of Turkey by a private firm, and to her Majesty's yacht, built in a Government yard, the one being universally admired, the other universally condemned. He trusted that the House would allow him to refer to private affairs for a few moments, in order to afford information. The amount of labour and material employed in all the Government dockyards was nothing like half as much as were employed by his own firm; and the firm so kept their accounts that in reference to each contract the capital charge was taken into account, and the cost of every article used in each particular contract was known on the termination of the work, and the exact cost of every item in the contract clearly shown. Until the Government furnished similar accounts they would not fulfil their duty. What was wanted was a debtor and creditor account for each particular yard, showing what each yard cost and produced; for then they would be able to see which yard manufactured the cheapest, and whether the public would supply them better. He must say that since the noble Lord (Lord Clarence Paget) had been at the Admiralty they had had more information than they had before; but still the 600 pages of information and the labour charts were not accounts in the proper sense of the word. Nothing could deserve the name of an account which did not include the cost of depreciations, of superintendence, of lighting, &c. At present, in our seven dockyards there were 227 separate establishments. Each had its separate superintendent, its inspector, sub-inspectors, timekeepers, and all the paraphernalia of a great establishment. He was not clear whether we were not carrying the separation of various establishments too far. For instance, they were told with respect to hemp that at Chatham the manufacture of rope could be carried on more cheaply than elsewhere. If that was the case, manufacture all you wanted at Chatham. If you could do a thing more economically at one place than another, concentrate the manufacture there; and if you found you could buy more cheaply than you could manufacture, by all means go to private establishments. He wished now to call attention to the enormous increase in our establishments during the last few years. Taking the year preceding the Crimean war, he found that the expenditure on the navy in 1852 was £5,622,000, while in 1864 it was £10,432,000, showing an increase of £4,810,000, or 83 per cent. The expense of superintendence in the dockyards was £155,000 in 1852 and £230,000 in 1864, showing an increase of £75,000. In labour and wages in the dockyards the expenditure in 1852 was £702,000, and in 1864 £1,344,000—an increase of £642,000, or nearly 100 per cent. Materials and stores for shipbuilding cost £782,000 in 1852, and £1,826,000 in 1864, which was an increase of no less than £1,044,000. The Admiralty were spending now as much upon wood as they were before iron was used, and he was very much in the condition of the noble Lord before he became Secretary of the Admiralty—he could not make out what became of the money. In 1852 the number of salaried persons employed in superintending the yards was 431; in 1864 it was 522. In 1852 the number of workmen employed in the dockyards and factories was 10,757, while in 1864 there were 19,419, an increase of 8,662. Now if the Admiralty were putting out so many iron ships to be built by private contract, what were all these men about? As far as he could make out from the accounts, about 26 per cent of this labour was devoted to converting timber and to manufacturing operations in the workshops; and it was therefore of great importance that the House should be able to see from the accounts whether the Government manufactured more cheaply than they could buy. As to the smaller dockyards, it was the practice of men of business to concentrate as much as possible—the fewer their establishments the more economically they could be conducted; and in the same way, if the Admiralty had seven dockyards, when they could do all that they wanted in three or four, looking, moreover, to the enormous sums spent in protecting these establishments, it would be exceedingly desirable to sell the small dockyards. The great thing for the Government to achieve was not to go on spending money in the dark. The Admiralty had probably tried to do their best with the accounts, but they were not accounts at all in the eyes of commercial men, and he hoped that next year such accounts would be presented as commercial men would understand and appreciate.

GENERAL PEEL: If I am called upon for my opinion upon the Resolution of the hon. Member for Rochdale, I must express entire agreement with that portion of it which demands that full and satisfactory accounts should be laid annually before the House. This is only what I promised to do when I was in office, and what I fully proposed doing had I remained in office. When, however, the hon. Gentleman says that he has read attentively the evidence given before the Committee, and professes to describe what took place there, I can only say that, if he had not told us he had read the evidence attentively, I could not possibly have believed it. The description he has given of the introduction of the Armstrong gun into the service is quite contrary to the clear statement made before the Committee, and quite contrary to the explanations which I have made in this House so frequently that I am ashamed of repeating them. In 1858, when I came into office, we were the only country in the world that had not got a rifled gun. I at once appointed a Committee to report upon the best rifled gun that was to be had—I did not care whose it was or what it was. The hon. Gentleman says the Armstrong gun was adopted because the Duke of Cambridge said this or because somebody else said that. No such thing. It was adopted because it had proved itself superior to all the other guns which were submitted to the Committee. They tried the Whitworth—they tried every gun which was before them—and they reported that the Armstrong gun was the best, limiting their approval to its use as a field gun; and I believe at the present moment that it is the best field gun in any country in the world. The hon. Gentleman said that the War Office did not know either how to build a gun or to buy one. What would be the consequence of following his advice? He says we should have tried the Whitworth, and everybody else's gun that seemed of merit. But you cannot have different guns in your service. You must make up your mind to adopt one. Then the hon. Member says, "Why did you not give Sir William Armstrong a large order for these guns?" What would have been the result of doing so? The absolute cost price of the gun which we had experimented upon was £260. If I had entered into a contract with Sir William Armstrong we should have had to pay him £260 a piece. Remember, he had a patent for his guns, and we must have dealt with him upon his own terms; we could not have gone to anybody else. Well, we did not do that. The hon. Member is wrong in saying that we paid the Elswick Company £60,000. We did not pay them one farthing. What the Company said was, "If we establish a plant for your particular service, will you pay us at the end for our outlay?" That was a fair stipulation. But instead of paying £260 for the guns we paid £170 originally, and afterwards a much smaller proportion. I wish to vindicate the Government to which I belonged in their proceedings with respect to the Armstrong gun. It is said that £2,000,000 or £3,000,000 have been spent; but all I am responsible for is the Estimate of 1858, which I brought forward. I fully approve of what my noble Friend who succeeded me in the War Office did. At that time there was no such thing as armour-plated ships. Neither armour-plated ships nor guns to pierce them were contemplated at the time. We took then the best gun that we could get, and if we had not done so what would be said except that we were behind other nations? Why, this House was always urging us on. It has been said that we are about to convert the whole of our muzzle-loading into breech-loading guns. I do not say whether that is right or not; but I do say that if we are going to do so we can effect that change much more cheaply in our own factories than anywhere else. And as for the gentlemen at the head of those manufacturing establishments, I say if they had works of their own they would earn twice as much as they receive from the Government. It is impossible to describe how efficiently they perform their duty. It has been said that a large sum has not been spent on warlike stores last year and the year before. But why has it not been spent? Because you have not yet decided what is the best rifled gun; but the instant you come to a decision on that point you will have to lay out a large sum. Again, with reference to armour-plating, you have not yet made up your minds. But let not the House deceive itself by imagining there can be any great saving effected in your warlike expenditure. And now a word about the establishment at Pimlico. The hon. Gentleman said that when I came into office it was necessary to change the system. The clothing is done partly by contract and partly by yourselves. But you must have a large establishment at Pimlico even for the clothing which is done by contract, because it is sent there in order to be inspected. I believe the clothing of the English army, which is done partly by contract and partly by our own manufacture, is better done than for any army in the world.

LORD CLARENCE PAGET: Before coming to the questions raised by the hon. Member for Finsbury (Sir Morton Peto), I wish to advert first to the subject of the Armstrong guns. Very strong opinions have been given to-night against Sir William Armstrong's breech-loaders. I have always been very frank on this subject, and I spoke of them as having been unsuccessful at Kagosima. But at the late affair in New Zealand these guns—both the 100-pounders and the 40-pounder—are reported by Sir William Wiseman, a high authority on this point inasmuch as he has commanded the *Excellent*, to have worked admirably. I was sorry not to have been in my place to-night when the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Bernal Osborne) asked whether some of our men had not been wounded in consequence of the stripping off of the lead from the projectiles? We have had no such accounts, and, as I have already said, the Report made by Sir William Wiseman is most satisfactory. The hon. Member for Finsbury finds fault with the dockyard accounts; but he has given us credit ever since the present Government has been in office, of endeavouring to make them so clear that every one would be able to form a comparison between the cost of ships built in private yards and those built in Her Majesty's dockyards. We are told that we should endeavour to put a price upon every thing. But how are we to do that? It would be a mere imaginary valuation, and I am sure if we were to attempt anything of the kind the House would not be satisfied with it. What we do is this—and I beg the attention of the House to it—the whole cost both of material and the labour expended upon it is given separately for each dockyard; so that the very accounts which my hon. Friend asks for are given already in what are called the "labour charts" of the dockyards. I quite admit that those charts might be improved, and if my hon. Friend will come to the Admiralty and make suggestions with that view I shall be very glad to profit by them. But if hon. Members suppose that because we have gone largely into iron ships we are at the present time about to give up wooden ships, that is not the intention of the Government. We are as desirous as any hon. Member to enlarge our iron fleet. No doubt such a fleet possesses great advantages, particularly in the heavy armour-plated ships; and we have done all in our power, and given every encouragement to inventors to come to us, in order to get rid of that most fatal defect—namely, the fouling of their bottoms, for until we have got rid of that we cannot have our cruisers, which go two or three years without ever entering a dock, built of iron. The time, therefore, has not come for suppressing the wooden fleet altogether. Hon. Members are all desirous that the business of the country should be conducted properly; but I can assure them that it is after the most serious consideration that the Admiralty have come to the conclusion that they should fail in their duty if they gave up the building of wooden ships. I will give an illustration which I have employed before. Everybody has heard of the feats of the *Alabama.* It is true she has shown her weakness. As a wooden ship against the heavy guns of the present day she could not last ten minutes. But for all that the *Alabama* has done to her enemies an immense amount of damage; but if she had been an iron ship she never could have done half of it. For many months she was away from any dock, yet she was able to catch a vast number of the ships of the enemy; but if she had been of iron she would long before have lost her speed from the foulness of her bottom. Merchant ships have a given duty to perform. They go from one part of the world to another and bring a return cargo home. They are consequently always moving. But the essential duty of a vessel of war is to lie at anchor at a particular spot; and that is the reason why these ships, not going through the water, get their bottoms foul. But if any person supposes because we are building these iron ships we are therefore about to reduce our dockyards, I cannot, without deceiving him, hold out a hope of any great reduction. If we are to retain wooden ships—and I have shown the necessity of retaining them—we must be continually employed in repairs, and at present we have great arrears to clear off. But, says my hon. Friend, I do not object to repairs, but to the large number of men that you keep in your yards. But any practical builder will agree with me that to get good mechanics for repairing you must make them acquainted with the art of shipbuilding. The ships are coming in at uncertain intervals for repairs, and when the workmen are not engaged in repairs they are employed in building. But, speaking generally, our dockyards are almost altogether employed in keeping our fleet in repair. I am extremely glad we have had this interesting discussion, and I do not doubt that we shall derive considerable benefit from the suggestions that have been made. But I protest against the supposition that the substitution of iron for wooden ships holds out a prospect of any considerable reduction in the expenses of our dockyards.

CAPTAIN JERVIS said, he agreed with almost everything that had fallen from the hon. Member for Rochdale. For the efficient defence of the country it was necessary that the interests of the mercantile community should be identified with that of the Government, so that the Government should be able in emergencies to fall back on the vast resources which it afforded. The advantage of a Government manufacturing department was simply as a check upon private contractors, but that check was eminently necessary. The Enfield manufactory was originally established during the Peninsular war, in consequence of the disgraceful frauds of the contractors, and the necessities of the Crimean war had originated there the introduction of machinery. The differences between the masters and workmen at Birmingham had hitherto prevented this great improvement in the trade, but the latter had at last followed the example of the Government, and one of the finest factories in the country had been lately built at Birmingham for the manufacture of small arms by machinery. The powder mills at Waltham Abbey had a similar origin. In 1777 the powder of the navy was so disgraceful that a Commission sent to Plymouth reported that only a few barrels were in a serviceable condition—and this in time of war. The mills at Waltham Abbey were, therefore, established; but they were never meant to be more than a check upon the contractors, and they had fully answered their purpose. The powder now supplied by contractors to Government was all that could be wished. The third manufacturing department was that for making gun carriages. An inquiry took place in 1829, when the late Lord Hardinge and the Duke of Wellington gave valuable evidence; and another inquiry took place in 1849. The result of these inquiries was that it was found absolutely necessary that gun carriages should be built under Government superintendence. It was impossible to tell by any mere test, after a gun carriage was constructed, whether it would stand the work required of it on service; yet the breaking down of a gun carriage on the march or in the field was so important as to involve sometimes the loss of an action, sometimes even of a campaign. It was, therefore, necessary that every part of a gun carriage should be made under the eye of the Government officials. The fourth department was the laboratory. The standing rule in former days with reference to these stores was to purchase of contractors, with the exception of articles not generally marketable. The establishment originally was at first small, and the whole outlay upon it did not exceed £6,000 or £7,000 a year. Then came the invention of percussion as applicable to small arms. It was found that if the Government bought percussion caps in the open market, the contractors adulterated them for the sake of making a greater profit, so that they could not be relied upon, and thenceforward they were manufactured in the laboratory. In 1847-8, improvements were made in fusees and shells, and it was found that the work required such minute accuracy that it was necessary to make them in the Government laboratory. Since the Crimean war further improvements had been made in fusees, rockets, and shells, and these were also consequently made in the laboratory. The principle having always been for the Government to enter into contracts for anything that could be bought in the open market, but to manufacture those articles for which there was no demand, and which required to be watched in the process of manufacture, it naturally followed that as the requirements in these matters increased, the work to be done in the Royal laboratory also increased. It was true also that the cost of the Government gun manufacture had increased enormously, but it was only of late years that the improvements in the art of war rendered it necessary to spend such large sums of money. When Sir William Armstrong produced his gun, there was not a manufacturer in England who could make it. Some years afterwards, Mr. Whitworth got up the Manchester Ordnance Company, and brought out a rival gun, and steel shells were now made at Sheffield; but there was still no competition in such matters to counterbalance the value of the Royal gun factory. One word in regard to the accounts of these departments, and the position of the superintendents. An artillery officer was appointed to undertake the supervision of one of these departments, just as he might be sent to take the command of a brigade. It was part of his profession, and all he had to do with the figures was to render an account to the War Office of the sums he received and the manner in which they had been expended. These officers knew nothing *ex officio* of the value of the plant, the amount that ought to be charged to capital, and the interest of money. Those were matters appertaining to accounts of bygone years registered at the War Office, and for the War Office to calculate.

Mr. LAIRD said, that having sat for two years on the Ordnance Committee, he was surprised to hear the statement of the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington), because it came out before the Committee that the members of the Government were strongly of opinion that the

Woolwich accounts were not reliable. He thought the hon. Member for Rochdale was correct when he said that we could not ascertain the cost of ships built in the dockyards; and unless we could do this all comparison as to the relative expense of public and private yards was fallacious. The noble Lord the Secretary of the Admiralty had declared the adherence of the department to wooden ships. One great cause of expenditure was this preference on the part of the Admiralty. As he built the first iron ship for the navy, he had much pleasure in saying that she was now twenty-four years old, and was at the present moment doing good service in the African squadron. The total amount voted for dockyards in the present Estimates, exclusive of engines and contract work, was about £3,000,000. The cost of management of the dockyards was about £134,000. The Admiralty were only building at the present moment in the dockyards six iron-cased ships, at a total estimated cost complete of £1,287,000. They were only building six wooden ships, at a cost of £107,000. There was thus a total expenditure for 1864-5 of £3,000,000, and estimating the expenditure during the coming year on iron-cased and wooden ships at £1,000,000, leaves about £2,000,000 to be accounted for, and which must go in repairs, alterations, refittings, &c. It was persevering in building wooden ships after the Governments of other countries were convinced of the superiority of iron, that caused so much waste and so large an expenditure. He believed that there would be an advantage in having fast sailing vessels like the *Alabama*, but he would remind the House that that vessel was totally destroyed in her action with the *Kearsarge* by the bursting of a single shell in her side. Had she been an iron vessel a shell would have done comparatively little damage. This showed that we should suffer some terrible disaster if we sent out wooden three-deckers to engage ships armed with the powerful artillery which was now coming into use. It would be much better to spend a million of money in graving docks upon our foreign stations, so as to enable us to dock and clean the bottoms of iron vessels. He could not go the entire length his hon. Friend the Member for Rochdale did with regard to our naval establishments. He was of opinion that it was desirable to build and repair in public yards, and also to build and repair in private yards. Both in the Committee of which he was a member and elsewhere he had always advocated the extension of the dockyards at Chatham, Portsmouth, and Plymouth. In time of war we could not do without large docks at those places, and in time of peace we suffered great loss from the want of proper dock and basin accommodation there, and the consequent necessity of fitting vessels in the stream. He believed that the *Achilles*, the first iron ship which the Admiralty had built, had cost the country £20,000 or £30,000 more than she would have done if she could have been fitted in a dock or basin. At the same time, he agreed with the hon. Member for Finsbury (Sir Morton Peto) in desiring the abolition of Deptford, Woolwich, and Pembroke Dockyards, which cost the country in management £40,000 a year. On the Thames there were plenty of private graving docks in which ships might be either repaired or constructed. In the Bristol Channel, at Cardiff, or Swansea, there was also good dock accommodation, and on the Mersey there were plenty of docks for the repair of ships. No man in the country could say what would be the time required to repair iron-cased ships, if damaged in action; but, at all events, it would be cheaper to send the ships where the labour was to be had than to bring the labour to them. If in time of peace both building and repairs were done in private yards, a number of firms would be accustomed to do work as it was done in the Government dockyards, and thus the resources of the country in war time would be doubled. The same rule might be adopted in regard to this matter as was acted upon in the case of the construction of engines, and only those firms might be permitted to do the work which could in time of war give the graving dock and other accommodation which would be required by the country. He hoped that the Admiralty would seriously consider the question of disposing of the three smaller yards he had mentioned, because if the £40,000 a year which they cost was capitalized, it would go far to defray the expense of making the other and more important dockyards all that we required.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he was anxious to express his thanks to the hon. Member for Rochdale for having brought forward this Motion, because it was obvious that the enormous extension of the Government establishments was gradually entailing upon the Government and the House the difficulties of monopoly. If the discussion had proved nothing else it had shown that all comparisons which the Returns laid before the House which pretended to institute between the cost of arms produced at Enfield and those manufactured by the trade were fallacious, because the same elements of cost were not included in both cases. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Limerick (Mr. Monsell) had had the audacity to allude to the circumstances that had characterized the supply of arms before and at the commencement of the Crimean war; he appeared to have forgotten that the mode in which the contracts for small arms were at that time conducted under his administration as Secretary for the Board of Ordnance was inquired into by a Committee in the year 1854, and that the result of that investigation was the breaking up of the late Ordnance establishment. For two years previous to 1854, only 22,000 small arms were ordered, a demand so limited as to have disorganized the trade; and then suddenly there was a large demand. In that year £34,000 was recommended by the Committee on Small Arms, and voted by the House for the enlargement and improvement of the Enfield establishment; but, far from being satisfied with this amount, a far larger sum, misappropriated from the Commissariat Vote, was spent upon the Enfield establishment by the Government, and yet during the war only 26,000 stand of arms were produced. Before the commencement of 1854 it was stated that the private trade could only be relied upon to make 50,000 stand of arms a year; but in less than two years it produced 272,000 stand. Those interested in the Enfield establishment were so infatuated with the belief that the natural resources of the trade of this country could not be trusted, that they sent for arms to Liège, St. Etienne, and the United States; but during the Crimean war not a single rifle was obtained from any of those places. Hon. Members appeared to discountenance the hon. Member for Rochdale's Motion, on the ground that it was impossible to rely on the arms trade of England for a supply of arms, and we had established the Enfield factory which had cost between £300,000 and £400,000. From year to year the arms trade of this country had been led on by the delusive hope that they were to be allowed to compete in the supply of their manufactures on fair terms, and Birmingham had in consequence been induced to establish a large factory with all the appliances of Enfield. It would, however, appear from the tone of the debate, that it was highly probable that no order for the supply of arms would be sent to Birmingham, so that the assurances on which the expenditure there had been based would not be adequately fulfilled. He rejoiced at the same time to say that the expense to which the Birmingham Company had gone was not likely to be thrown away, for if the Government of England declined to avail themselves of the private enterprize of the country, foreign nations had not yet arrived at the conclusion that the arms provided by the trade were unworthy of use. The result might, however, be that the Government might find the English manufacturers engaged in the execution of foreign contracts at a moment when we would stand greatly in need of their services.

Mr. COBDEN rose, apparently with the intention of replying, when

Mr. SPEAKER reminded the hon. Gentleman that he had already spoken.

Mr. COBDEN: Then I shall put myself in order by moving an Amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has moved an Amendment, and cannot move another.

CASE OF MR. O'MALLEY IRWIN.

OBSERVATIONS.

Sir FITZROY KELLY said, he wished to call the attention of the House to the case of Mr. O'Malley Irwin, and to submit that it is the duty of Her Majesty's Government to inquire into that case, with a view to the affording of redress to Mr. Irwin. Though the case had occurred thirty years ago, yet if this gentleman had been unjustly treated he considered that it was the bounden duty of the Government to remedy the injustice under which this gentleman had suffered.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that the circumstances of the case had occurred thirty years ago, and that all the persons who could throw light on it, except Mr. Irwin himself, were dead. In the year 1835 Mr. Irwin was twice tried, on the criminal charge of forging a letter from Mr. Johnstone, a revising barrister. The jury believed that the letter was a forgery, and convicted Mr. Irwin. On the second trial Mr. Johnstone was put into the box, and Mr. Irwin did not cross-examine him. Since then Mr. Irwin had presented several petitions of right, alleging misconduct against the Law Officers of the Crown, but not calling for inquiry. He (the Attorney General) could not promise any action on the part of the Crown, unless Mr. Irwin petitioned that House for inquiry, when it would be competent for the House to declare the course it would take.

MR. HENNESSY said, he believed that this was a case in which the grossest injustice had been done. [The hon. Member read several documents in support of the Motion.]

Question put, and *agreed to.*

House adjourned at Two o'clock, till Monday next.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Saturday, July 23, 1864.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report*—Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 151).

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Contagious Diseases* (No. 234); Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* (No. 236); Corn Accounts and Returns* (No. 238); Westminster Bridge Traffic* (No. 240); Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment* (No. 241); Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* (No. 215).

Committee—Highways Act Amendment* (Nos. 227 & 228); Railway Companies Powers* (No. 230); Thames Conservancy* (No. 226); Bank Notes, &c., Signature* (No. 217); Bleaching and Dyeing Works Act Extension* (No. 213); Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000)* (No. 224).

Report—Bank Notes, &c., Signature* (No. 217); Bleaching and Dyeing Works Act Extension* (No. 213); Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000)* (No. 224).

Third Reading—Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c.* (No. 219); Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex)* (No. 244), and *passed.*

Their Lordships met; and having gone through the business on the Paper without debate,

House adjourned at half past Two o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Four o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, July 25, 1864.

MINUTES.]—*Sat First in Parliament*—The Viscount Gordon, after the Death of his Father.

SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report*—Judgments, &c., Law Amendment (No. 194); Local Government Supplemental (No. 2) (No. 190).

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* (No. 247).

Second Reading—Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension* (No. 231); Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues* (No. 232); Consolidated Fund Appropriation (£15,000,000)* (No. 54); New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan) (No. 233); Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2) (No. 235); Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) (No. 237); Poor Removal (No. 239); Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* (No. 216); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental* (No. 221); West Indian Incumbered Estates Act Amendment* (No. 225).

Committee—Expiring Laws Continuance* (No. 208); Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation* (No. 151); Contagious Diseases* (No. 234); Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* (No. 236); Corn Accounts and Returns* (No. 238); Westminster Bridge Traffic* (No. 240); Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment* (No. 241).

Report—Harwich Harbour Act Amendment* (No. 210); Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* (No. 215); Judgments, &c., Law Amendment* (No. 194); Railway Companies Powers* (No. 230); Contagious Diseases* (No. 234); Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* (No. 236); Corn Accounts and Returns* (No. 238); Westminster Bridge Traffic* (No. 240); Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment* (No. 241); Thames Conservancy* (No. 226); Railways Construction Facilities* (No. 222).

Third Reading—Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* (No. 214); Registration of Deeds (Ireland)* (No. 218); Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal* (No. 212); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* (No. 211); Bank Notes, &c., Signature* (No. 217); Bleaching and Dyeing Works Act Extension* (No. 242); Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000)* (No. 224), and *passed.*

Royal Assents—Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 56];

Valuation of Rateable Property (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 52];

Penal Servitude Acts Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 47];

India Office [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 51];

Summary Procedure (Scotland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 53];

Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 54];

Factory Acts Extension [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 48];

Indemnity [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 49];

India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 50];

Street Music (Metropolis) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 55];

Lunacy (Scotland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 59];

Admiralty Lands and Works [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 57];

Pilotage Order Confirmation [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 58];

Public and Refreshment Houses [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 64];

Clerks of the Peace Removal [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 65];

Militia Ballots Suspension [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 63];

College of Physicians [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 60];

Trespass (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 67];

Militia Pay [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 69];

Local Government Act (1858) Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 68];

Cathedral Minor Corporations [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 70];

Railways (Ireland) Acts Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 71];
Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 72];
Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 61];
Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 62];
Inclosure (No. 2) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 66].

DENMARK.

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO TREATIES.

LORD CAMPBELL* said: My Lords, I trust that I shall not oppose the wishes of the House in now proceeding with my notice, in spite of that which has been given by a noble Earl over the way, and which opens a wider field in regard to foreign policy. I should have been inclined to withdraw mine, although his was subsequently given and stands for a later day, were it not that such a course would deprive a noble Marquess near me (the Marquess of Clanricarde), long versed in these affairs, of the latest opportunity for discussing our present situation. My Lords, it will be easy to explain the question I propose to put, as to whether the Treaty of 1852 and the older Treaties relative to Schleswig have any further international validity, and the Motion I submit for recent correspondence on the subject. According to a general impression, the reverses and the losses our diplomacy has suffered impose some line of action, or at least suggest it, to redeem our credit, to reinstate our influence, and to indemnify the Continent to the greatest possible extent for the evils our discomfiture has lately brought upon it. But until these treaties are in some degree considered and disposed of, no such compensating line appears feasible or open. They bind us to uphold a past or at least an evanescent situation, and do not well admit of our being parties to a new one. They pledge us to sustain a fabric which is crumbling, and hardly seems to warrant us in building on the vacancy. At the same time, my Lords, it is far from my intention to disparage them. The proposition I have hazarded—namely, that a new line of action is required, would rather make it logical and just to dwell upon their gravity. The clearest ground for the necessity of diplomatic and political repair is that in the torrent of events we have departed from engagements not to be denied, and hitherto held sacred. As regards the Treaty of 1852, which is so familiar, nothing need be said, except that its apparent ruin is a serious disparagement to the country under whose auspices it came into existence, and by whom it has been so frequently and ineffectually appealed to. The gravity of those treaties by which the Duchy of Schleswig has been guaranteed to Denmark is based on more than one consideration. Although they date from 1720 they also date from 1814. It is a fallacy to think that they are buried like an ancient temple in the dust which ages heap upon it. At the end of the great war, the Treaty of Kiel revived and re-established them. Besides this, in 1826, Great Britain recognized and acted on treaties identical in scope, in character and circumstances. Mr. Canning, in defending the British expedition to the Tagus, stood upon two guarantees of Portugal—given, one in 1661, the other in 1703, and of which both were re-established at the Treaty of Vienna. It will thus be seen by your Lordships that the guarantees of Schleswig were coeval in their second birth with those of Portugal, and less remote in their original concession. The principle of Mr. Canning with regard to those of Portugal went to the extent that the faith and honour of the country were involved in their observance, no matter how great the risk it might contain, no matter how doubtful or minute the British interest connected with it. Mr. Canning, in his famous speech of December, 1826, was not the leader of a party only, but the organ of an empire. The country acted on the doctrine he advanced, and took a measure which, although it ended in the quick and bloodless victory of right, might have embroiled us not only with Spain, but France, and the three despotic Powers which impelled them against Portugal. If, therefore, and the point will hardly be contested, the guarantees of Portugal and the guarantees of Schleswig stand on the same basis, the indirect acknowledgment which the last received in 1826 was brilliant and emphatic. No English politician can see Schleswig torn from Denmark without the same regret, at least the same humiliation he would feel if Portugal was conquered. He must desire a compensation and a balance for a result by which the credit of Great Britain is so injuriously altered. But the lapse of treaties and oblivion of engagements is not the only ground for seeking a new policy. The general position of the Continent can hardly fail to offer us another. We cannot help observing every tendency and movement which Great Britain would desire to avert. We see France—to avoid all exaggeration—colder than she used to be. We see Russia and the German Powers obviously combining. If they were not combined, could Denmark have been trampled on? Do you believe the German Powers would have ventured on that course had Russia actively discountenanced it? If they had not combined, could Poland have been cast into a deeper tomb than that which formerly compressed her? If they had not combined, would Austria have been detached from the path on which a year ago it was the triumph of the Foreign Office to have set her, and from which she has relapsed into the ancient mire she had quitted? We see upon the Continent—these are facts which cannot be disputed—the objects of the country baffled, and her remonstrances despised. Let any one compare in foreign policy the Britain of 1815, or that of 1826, or that of 1841, with that of the present moment, and he must be tempted to indulge in terms which I, in order to avoid the semblance of heat, shall studiously refrain from. But what, my Lords, enhances the regret and adds to the desire of reparation; in any foreign capital we should hear something of the errors from which the situation had arisen. In Copenhagen we should hear that the despatch of September, 1862, had lent an impulse to the German movement which never afterwards subsided. This very day, a well-known journal has a letter from that city, alleging, what indeed we knew before, that its inhabitants attribute to that despatch the tide of evils which engulfs them. At Paris we should be informed that the obstacles presented by Great Britain to the Congress in November had altered the alliance, had estranged the Emperor, at the very moment when the death of the King of Denmark and the impending crisis made such consequences doubly alarming. And will any one at present venture to assert that the latent and contingent inconveniences, which, perhaps, resided in the project of a Congress, outweighed the broad and palpable calamities which its refusal has inflicted upon Europe. At St. Petersburg we should be told of the delusion which led our Foreign Office to count on Russia in the autumn, when our conduct on the Polish question had excited her resentment; when the Russian and the German objects were identical upon the Baltic; when the necessity and policy of Russia was to exchange support and succour both at Berlin and Vienna. In any capital the English traveller would hear that to insist upon the Conference without preliminary measures to support it was to run into inevitable failure. It was said before the Conference began—and this will be admitted—that success alone can vindicate a measure which at the outset all the world condemns as idle for its purpose. If it is true, my Lords, after a brief and unimpassioned view of what has happened, that our treaties have been sacrificed; if it is true that our objects have been baffled, and also that our errors are conspicuous, I venture to maintain that a desire must suggest itself for something in the nature of an indemnifying policy. To rescue Denmark is assumed to be impossible. But the fragment of that kingdom cannot stand alone without the territory which we have not been able to secure to it. It is hardly requisite to show that a nation composed of North Jutland and the Islands, reduced in population and revenue, no longer leading on the Baltic, without a military frontier, assailable by Germany from Schleswig, assailable by Germany on the sea coast, and at the same time the object of its wishes, would not be able to maintain itself. Eventually it must become absorbed in Germany, unless a Scandinavian union happens to preserve it. Both in Sweden and in Denmark a considerable party are known to lean to such an union. If the Treaty of 1852 is gone, dynastic circumstances favour it. Before now its advantages to Europe have been stated. But they are summed up in the jealousy with which—as the despatches before your Lordships show—it is regarded at St. Petersburg. What inspires that jealousy? A Scandinavian union could not act aggressively on Russia. Its population could not go beyond 10,000,000, while that of Russia, as your Lordships well know, is 70,000,000. The jealousy arises from the fact, and only from the fact, that such an union would retard the growth of Russian power on the Baltic. While Russia menaces the East, defies the Treaty of Vienna, detaches Austria from the wholesome concert in which the Western Powers had succeeded in engaging her, it is not our policy to encourage her maritime ambition on the Baltic. On the contrary, it seems to be our policy to check it. No doubt, my Lords, the union of the Scandinavian countries could not be promoted except by France and Great Britain cordially co-operating. Such a line could only be pursued with tenderness to vested rights, to popular ideas, and diplomatic complications. It could only be pursued by cautious steps and well concerted movements. But before it is denounced as visionary or irrelevant, your Lordships ought to glance at the alternative. The alternative contains a series of intelligible evils. When Denmark lapses altogether into Germany, you have to bear the unmitigated triumph of that false and hypocritical aggression, which has shocked us; the no less complete humiliation of the power whose diplomacy endeavoured to restrain it; the aggrandisement of Russia in the Baltic through her influence on Germany; the defencelessness of Sweden no longer fortified by Denmark; the right of any country strong enough to kindle war in Europe when its balance had so materially altered; the general decline of public law after the blows it would receive and the encroachments it would suffer in the event I am supposing. But whether or not we ought to favour Scandinavian union as the best result of the misfortunes which have happened to ourselves and to the world—dismissing altogether such a topic—it is still essential to determine the operation of the treaties which the notice has referred to. Were it our policy to make Denmark German, or to sustain her weak, denuded, and dismantled in her islands, the question would not be irrelevant. No line of action seems to be legitimate until we understand the manner in which the treaties bear upon us. It would be satisfactory, no doubt, if the Government would say that they continued to acknowledge them, that combinations might be yet formed for giving them effect, that it was not too late to rescue Denmark, and recover our honour. Such language all would hail, and nobody anticipates. It would be admissible, although not a source of pride, if the Government declared that overruling circumstances rendered it impossible to execute the treaties: that their utility was gone, and that the ground was cleared for a line of action they had hitherto debarred us from. But to connive at them, ignore them, hush them up; at one time to call them immaterial because the *casus fœderis* has not arisen, and when it has disastrously occurred to bury them in silence; to pretend that we are ready to enforce the guarantee of Prussian Saxony, while that of Schleswig perishes without apology before us, is inadmissible, derogatory to the Crown, and not to be encouraged by the Legislature. That course the Government will now have the opportunity of quitting. I will not detain your Lordships but move for the Correspondence I have asked for.

Moved,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Copies of any recent Correspondence relating to the Treaties between Denmark and Great Britain."

Earl GRANVILLE: My Lords, I do not think it necessary to follow my noble Friend in that part of his speech which relates to the position which this country holds in Europe. That subject has recently been ably discussed in both Houses of Parliament, and both Houses came to a decision upon it. To re-open that question would, to use a vulgar phrase, be like "serving mustard after dinner." I believe it would neither tend to promote the interests of the public service nor to advance the dignity of this House. The question, however, which the noble Lord has put is one of very considerable importance. The noble Lord asks whether the Treaty of 1720, with the additional sanction which it received from the Treaty of 1814, is still obligatory. The noble Lord stated that the validity of our ancient treaties with Portugal was recognized by Mr. Canning in 1826. But the facts of the two cases are perfectly dissimilar. We had had no war with Portugal to put an end to those treaties, but with Denmark we had had hostilities; and it is not only my opinion, but the opinion also of the Law Officers of the Crown, that the obligations of the Treaty of 1720 were put an end to by the war. The Treaty of Kiel, in 1814, prevented that treaty from having any force or obligation on this country. With regard to the Treaty of 1852; it contained no guarantee of any sort; and although the preamble showed the importance which the great Powers of Europe attached at that time to the independence and integrity of Denmark, yet the only obligations imposed upon this country, in common with the other signitaries, was to acknowledge the succession as settled by that treaty. This we willingly and readily did as soon as the occasion presented itself. With regard to the present position of that treaty, on going into the Conference we found that we were the only nation who were satisfied to adhere to the treaty. Under those circumstances it became necessary to join with our co-signitaries in agreeing to certain modifications of that treaty; and no doubt to that extent the treaty has been modified.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE doubted whether the noble Earl had quite correctly represented the fact as to the Treaty of Kiel, because he was under the impression that that treaty renewed all others which had been entered into with respect to Denmark. However, as we were not to support our opinions by force, he was glad that we were to have no more protocols about the Treaty of 1720. He was sorry to hear from his noble Friend that the Treaty of 1852 was still to be considered in force.

EARL GRANVILLE explained that he had stated the very reverse. He said that in the Conference the British Government finding themselves alone in their adherence to that treaty, had thought it politic to join with their co-signitaries in agreeing to certain modifications of it.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE should then like to know what were the modifications which were agreed upon—because in the papers which had been produced there was no mention of any agreement as to modification. He regretted that there should be any agreement the effect of which might be to draw us into Conferences upon this subject again, either at Vienna or elsewhere; because he attached no importance to any conference or negotiations into which we might enter after a declaration more or less openly avowed that, come what might, we would not enforce our views or opinions as to the rights or obligations which were imposed upon other Powers either by the public law of Europe or by special treaties. [Earl GRANVILLE: I said nothing about going into another Conference.] He (the Marquess of Clanricarde) knew that, but he was afraid from what his noble Friend had said, and from other circumstances, that there was such a risk. When his noble Friend the Secretary for Foreign Affairs was good enough to attend that House and take part in their debates, he told them that no faith could be placed in the declarations of Austria, because she had not the power to control either her allies or her subjects, or to overcome contingencies which must force her to depart from her engagements. Should not that circumstance of itself act as a warning to prevent our entering into any more Conferences upon this subject? His noble Friend had in his speeches talked a good deal about moral influence; but moral influence was only effective when it was known that you were ready to support your views by force. If they were not prepared to do so he entreated the Government to go into no more Conferences. They had greatly injured the power of Denmark by the course which they had already taken, and no interference on their part would do her any good unless they were prepared to say that in certain cases, or in some case, or in any case, they were prepared to assert their opinions by force. He had as great a horror of revolution as any man, but it was better than total loss of liberty or submission to a foreign yoke. The revolutionists at present were not the Democrats but the Sovereigns. Could there be a greater revolutionist than he who now sat upon the throne of Prussia? A revolution had been effected in that country, and in order to carry it out and put down the constitution the King had not hesitated to invade Denmark.

LORD CAMPBELL, in reply, stated that according to Dr. Twiss in his well known work on the Danish Duchies, the Treaty of Kiel revived all our former treaties of amity with Denmark, and among them the guarantee of 1720. The controversy was between the noble Lord the President of the Council upon the one hand and Dr. Twiss upon the other. Since all parties in the State had acknowledged the guarantees in 1848, Dr. Twiss could not be denied to have the balance of authority. At the same time he (Lord Campbell) admitted that if the guarantees were not enforced, it was better for the country and the world they should not be held valid.

Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

NEW ZEALAND (GUARANTEE OF LOAN) BILL—(No. 233.)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

EARL GRANVILLE, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, he thought it was, as a general rule, undesirable that this country should guarantee loans raised for colonial purposes. Such a course must tend, in his opinion, to encourage a large increase in the expenditure of a colony. At the same time, it was impossible for the mother country to divest herself entirely of responsibility for her colonies, especially in case of war; and the circumstances of the present case were so exceptional and so strong, that he thought it impossible for their Lordships to refuse their assent to this Bill. With regard to the origin and commencement of the war now being waged in New Zealand, he believed it to be a just war, for there could be no doubt that the immediate cause of it was the murder of British subjects by the Maories. The struggle which ensued had been a very severe one, and there could be no doubt that in the struggle the colonists had greatly exerted themselves. There was, he believed, no foundation for the charge that they had supplied arms and ammunition to the Natives, to be used against themselves and us. No doubt, in a free country, and in peaceable times, the Natives had had abundant opportunities of providing themselves with arms; but it was utterly incredible that at a time when the whole male population of the colony were combined against the Natives, that any portion of them would be allowed by the rest to furnish arms to the insurgents to be used against themselves. In consequence of the expenses occasioned by the war, and the consequences of the disturbed state of things, the colony were compelled to have recourse to a loan; but they experienced great difficulty in obtaining it, and they then applied to the Government for a guarantee. One of the great objections, so far as he had been able to ascertain, against the proposed guarantee was founded on the alleged insufficiency of the resources of the colony, but, after the most careful consideration of the point, both on the part of the Colonial Office and the Treasury, the conclusion had been arrived at that the security was satisfactory. The revenue of the colony was largely increasing, and although no doubt the expenditure was also increasing, yet on a comparison of the ordinary income with the ordinary expenditure, there was a surplus of revenue of £260,000; and besides the ordinary revenue there was a large sum derived annually from the sale of waste lands. Moreover, and above the advantage of assisting the colony in its difficulty, there would be this further advantage in giving the Imperial guarantee asked for by the Bill, that the mother country would receive out of the loan to be raised the immediate repayment of the sum of £500,000, in which the colony was already indebted to us. He did not attach much importance to this, except in one respect—that it at once wiped away a cause of irritation between the mother country and the colony which had at various times been found to be exceedingly inconvenient. With respect to the termination of the war, he could only say that the Government were anxious that it should be brought to a close at the earliest possible moment; and, to that end, they had by their last despatch invested Sir George Grey with summary powers over the movements of the troops in New Zealand; and Governor Sir George Grey, in writing on the subject on the 7th of April last, said—

> "I can have no hesitation in saying that the wishes and instructions of his Grace the Duke of Newcastle impose on me as a duty that which is entirely in consonance with my own feelings and with yours—namely, that I should instantly listen to any reasonable overtures that the Natives in arms may make, and that I should avail myself of any opportunity that offers of obtaining permanent peace for this colony. I am quite confident that general public opinion in this country will support me in taking this course and would expect me to do so. With regard to the confiscation of portions of the lands of the Natives now in arms, this point has to be considered—that mercy requires that future contests between the two races should in as far as practicable be prevented, and that there are many tribes in New Zealand who have taken no part in the present lamentable conflicts, yet who might hereafter be led into similar acts; while nothing would more certainly lead to the extermination of the Native race than a series of contests such as that which is now being carried on. The object of the local Government, therefore, has been to secure to that numerous part of the Native population who have taken no active share in the present war the whole of their landed possessions, and also by laws passed expressly for this object, to give to the lands held by such Natives a value greater than they have previously had for their owners, by in all respects giving them equal rights in their landed possessions with those enjoyed by their European fellow-subjects, the intention in this respect being to show that the rights of peaceable citizens of whatever race are carefully respected, and to give the Natives so valuable a stake in the country that they are not likely hereafter to regard it lightly. On the other hand, it was thought necessary by an example to show that those who rose in arms against their fellow-subjects of another race, suffered such a punishment for doing so as might deter others from embarking in a similar career. It is therefore proposed to deprive such persons of a considerable portion of their landed properties, and to provide for the future safety of the colony by occupying such lands with an European population. But even in the case of these persons it is intended

that sufficient lands shall be reserved for themselves and their descendants, to be held on the same tenure as lands are henceforth to be secured to the rest of the Native population. That these measures will be carried out in a spirit of liberal generosity and mercy I earnestly hope, and will do my best to insure, and I believe that I shall be supported by a large majority in this colony."

The despatch of his right hon. Friend at the head of the Colonial Office giving the general support of the Home Government to the policy would, he believed, enable Sir George Grey to carry out his liberal and just scheme in a manner which would have the effect of securing permanent peace for the colony.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord President.*)

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY said, he had not intended to make any observations on the Bill, but in the absence of his noble Friend the Earl of Carnarvon, who took a great interest in the subject, he could not allow the Bill to pass without making a few observations on the nature of the proposal. The apologetical tone in which the noble Earl had introduced the Bill, was certainly by no means misplaced, for a more questionable measure had never come before Parliament. The feeling of the country had been unmistakably manifested against the principle of the Bill, and there was now firmly established in the public mind a complete conviction that a colony, when once it had arrived at a certain point of power and prosperity ought to defend itself against its natural enemies, and ought not to call on the mother country for the aid of Imperial troops. With respect to Canada, we could not too soon persuade the people of that country that it was impossible for them to obtain Imperial assistance in the way of English troops. If they were attacked by the Indians, or by their neighbours of the same race with themselves, they were now strong enough, prosperous enough, and populous enough to do without British troops, and any help which they asked from us must be in the way of naval assistance and guns and materiel of war; but they ought to find their own men, and defend their own frontier. The same principle applied to New Zealand. There certainly were no restless aggressive elements in Canada, but the same compliment could not be paid to the Government of New Zealand. Colonists of New Zealand had obtained from this country powers of self-government, and since then they had kept up a constant quarrel with the Natives. They had done nothing to reconcile the Natives to their rule, and if they became engaged in consequence in a war with the Natives—which should be regarded in the light of a civil war—they ought to learn how to take care of themselves, and not to call on this country for some 10,000 or 12,000 soldiers, thus draining our small army, and staving off the retribution for their mismanagement at our expense. If they had had themselves to pay and to bleed for their own defence, we should have heard very little of the present difficulties, and when people had to pay their own expenses, the amount was far less than if they could send in their bills to other parties for payment. There was another point with respect to the defence of the colonies by our troops. He saw no reason why British soldiers alone should be sent to carry on these colonial wars. The Romans did not send Italian soldiers into Syria, Britain, or any of their colonies; they sent the troops of the countries which they had conquered and occupied, and in the same way he never could understand why some of our Indian regiments, the Sikh regiments, should not be employed in our colonial wars. He looked on this Bill as an encouragement to all colonies in the same position as New Zealand to quarrel with the Natives, and get up little wars of which they were sure not to bear the burden. He had no wish to divide the House against the Bill, but he looked upon it as a most impolitic measure, and was astonished how it could have received the assent of the House of Commons. He believed that if the public purse were in the hands of their Lordships instead of in the hands of the House of Commons, a much more economical system would be adopted. The House of Commons was by far too generous in many respects, and it sanctioned many things which never would have passed their Lordships. He thought this war in New Zealand was unholy and unjust, and that every drop of blood shed and every guinea spent upon it was wasted.

LORD LYVEDEN said, he believed there was a pretty general concurrence in the principle laid down by the noble Earl (the Earl of Malmesbury), that every colony should bear its own expenses; but though this principle was undoubtedly sound, the difficulty lay in the application of it; and he would take the liberty of reminding their Lordships that every successive Colonial Secretary had, in his own despite, been dragged into a colonial war, with all its attendant cost. The noble Earl suggested the employment of Indian troops in New Zealand; but did the noble Earl mean to saddle the Indian exchequer with the cost? He was afraid that this important measure had not been sufficiently considered. It was introduced to the House of Commons at a very late period of the Session—so late, in fact, that a discussion was out of the question even in that House; and if their Lordships could, according to the rules of the House, discuss the measure—which he believed they were not able to do—there was not time for it. The only valuable part of the Bill was that which was not in it when it was introduced into the Commons. He alluded to the proviso at the end of the second clause, which provided that the guarantee should not come into operation until the Colonial Legislature had passed such measures as were required by the Secretary of State to secure the repayment of the loan, as well as the cost of the British troops employed in the colony. But this was a new clause. If the Bill had passed in its original shape it would have been quite possible that the Colonial Legislature might not have taken steps to provide for the repayment of the loan. The colony was at war. We said it was the war of the colonists; they said it was an Imperial war, produced by carrying out the measures of the Home Government, and compelling them to deal with the Natives in a particular manner of which they did not approve. The colonists added that they would not have been in their present unfortunate position if they had been left to themselves. Being in this state of distress, they sought a loan, which they asked the Home Government to guarantee. They wanted a loan of £3,000,000; and the Government consented to grant a guarantee for £1,000,000. What was to be done with regard to the other £2,000,000? The colonists said they found a difficulty in procuring a loan themselves. Doubtless there must be a difficulty in obtaining the money at 4½ per cent; but there would be no difficulty if they gave the market price, say of 7 per cent. We should adopt the principle of refusing to guarantee any loans whatever. We had refused to do so in the case of India, although we should have thereby saved to the Indian treasury a very large sum of money. It was unfair to say that the murders which had been the origin of this war could be traced to any other source than the question of land. Sir George Grey, in one of his despatches to the Duke of Newcastle, expressly said that if the colonists were resolved to take the lands of the Natives they must be prepared to abide by the consequences. He (Lord Lyveden) was of opinion that the war was not likely to be brought to a speedy conclusion, for but little had been done to mitigate the hostility between the Natives and the settlers. He quite agreed in thinking that guaranteeing the loan was guaranteeing everything that had been done by the settlers to the Natives, and, while the saving would be small, the loss in point of principle would be great. Everyone must regret the loss of life which had taken place, and they were told that the troops were utterly disgusted with the service on which they were engaged. That might or might not be true, but it was an awful responsibility for any one to incur to proceed with a war which it was believed at home could not be proved to be quite just, and which was certainly not one upon which this country would be justified in expending its resources. In the present state of the House it would be useless to divide against the Bill, but he thought it right to enter his protest.

THE DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE: My Lords, I cannot allow an observation which has just fallen from the noble Lord (Lord Lyveden)—namely, that the war is viewed with utter disgust by the British troops—to pass unnoticed. We all must regret the misfortune which has happened to a distinguished regiment; but I wish in the strongest manner to protest against the impression getting abroad that any of Her Majesty's troops, in whatever service they are employed, so long as they are employed by Her Majesty's Government, perform the service on which they are sent with the slightest disgust. Discipline and obedience constitute the means by which an army is held together and prevented from becoming a useless collection of men. It is the duty of the Government to decide on what service the troops shall be employed; and, as is well known, Parliament can dissent from any measure adopted by the Government; but it is the duty of the troops implicitly to obey any order and command they receive from those under whom they are placed. I firmly believe that there is no foundation for the impression that the cause of the misfortune which has recently occurred is that the troops did not like the service on which they were engaged. If there were the slightest foundation for such a suspicion, I should sincerely deplore that any of Her Majesty's troops should have become so undisciplined. I cannot concur in some of the observations which have fallen from the noble Earl (the Earl of Malmesbury). So long as this country possesses colonies it cannot be expected that the British troops shall not be employed in them, and I cannot imagine that the noble Earl meant to say that Indian troops would have behaved better than British troops.

Lord LYVEDEN explained that what he said was that he believed that an impression, however false, prevailed in the colony that the troops felt disgust with the service on which they were employed.

The Earl of MALMESBURY said, that in speaking respecting the employment of British troops in the colonies he had in mind that the colonies were of two descriptions. He never intended to suggest that we were not to employ British troops in Gibraltar, Bermudas, and Malta, which were not so much colonies as military stations. But when colonies had increased to such an extent of prosperity as to have 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 of inhabitants, it seemed hard that they should not find men enough to form regiments to defend themselves. He did not pretend to say that the Indian troops were superior to the English troops; but he was sure the illustrious Duke would agree with him that they were very good troops. He considered that the Sikhs might be made available for service in the colonies, and thus release the British troops for other service.

Earl DE GREY and RIPON said, he would not follow the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Malmesbury) into the very large question of the employment of British troops in our colonies. But there was one thing which he wanted to know, and that was, where the colony was to be found in which there were seven millions of inhabitants? When we arrived at that time in which colonies of ours should have such a large population, the whole question would have assumed a very different aspect. The question was a wide but was altogether one of relative population and wealth; but, at any rate, it could not be discussed in the present state of the House and of the Session. With regard to the war which had arisen in New Zealand, noble Lords had spoken as if it had its origin entirely in the policy, and was the fault of the Colonial Government, and as though the Natives were in no wise to blame. But such was not the case. The war had its origin in a cruel and cowardly murder committed upon a body of English troops passing from one station to another, who were surprised by an ambush, and two officers and seven men were killed and others wounded. That outrage took place, it should be remembered, after the arrival of Sir George Grey, a Governor in whom the Natives professed to have the greatest confidence, who had always been regarded as their friend, and who had been sent out after the outbreak of the previous war on account of the special qualifications which he possessed for the office. It was not, then, from any desire on the part of the Colonial Government to exterminate the Natives that this war had arisen. Under these circumstances, he did not think there was any one of their Lordships who would say that it was right to let such an outrage as that to which he had alluded pass unpunished. Measures were in consequence resorted to which led to general hostilities; but it was the desire of Her Majesty's Government to bring the hostilities to a conclusion at the earliest possible period. Noble Lords had talked as if Her Majesty's Government were determined to bear the whole expense of the war, to send out any number of British troops, and to leave the colonists to reap the benefits of supplying the commissariat. But that was not true. In the first place, the colonists bore a considerable portion of the expenditure; next, they had raised 10,000 volunteers who had served with credit in the field; and the illustrious Duke would bear him out when he said that their officers and men had been often mentioned with distinction in the despatches. The colonists were bearing the expenses of that force and various other charges incident to the war. Besides, the Colonial Secretary had lately given notice that, from the 1st of January of the next year, the colony would have to pay £45 a man for every one of our troops employed there, a payment calculated to cover the entire expenses of the troops. Under these circumstances, Her Majesty's Government were not open to the charge of being ready to expend the blood and treasure of this country for the objects of the colonists of New Zealand. But we ought not to have left our countrymen in that colony entirely without protection. He thought the course which had been adopted would bring the war to a speedy conclusion; because the colonists, if what noble Lords said was true, would, when they had to pay the whole expenses of the war, take measures to bring it to an end as soon as possible.

VISCOUNT STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE said, the Bill now before their Lordships had been brought from the House of Commons, and being a money Bill it was not competent for their Lordships to alter it. At the same time it was matter of surprise to hear the arguments put forward on both sides of the House—first, on the side of the Government, who entered into a protest against the application of the principle, while his noble Friend opposite (the Earl of Malmesbury) not only protested against the application of the principle, but was decidedly opposed to the measure itself. Now, it was a painful thing to one holding an independent position in that House, to observe so often a contradiction between the principle enunciated and its application; and he must say it would be far better for the honour of that House and the interests of the country if greater harmony was observed between the two. Now, if there was one principle more clear than another, it was that where a colony had been allowed by Act of Parliament to have a Constitution and Legislature of its own it ought at least to incur the expenses consequent on managing its own affairs. Some assistance might, in the first instance, be accorded by the mother country in order to help the colony in getting into a proper condition; but it would not be too much for the mother country to expect after a short time that the charge of administering its own affairs and protecting itself should be borne by the colony. It was, however, a painful thing for any one who had the honour of his country at heart to hear doubts thrown out as to the capacity of this country to protect our colonies. If unfortunately it should happen at some future time, either from the increase of the power of other countries or the reduction of our own, that we should be reduced to the necessity of abandoning our colonies, there was no necessity for anticipating any such thing, and it was much to be regretted that those anticipations could have only the effect of adding to the chances of such an event. The interests of this country would be much better consulted by waiting until such circumstances should arise and then meeting the matter with calmness. He quite agreed with the illustrious Duke that any course which seemed to admit a choice on the part of troops employed in the field would be utterly subversive of discipline and most injurious to the country whose servants they were.

LORD TAUNTON said, that it was a folly to expect that we could give representative institutions to a colony, and yet protect the land of the Natives from encroachment. All the late difficulties in New Zealand might, in his opinion, be traced to the Treaty of Waitangi, which was a great mistake in every respect. The moment that we gave the colonists popular institutions—the moment we obliged the Governor of New Zealand to follow the advice of responsible Ministers, who were themselves dependent on the votes of the Assemblies—the Government at home was placed in a position of the utmost embarrassment with the Colonial Government, and was placed in a position with regard to the Natives which it was impossible to carry out. He had heard with the greatest gratification the statement of his noble Friend (Earl Granville), that Her Majesty's Government were doing all that could be expected in order to place all the parties in New Zealand on a more satisfactory footing. He should be sorry that the present opportunity should be lost without obtaining some guarantee from the colonists for the future security of the Natives. Sir George Grey was a friend of the Maories, and he was sure that everything that could be done by him would be done to remedy existing evils. It was very easy to say, leave the black men and the white men to settle matters between themselves. If any Government in this country were to do so, it would excite a cry of indignation from one part of this island to the other. He had heard declamations against the employment of British troops in the colonies, and it was undoubtedly right to encourage the colonists to fight for themselves; but it was utterly impossible to say that circumstances might not arise in a wide-spread empire like ours in which British soldiers might be usefully employed in the colonies for the interests of this country. His experience in colonial affairs satisfied him that a few British troops were often of essential service in a colony. At the time of the gold discoveries a very few English soldiers saved Australia from a state of things that would have been most disgraceful. In California, under similar circumstances, all law was set aside. But public opinion in this country would not have allowed such a state of affairs to arise in Australia. He could by no means agree with those who laid down the principle that, under no circumstances, should British soldiers be employed in our colonies. Averse as he was to the principle of giving the security of this country for loans to the colonies, there were, he thought, exceptional cases in which the credit of the Imperial Government might usefully step in to the relief of the colonists, and that without loss to this country. The Legislature had done this on similar occasions, and there were very few cases in which the mother country had lost by the guarantee, while a great deal of good had been done. He thought that if ever there was a case in which the assistance of the Imperial Government might be properly given this was one, and he would therefore support the Bill.

THE EARL OF ELLENBOROUGH said, that if he understood correctly the circumstances of the loan, and the new regulations with respect to the payment of troops, he could not understand how the various charges upon the colony could be met. He understood that the colony had now a surplus revenue of £200,000 a year. It was about to raise a loan of £3,000,000 —£1,000,000 upon the guarantee of this country, and £2,000,000 upon the credit of the colony. The colonists would have to pay upon the first loan at 4 per cent £40,000, and upon the remainder £120,000, making altogether an annual charge of £160,000, which would leave £40,000 clear surplus. But then, after the 1st of January next, the colony would be called upon to pay £45 a man for every British soldier employed there, making for 10,000 men a sum of £450,000 a year. This would leave a deficit of £400,000 a year from the 1st of next January.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE agreed with the Secretary for War that it was impossible to withdraw Her Majesty's troops under existing circumstances, and leave the colonists to bear the whole brunt of the present war. But a very serious question remained behind—what was to be the policy of this country when the present war was concluded? There were two distinct courses of policy—one, imitating the policy of our ancestors with respect to the North American colonists, to leave it to the settlers to deal with the Natives as they thought fit, and to leave it also to them to fight it out if any quarrel arose; or, on the other hand, the Imperial Government might take into their own hands the whole of the relations between the settlers and the Natives, placing the government of the colony in reference to dealings with the Natives under the command of the Colonial Secretary without any interference on the part of the Government of the colony. If they adopted the latter course they would necessarily have to support the Governor in the event of any dispute between the two races. He could conceive Her Majesty's Government adopting one or other of the two courses; but the Government did not seem to have made up their minds either to give the settlers control of their affairs in reference to the Natives, or to take the control themselves. Now if Her Majesty's Government halted between these two opinions and allowed the colonists to interfere to a certain extent, whilst the Imperial Government themselves also interfered somewhat, they would have the disadvantages of both systems and the advantages of neither. He must join in protesting against the guarantee being given, and for his part he would rather that a sum of money should be given to the colony than that the debt should be guaranteed.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY said, it was not always safe to leave these affairs in the hands of the colonists as our experience in North America showed. In North America the colonists waged a war of extermination with the Natives and the Red Indians, in which the Indians were shot down like kangaroos. That might be an economical system, but he doubted whether the country would allow it to be pursued in the present day. Each of these causes must be judged distinctly and on its own merits. In time of war the mother country could form alliances for its protection; but the colonists were not allowed to have allies, and we must, therefore—wisely and judiciously of course—give them assistance in periods of difficulty. He did not recollect that noble Lords opposite while they were in office proposed to throw all these burdens upon the colonists.

EARL GRANVILLE thought that the principles which had been laid down during this debate were excellent, provided that they were accompanied by certain checks; but that it was wrong to lay down those principles without any restriction whatever. As to what the noble Earl (the Earl of Ellenborough) had said in reference to financial matters, it must be borne in mind that it was not contemplated that the colonists should keep 10,000 troops there for an indefinite time; and one purpose of this loan was to provide for the extra expense incurred whilst the additional troops were there. It was proposed that £1,000,000 only should be borrowed at present; and it was to be hoped that there would be no occasion for the further loan of £2,000,000. This being so, he believed that the surplus revenue in the colony would be amply sufficient to pay the interest which was guaranteed.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

PILOTAGE ORDER CONFIRMATION (No. 2) BILL—(No. 235.)

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2.ª"—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

Lord REDESDALE opposed the Motion. The Bill was not introduced into the House of Commons until the 30th of June—the very day which, according to their Lordships Sessional Order, was the last upon which Bills should be read a second time. This Bill was to carry into effect certain regulations in reference to the Tyne, and persons interested in the matter had no opportunity of stating their objections to the Bill. If the Bill were pressed forward he did not think that justice would be done to those who desired to oppose it, and therefore he should vote against the second reading.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY observed, that the Provisional Orders upon which this Bill was founded had been well considered, and the parties objecting had had an opportunity of being heard. The Sessional Order fixing the time beyond which Bills should not be read a second time in their Lordships' House did not apply to a Bill of this kind. He thought the noble Lord had hardly treated him fairly in asking him to postpone the Bill from Friday until to-day, to give time for presenting petitions, and now opposing the Bill. As to the petitions which had been presented against the Bill, there was

plenty of time for the Select Committee to consider them in the usual course.

Viscount MELVILLE objected to the Bill being forced on without proper time being allowed.

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE thought that the Bill should have been introduced earlier into the other House.

The Marquess of CLANRICARDE felt that an useful measure ought not to be sacrificed upon a mere matter of form; but this being an important Bill, against which petitions had been presented, it certainly could not be fairly considered by a Select Committee sitting in the last week of the Session.

Earl GRANVILLE reminded their Lordships that he had promised, on the part of the Government, that they would not advise Her Majesty to prorogue Parliament this week, if the Select Committees of that House required a few days more to get through their business. The Government would not advise proceeding with the Bill if the Select Committee thought further time was required.

The Earl of HARROWBY thought that there was no excuse for this Bill not being brought up to their Lordships' House before Friday last, and he objected to their being called on to proceed in a hurry with it. He should like to know what excuse the Board of Trade had for not introducing this Bill earlier in the Session.

Lord REDESDALE admitted that the Sessional Order did not prevent this Bill being read a second time. It was his own fault that it did not. The Bill belonged to a class of Bills which, under the Act which gave power to the Board of Trade to introduce them, were to be treated in the same way as Private Bills, namely, by reference to a Select Committee. Inclosure and Board of Health Bills were under the Sessional Orders relating to Private Bills, and no doubt Pier and Harbour Bills ought to be included. He did not believe that the parties who were opposed to this Bill could receive justice if it were now proceeded with.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY thought, as Metropolitan Railway Bills had been considered in Committee up to that very day, there could be no reason against proceeding with this, which was essentially a public measure. There was no reason why a Select Committee should not do justice to the case of the petitioners.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY reminded the noble Lord that he had not informed the House why the Bill was brought in so late.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said, that it was often late in the Session before the parties interested could come to such an agreement among themselves as to apply to the Board of Trade to confirm an order. This Bill had been under discussion in the district to which it was to apply for the last six months.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE thought that justice required that the Bill should not be read a second time at that period of the Session.

Amendment *moved* to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months"): Question, That ("now") stand Part of the Motion? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative:*

Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed:* The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the Consideration of the said Bill. Select Committee *nominated:* The Lord Steward (Chairman), The Earl of Devon, The Earl of Romney, The Earl of Ducie, The Lord Silchester, *agreed to;* and the said Lords *appointed* accordingly: The Committee to meet *To-morrow,* at Eleven o'clock.

PUBLIC WORKS (MANUFACTURING DISTRICTS) BILL—(No. 237.)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord President.*)

THE EARL OF LEITRIM wished to know why the Government did not propose to assist public works in Ireland, especially as the blow which had fallen on the manufacturers of Lancashire had been felt with double severity in the sister country?

EARL GRANVILLE said, that when some years since great distress prevailed in Ireland this country cheerfully agreed to a large loan of money for public works in that country, but he believed that a large portion of it had not yet been repaid. This was not a grant of money, but a loan on excellent security.

THE EARL OF POWIS called attention to the rate of interest to be paid under the Bill. Since 1859 the rate of interest for money to be employed on public works that were executed not for profit, had been reduced by a Treasury Minute to 4 per cent, and he asked why in this case the interest required to be paid was only 3½ per cent?

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

POOR REMOVAL BILL—(No. 239.)

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Wodehouse.*)

LORD REDESDALE protested against the practice so frequently adopted with regard to Government Bills, of hurrying through important measures without allowing sufficient time for considering their provisions. The decision in the Queen's Bench that had rendered this Bill necessary was given on the 28th May, but this Bill was not introduced into the other House until after midnight on Monday last, the 18th July; it passed all its other stages after midnight; and was read a third time on Friday night; it was brought into their Lordships' House on Saturday, and was now to be read a second time tonight. The Poor Law Board ought to have brought the Bill in much earlier, so as to have allowed their Lordships more time for its consideration.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

PEERS ROBING ROOM.
THE FRESCOES IN THE NEW HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT.
MR. HERBERT, R.A.

LORD REDESDALE in moving an Address for

> Copy of the Report of the Commissioners lately appointed on the Fresco Paintings in the Palace of Westminster, and of a Letter addressed by Lord Redesdale to those Commissioners in relation to the continued Occupation of the Peers Robing Room for the purpose of such Paintings by which the Peers attending certain Committees have been so long subjected to great Inconvenience,

said, it would be in the recollection of the House that three years ago a Commission had been appointed to inquire into the manner in which a certain room appropriated to one of the Committees of the House had been kept from that use by being occupied by an artist who was decorating it. The Committee was very indulgent to the artist, and contented itself by expressing a hope that he would give up possession of the room at the earliest possible moment. Three years had since elapsed, and he had felt it his duty to call attention to the fact. He thought that the room should not be decorated by any more paintings. The artist, Mr. Herbert, had managed the lights with great skill on the wall which he had selected; but he believed that if any further paintings were placed on the other walls the arrangement of the light was such that they would not be seen to the same advantage as the excellent work with which the artist had already decorated the room. Besides it was not altogether desirable that paintings should be placed in a room intended for business. It always attracted a constant flow of visitors, but being placed opposite the door persons coming in could see it without much moving about; if, however, paintings were placed on all the four walls, the visitors would be always moving about the room, to the great disturbance of business. If any further paintings were desired, the Painted Chamber was open to decoration; but he hoped something would be done to restore the Committee-room to which he referred as soon as possible to the use for which it was intended.

Lord TAUNTON, as a member of the Commission, said, the Commission had presented its Report, and there would, no doubt, be no objection, on the part of Her Majesty's Government, to produce the documents moved for. In the present case the Commissioners had thought it right to recommend a considerable increase upon the sum agreed to be paid for Mr. Herbert's picture, which he believed the public had seen with the greatest admiration. In doing that, however, the Commissioners had recommended that the contract should be broken, and that either party should be free to enter into a fresh engagement, before any new work was begun. There was but one circumstance which they thought justified the re-opening of such a contract, and that was the novelty of the process employed—namely, the water-glass process; but as sufficient experience had now been obtained, he hoped that the precedent would not hereafter be followed. The Commissioners had expressed their opinion that it was not for the honour of British artists, nor was it just to the British public, that engagements they had entered into of this nature should be violated, and nothing could tend more to discourage the Government from entering into engagements with artists than to find that they were afterwards subject to great expenses which they had not contemplated, and that it was impossible to lay on the table of the House any reliable estimates of the cost of these pictures. The noble Lord would see that it was for the Government to say whether they would think it right to go on with the work in the rest of the room. The noble Lord had alluded to a letter which he wrote to the Commissioners. That letter had engaged the attention of the Commissioners, but they had not inserted it in the appendix to their Report, as it was not on the subject immediately referred to them.

Earl NELSON thought it due to Mr. Herbert to state that that gentleman was not justly liable to the accusations which had just been brought forward. The original work which Mr. Herbert had undertaken was of a very different character from the one he had executed, and which might have been finished in a much shorter time. Indeed Mr. Herbert had made considerable progress in it; what he had done was destroyed at the suggestion of the late Prince Consort, who desired to see it executed in work of a more permanent character. He (Earl Nelson) would venture to express a hope that some arrangement would be made by which, at least, another picture, corresponding to the one completed, would be secured from the hand of the same distinguished artist.

Earl GRANVILLE understood the noble Lord (Lord Taunton) to make no accusation against Mr. Herbert, but rather to justify, by anticipation, an increased remuneration to that artist. There was no objection to produce the papers moved for.

Motion *agreed to.*

House adjourned at half past Eight
o'clock, till To-morrow, half
past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, July 25, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills — *Second Reading* —Naval Discipline * [Bill 233].

Committee—Poor Relief (Metropolis) [Bill 224]; Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia) [Bill 231], *adjourned.*

Report—Poor Relief (Metropolis) [Bill 224].

Considered as amended—Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Act Amendment * [Bill 210].

Third Reading — Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) [Bill 218]; Indian Medical Service [Bill 213], *negatived;* Defence Act Amendment* [Bill 223]; Cranbourne Street* [Bill 154], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Titles (Ireland)* [Bill 244].

STANDING ORDERS REVISION.

REPORT.

Report from Select Committee read; Standing Orders, as revised by the Committee, read.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, he rose, pursuant to the notice he had given, to call the attention of the House to the Report of the Select Committee on the Revision of Standing Orders. He would not detain the House by repeating any of the arguments which he used on a former occasion when he moved for the appointment of the Committee. He would merely state that the Committee, after much consideration, resolved to recommend the adoption of the Resolutions he had had the honour to submit. If he could persuade the House to agree to the Report of the Committee, next Session, Referees would be appointed by the Speaker, who would have, in connection with Private Bills, to determine certain facts, the investigation of which would thus be withdrawn from the Committees of the House. There was some delay in coming to a conclusion, in consequence of the reluctance of the Speaker to assume the responsibility of appointing the Referees. The Committee were, however, so strongly of opinion that it was desirable that the whole system should be in the body of the House, and unconnected with any public office, that they renewed their request to the Speaker, who was then good enough to express his willingness to undertake the duty if the House required it. The Committee had made some alterations in the definition of subjects to be submitted to the Referees. In regard to the second class of questions, for instance, it had been decided that only the details of traffic should be referred to the tribunal. Although the Resolutions had not met with the entire approbation of all concerned, he was bound to acknowledge the spirit of fairness with which they had been considered. The Parliamentary Bar had expressed their readiness to give the new system a fair trial, and the Parliamentary agents had not only made the same statement, but had given him their best assistance in determining the various subjects to be submitted to the Referees. He inferred from the recent discussion that the disposition of hon. Members was not unfavourable to the experiment. For his own part, he would undertake, if the Resolutions did not accomplish the object with which they had been proposed, to save the time of the House and to diminish the expense to persons promoting or opposing Bills, to move their repeal at the earliest moment. He hoped, however, that they would prove successful. The Committee had agreed, not unanimously, but by a large majority, to recommend an important change in the Standing Orders of the House, that Private Bill Committees should each consist of three instead of five Members. He was one of those who had doubted the expediency of so great an alteration, and he at first proposed that the number should be reduced to four; but there was much to be said for the larger reduction. At present three formed a quorum, and as, under the new rule, the proceedings would be suspended in the absence of any of the three Members, there would practically be no change. Another alteration which was recommended with the view of expediting the private business of the House, and of advancing Bills early in the Session, was that the time allowed for petitions should be ten clear days after the first reading, instead of eight days after the second reading. There were some further alterations of minor importance to which he need not refer in detail; but, in conclusion, he would express his belief that if these proposals were carried out, Private Bill legislation would be conducted in a more satisfactory manner, and they would not have Bills delayed till the end of the Session, so that it was scarcely possible for them to be considered in the other House. He moved the repeal of the present Standing Orders relative to Private Bills.

Colonel FRENCH said, he wished to ask, whether the object of the Motion was to give the House a clear sheet of paper for the introduction of a new series of Standing Orders?

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, that was the object of the Motion. That course had always been adopted on former occasions.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH asked, whether the proposed Resolutions contained any provision to the effect that the Referee was not to be a Member of the House?

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, that

the Resolutions contained no provision; on the contrary, it was proposed that the Chairman of the Referees should be the Chairman of Ways and Means.

Sir JOHN SHELLEY said, he could not help thinking that so important a subject should have been brought forward earlier in the year, and he suspected that, considering the period of the Session, and the attendance at the Committee, they had arrived at what was rather a foregone conclusion. He confessed that he had no great hope that the new system would lead to any reduction in expense. He even feared it would be attended with the opposite result. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had, however, in some degree disarmed opposition by pledging himself to move the repeal of the Resolutions if they did not prove effectual in saving the time of the House and the money of suitors.

Lord ROBERT CECIL said, that he hoped sincerely that the House would adopt the proposition of his hon. and gallant Friend. All the Members attended the Committee, and gave the subject most careful consideration. The Resolutions had, in substance, been explained to the House previously.

Mr. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD said, he understood his hon. and gallant Friend to undertake that if the new plan was not found satisfactory he would propose its repeal. He was, however, afraid that it was exactly in the fact that it was an experiment that the real danger lay, and that it might be the first step towards taking away from the Committees of that House their jurisdiction over Private Bills.

Sir FRANCIS GOLDSMID said, he questioned very much the expediency of leaving engineering questions to be decided by Referees, and the other questions connected with Private Bills to the Members of the Select Committee. Experience had, he thought, proved that whenever the attempt had been made to divide a judicial inquiry into two parts to be dealt with by separate tribunals, the system had operated unsatisfactorily. He, however, did not intend to oppose the proposition of the hon. and gallant Member, but he thought that its practical effect would be to make these matters of inquiry more expensive and less satisfactory.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, he wished to correct the answer which he had given to the hon. Member behind him in respect to the appointment of Referees. Now, as there was a small salary attached to the office of Referee, the Chairman of Ways and Means, who was to be Chairman of Referees, could not appoint a Member of that House unless he resigned his seat. He would begin by moving the adoption of the new Standing Order No. 7, which proposed that the numbers of the Select Committee should be three instead of five.

Standing Order No. 7, as amended by the Committee, read, as follows:—

> "7. The Committee on every opposed Railway and Canal Bill, or Group of Railway and Canal Bills, shall be composed of three Members not locally or otherwise interested in the Bill or Bills referred to them; the Chairman to be appointed by the General Committee on Railway and Canal Bills, and two other Members by the Committee of Selection."

Mr. SPEAKER said, that the new Standing Order itself proposed to effect the reduction to three Members, and if nobody objected to it, the new Standing Order would pass.

Mr. H. BAILLIE said, that such a reduction was open to great objection. In the Committee of which he was a Member that Session two of the Members were taken suddenly ill and were obliged to absent themselves. Now, if there were to be only three Members on the Committee, in the event of such a contingency, the inconvenience would be obvious.

Amendment proposed, in line 2, to leave out the word "three," in order to insert the word "five,"—(*Mr. Henry Baillie,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'three' stand part of the Standing Order."

Mr. WATKIN said, he wished to ask whether the reduction was proposed for the convenience of individual Members of that House. The public interest, he thought, would suffer by leaving Private Bills to be decided by Committees of only three Members, instead of five.

Lord HOTHAM said, he could not concur in the proposed reduction the practical effect of which would be that Committees would consist of two Members only! That would not be satisfactory to the public. He should not so much object to a Committee of four.

Mr. E. P. BOUVERIE said, it had been felt, in the discussions on that matter which had taken place in the Committee, that if they had Committees of four Members, too great power would be thrown in the hands of the Chairman, who would have a casting vote where the Members were equally divided in opinion. On that ground, after considerable discussion, the Committee determined to recommend that the Committees should be constituted of three Members. The most experienced Parliamentary agents were of opinion that as much weight of authority would be carried by a decision of a Committee of three as of a Committee of five. Under the system at present in operation, the amount of business to be done being so enormous, hon. Members had to endure a very severe demand upon them, and, in fact, that mode of carrying on the business was breaking down. The House must contemplate the alternative of reducing that pressure, or that of taking that business away from the House altogether. His noble Friend (Lord Hotham), he knew, had always deprecated the notion of taking the business away from the House, but, in order to retain the jurisdiction in that House, some reform of the present system must be adopted, which would give satisfaction to the public on the one hand and afford a relief to Members on the other hand.

Sir **EDWARD COLEBROOKE** said, he did not believe that the decision of a smaller number would carry so much weight as that of a greater number. He would also point out that if the reduced Committees were to be selected, as at present, from all the Members of the House, the inexperienced would rely upon the more experienced, and thus upon the Chairman of a Committee would devolve most of the labour and responsibility of the inquiry.

Sir **JOHN SHELLEY** said, he thought the decision of a Committee of three would have as much, if not greater, weight than that of five, because of the responsibility being less divided.

Mr. **PAULL** said, that in his opinion the House ought to hesitate long before it altered the constitution of the Committees. Too much was made of the tax put on hon. Members to serve on Committees. No doubt there was some inconvenience, but so long as the House chose to keep those matters within their own jurisdiction, the only question to be considered was what arrangement would be most satisfactory to the public. If the number were reduced to three, great difficulties might arise. Should one Member be absent, and the inquiry proceed with the concurrence of all parties, the result would be a tribunal of two, one Member of which would have two votes, and would practically have the case in his own hands. On the other hand, if, upon the absence of one Member, the Committee had to report to the House and take its pleasure, then upon the rising of the Committee the parties could not be told when the proceedings would be resumed, and the expenses of the inquiry would be going on, though no progress was being made. If the tribunal was to consist of four, the result would be almost worse, because one Member must then have two votes. He thought that with some of the new regulations and with others which might be introduced, the present odd number of five would give more satisfaction than any change such as was proposed.

Mr. **MILNER GIBSON** said, that he had had an opportunity of hearing the Question discussed both at the Committee which had been held last year and at the Committee which had sat during the present Session, and he had come to the conclusion that the arguments were rather unfavourable to reducing the number so far as three. He believed that there was a good deal of force in the argument employed by the hon. Member for St. Ives, that in the case of the absence of one of the Members of a Committee formed of three, through illness, the whole business was practically under the control of the Chairman, who, in case of a division of opinion, would have the privilege of using his casting vote. Many of the matters referred to Select Committees were too important to be decided by one Member, and the public would hardly think that sufficient justice was done to their interests. If they could secure the attendance of three Members no doubt it would be sufficient, as that number was the present quorum. He would much prefer the reduction of the number of Members on the Committee to four. If he remembered rightly, his hon. Friend the Member for North Lancashire in the Committee which sat upon the subject last year advocated the reduction to that number, although as Chairman of the Committee which had recently sat he brought forward the recommendation for the reduction of the number to three.

Captain **JERVIS** said, he hoped that the House would not agree to the proposition of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, which would practically have the effect of placing the whole of the power in the hands of the Chairman, and reducing the other three Members to the position of dummies. He was quite willing to acknowledge that ability and intelligence possessed by the Chairmen of Committees, but he believed it would be very easy to find another half-dozen Gentlemen who would perform the duties of Chairmen equally well in every respect.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, that he certainly had been in favour of four, but the feeling of the Committee was so strong against that number that he believed he stood almost alone. Under those circumstances, he felt himself bound to support the Report of the Committee.

MR. AYRTON said, he thought that the House hardly understood the proposition which had been made, because it involved not only an alteration in the number of Members serving on a Committee, but an alteration in the constitution of the Committee itself. At present the Committee was formed of five shifting Members, any three of whom formed a quorum, and the present proposal was that the Committees should consist of three Members, in the absence of any one of whom no business, unless the consent of the House had been obtained for such a course, could be proceeded with. The intention of the new Standing Order was that no one should vote who had not heard the evidence from beginning to the end.

Question put, "That the word 'three' stand part of the Standing Order."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 67; Noes 74: Majority 7.

Motion made, and Question proposed, that the word "five" be inserted, instead thereof.—(*Mr. H. Baillie.*)

LORD ROBERT CECIL said, he wished to move that the word "four" be inserted.

MR. H. BAILLIE said, he wished to know, if it was competent to move an Amendment?

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, he was in favour of four Members rather than of five, and should therefore vote against the insertion of the word five. He thought that the number of four would facilitate the conduct of private business.

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, he was also prepared to vote for "four." That number would afford some relief to the House and also leave an efficient Committee.

MR. SPEAKER said, he would put the Question in this form:—That the word "five" do stand part of the Resolution. Those who were opposed to "five" might fill up the blank with any other number.

Question put, "That the word 'five' be inserted," instead thereof.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 55; Noes 87: Majority 32.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, he moved that the word "four" be inserted, instead thereof.

Motion made, and Question proposed, that the word "four" be inserted, instead thereof.

MR. H. BAILLIE said, he objected to the proposal, as he should prefer a Committee of three to four Members. In the former division the question was as between three and five, and he voted against three; but now he would, if it were competent to him to do so, move that the word "three" be inserted instead of four.

MR. PAULL said, he wished to ask, if it was competent for any hon. Member to move the insertion of the word "three" as an Amendment?

MR. SPEAKER said, it could not be done. The House had already decided against "three."

MR. PAULL said, that decision was "five" against "three." It was then proposed to take the decision of the House on the question of "three" against "four."

Motion made, and Question put, "That the word 'four' be inserted,"—(*Colonel Wilson Patten,*)—instead thereof.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 98; Noes 50: Majority 48.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, that in consequence of the alteration just made he begged to move the postponement of Resolutions 7, 8, and 9, his object being to make them conformable to the Resolution already adopted.

Further Consideration of Standing Order, No. 7, *postponed* till *To-morrow*, at Six of the clock.

Standing Order No. 8, as amended by the Committee, and No. 9, as revised by the Committee, read as follows:—

"8. The Committee on every opposed Private Bill (not being a Railway, Canal, or Divorce Bill), or Group of Bills, shall be composed of a Chairman and two Members not locally or otherwise interested in the Bill or Bills referred to them, to be appointed by the Committee of Selection."

"9. The Committee on every unopposed Private Bill (not being a Railway, Canal, or Divorce Bill), shall, if the same shall have originated in this House, be composed of the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, who shall be ex officio Chairman of every such Committee, together with one of the Members ordered to prepare and bring in the Bill, and one other Member not locally or otherwise interested therein, such Members to be appointed by the Committee of Selection, and shall, if such Bill shall have been brought from the House of Lords, be composed of the Chairman as aforesaid, and two other Members, to be appointed by the Committee of Selection, of whom one at least shall not be locally or otherwise interested in the Bill; and the Chairman and one other Member of such Committee shall be the quorum thereof."

LORD ROBERT CECIL said, he wished to know how his hon. and gallant Friend intended to deal with the question of the Chairman's vote. There was a difficulty in the matter, as the Committees were to be composed of four Members. It would be objectionable to give one Member a double vote, and therefore he thought they ought to act on the maxim *semper presumitur pro negante.* The presumption was for the negative in appeal cases in the House of Lords and the Courts of Law, and he thought that would be the safest rule for the Committees of the House.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, his wish was to take the sense of the House on the Question, and therefore he would consider it afresh on the following day.

Motion made, "That the Consideration of Standing Orders No. 8 and No. 9 be postponed till to-morrow."

CAPTAIN JERVIS asked the Speaker, whether it would not be competent to any hon. Member to move on the following day that the word "three" be inserted in the Resolution instead of "four?"

MR. SPEAKER said, it would not. The sense of the House had been taken on the Question, "that the word 'three' stand part of the Question," and the decision had been in the negative. The only matters to be decided in connection with the Resolution were those of the quorum and the vote of the Chairman.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY said, that believing that some time should be given for the consideration of the proposed changes, he would move the adjournment of the debate until to-morrow.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, he had never heard a more unreasonable proposition. The three Resolutions which he moved to postpone were connected with the one just adopted; but the others were in no way connected with those three.

MR. LYGON said, he would suggest that Resolutions 7, 8, and 9 should be postponed till the next Session.

MR. VANSITTART said, he should support the Amendment of the hon. Baronet the Member for Westminster.

MR. E. P. BOUVERIE said, the House had distinctly decided the Question that four should be the number of members, and he was afraid that having so decided they could not go back on it. The Question of the casting vote of the Chairman was a very important one, and if Resolutions 7, 8, and 9 were postponed till the following Session, a new Standing Order might be framed, which, on a full and fair consideration of the subject, might meet all the difficulties.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, he would have no objection to the suggestion of his right hon. Friend (Mr. Bouverie), but he did not see what was to be gained by it. At the beginning of next Session any hon. Member might move the repeal of the Resolution fixing the number at four.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, he believed they had begun by repealing the Standing Orders, and, if so, they had no machinery for dealing with private business.

COLONEL FRENCH said, he thought it was not the fact that the Standing Orders had been repealed.

MR. SPEAKER said, he begged to remind the House that it had already decided that Standing Order No. 7 should be postponed till the following day. Then came Standing Orders 8 and 9, when it was proposed that they also should be postponed till to-morrow, on which the Question had been raised whether or not the whole debate should be adjourned. It was quite competent for any hon. Member to move that the debate be adjourned, otherwise the hon. and gallant Gentleman could go forward with the other Question which stood for consideration that evening.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY said, he wished to ask, whether the Standing Orders had been repealed or not?

MR. SPEAKER said, it had been proposed to repeal the old Standing Orders and proceed to the consideration of the new, but a debate arose before that Question had been finally submitted to the House; and, therefore, the House had not come to any decision that the Standing Orders should be repealed.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, it was necessary that they should now adjourn the debate, because they were now passing Resolutions which seemed to be inconsistent with the existing Standing Orders, and they would have two different sets of rules at the same time.

Further Consideration thereof, and of the Report of the Select Committee, *postponed* till *To-morrow*, at Six of the clock.

PARK LANE.—QUESTION.

Sir JOHN SHELLEY said, he wished to put a Question with reference to the enormous traffic which passes through Park Lane into Piccadilly. As the Metropolitan Board of Works had given in writing to the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works their opinion, that the best mode of facilitating that traffic would be the opening of Hamilton Place, and as the houses in that place were Crown property, he would beg to ask, Whether the right hon. Gentleman has considered the matter, and, if so, what course he, as representative of the Crown, intends to take in reference to it; whether he is prepared to assist the Metropolitan Board, they being responsible for compensation to the Crown tenants?

Mr. COWPER said, he was glad to hear that the Metropolitan Board of Works had recognized the duty intrusted to them of preventing a serious public inconvenience and danger which at present existed, owing to the crowded state of Park Lane. He would willingly offer them every facility in his power to remedy so great an inconvenience. The Metropolitan Board of Works seemed to think that opening Hamilton Place would be a better course than widening Park Lane. He apprehended that there was considerable doubt upon that point. The upper portion of Hamilton Place was only twenty-eight feet wide in the carriage-way, which he considered was too small a width to meet the object in view. The land occupied by gardens northward was the property of the Crown, and was let upon lease to the tenants of the houses. Of course the Crown could not be advised to take any steps towards breaking the terms of those leases, which could only be done by an Act of Parliament. If, however, the Metropolitan Board of Works would bring forward a Bill to prolong Hamilton Place, no impediment would be offered on the part of the advisers of the Crown.

THE STANDARDS OF WEIGHT AND MEASURE.—QUESTION.

Mr. DOULTON said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Exchequer Standards of Weight and Measure have been adjusted and reverified, in pursuance of an assurance given by the Secretary of State for the Home Department on the 29th of July, 1862, to the effect, "that measures had already been taken for the accomplishment of that object;" whether the Standards recently taken out of the wall of Parliament have been compared with those at the Exchequer; and, if so, whether any and what discrepancy was found to exist; and whether any Report has been received from the Astronomer Royal, as chairman of the Standard Committee, relative to such comparison?

Mr. PEEL said, in reply, that early in the present year the Treasury asked the surviving members—seven or eight in number—of the National Standard Commission, to examine the original Standards of Weights and Measures, and the Astronomer Royal had made a Report, in which he said—

> "The Controller General of the Exchequer produced for the inspection of the members the National or Parliamentary Standard of Length (duly identified by its distinguishing marks as described in the Standard Act), which was examined by all the members present with the aid of powerful microscopes, and was judged by all to be in so perfect a state that no comparison with the Parliamentary copies was necessary."

As regarded the Standard of Weight, Professor Airy said—

> "The three Parliamentary copies of the Weight Standard were collected on March the 14th; and, on March the 15th, Professor W. H. Miller recompared the Parliamentary Standard of Weight with them under favourable circumstances. The apparent change of weight of the Parliamentary Standard was less than 1-5,000,000th of the whole—a quantity within errors of observation, and implying no real change."

As regarded the copies of the Exchequer Standards deposited in the wall of the recess in the Lower Waiting Room of Westminster Palace, he says—

> "In the presence of the Committee, the leaden box of the immured Standards was opened, and the Parliamentary copy of the Standard of Length was examined with Mr. Simm's microscopes, and that of Weight by general inspection. Both were in the finest possible order."

NAVY—GREENWICH HOSPITAL.

QUESTION.

Mr. CRAWFORD said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether it is the intention of the Lords Commissioners to appropriate any portion of Greenwich Hospital for the reception of worn-out and disabled Seamen of the Merchant Service?

LORD CLARENCE PAGET said, in reply, that it was not the intention of the Admiralty to appropriate any portion of Greenwich Hospital to that purpose.

PAY AND CLOTHING OF THE POLICE.

QUESTION.

MR. HOWES said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown has been given on the construction of the Act 19 & 20 *Vict.* c. 69, s. 16, respecting certain deductions made by the Treasury from the Government contribution of one-fourth part of the charge for the pay and clothing of the Police in Counties and Boroughs, and whether he will state the effect of such opinion?

MR. PEEL said, in reply, that the Law Officers of the Crown had given it as their opinion that the expression, "charge for pay," would include any portion of the pay deducted for the purpose of being paid over to the superannuation fund. The Treasury, therefore, were at liberty to contribute one-fourth part of the charge for pay inclusive of the sum paid for superannuation.

PASSPORTS IN FRANCE.

QUESTION.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he would beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the exemption of British Subjects from the demand for Passports in France exempts them also from their Passports being demanded and given over to the custody of the captain on going on board French Passenger Steamers in the Mediterranean and elsewhere? He wished further to ask, Whether any information has been received at the Foreign Office of the complaint made by Lord Francis Douglas, that his Passport had been taken from him and torn to pieces before his face at a place near Bodenbach, in Austria?

MR. LAYARD replied, that he had not received any official communication on the subject of Lord Francis Douglas's passport. With regard to the more general Question, he had to state that, as far as he could ascertain, the rule appeared to be that when a French passenger vessel called at any port in the Mediterranean, it was the practice for the captain to collect the passports and show them to the authorities. But he was not aware whether the captain did that in the case of vessels trading between one French port and another. He rather thought that was not the practice.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE — BRITISH KAFFRARIA.—QUESTION.

MR. ARTHUR MILLS said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether he will lay upon the table of the House the recent Despatches from the Governor of the Cape Colony relating to the proposed annexation of the Trans-Kei territory to British Kaffraria? He also wished to ask, Whether the recent Despatches received from the Cape of Good Hope have led the right hon. Gentleman to think that there is any chance of another Kaffir war; and, if so, whether in the event of such misfortune the whole cost will have to be borne by the Imperial Exchequer, or whether any portion of the cost beyond the payment of the Mounted Police will be required from the Colony?

MR. CARDWELL, in reply, said, it was difficult to state the provision for a future war. As he had stated the other evening, the result of the despatches was upon the whole satisfactory. With respect to the details of those despatches which related to the state of feeling on the frontier, he thought it would not be desirable to produce them.

UNITED STATES—THE CIVIL WAR.

QUESTION.

MR. LINDSAY said, before putting the Question of which he had given notice, he had desired to have made a statement, containing some important facts bearing upon the American war, and tending to show how futile was the attempt to restore the Union and to coerce the South; but as he had no opportunity now of doing so, he begged simply to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, If, considering the great sacrifice of life and property occasioned by the war still raging between the United States of America and the Confederate States, and considering the loss the people of this Country have suffered by the war, it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government, in concert with the other Powers of Europe, to use their endeavours to bring about a suspension of hostilities?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: I can assure my hon. Friend that Her Majesty's Government deeply lament the great sacrifice of life and property in America and the distress which that war has produced in this country. But we have not thought that in the present state of things there was any advantage to be gained by entering into concert with any other Powers for the purpose of proposing or offering mediation, or of negotiating with the Government of the United States or of the Confederate States to bring about a termination of this unhappy war.

ORDER OF ST. MICHAEL AND ST. GEORGE.—QUESTION.

LORD ERNEST BRUCE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Ministers to advise Her Majesty, in consequence of the cession of the Ionian Islands to the kingdom of Greece, to enlarge the statutes of the most distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, so as to enable Her Majesty to confer that Order upon such persons as She may think proper, who have served Her Majesty in any part of Her Colonial Possessions?

MR. CARDWELL said, in reply, that it was true that, since the cession of the Ionian Islands, the Order had become confined to Malta. The subject of its extension was well worthy of consideration, but Her Majesty's pleasure had not yet been signified.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE—THE KAFFIR WAR.—QUESTION.

LORD ROBERT CECIL: I wish, Sir, to ask a Question of the Secretary of State for the Colonies in consequence of the reply he has just given the hon. Member for Taunton. I do not understand how the expenses of a Kaffir war are to be shared in the unfortunate mischance of such an event. I hope the right hon. Gentleman has formed a distinct conception in his own mind upon this subject, and I trust that the right hon. Gentleman will console the House by assuring them that in the event of such a calamity as that referred to there will be a limit to our share of the consequent expense.

MR. CARDWELL said, he wished—but unfortunately it was not in his power—to state beforehand what the expenses of any future war would be. He had already stated that there was no arrangement between this country and the colony as to the expense of any Kaffir war. British Kaffraria, as the noble Lord was doubtless aware, was no longer part of the Cape Colony.

ARMY—STAMP DUTY ON COMMISSIONS. QUESTION.

LORD HOTHAM said, he rose to ask, on behalf of his right hon. and gallant Friend General Peel, Whether it is true that a demand has recently been made upon an Officer for Stamp Duty upon a Commission as Quartermaster General in the Crimea in 1855, which appointment he ceased to hold in 1856; and whether, in fact, any Commission has ever been made out?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON replied, that a Circular had been issued in December, 1858, which laid it down that a stamp duty of thirty shillings should be paid on commissions being gazetted. According to that rule, this stamp duty ought to be collected out of the first additional pay received by the officer. It appeared that in some cases this had been neglected to be done, and therefore it was very probable that in some instances officers might have been recently asked to pay the stamp duty on commissions granted so long ago. With regard to the great delay in making these claims on officers, the noble Lord was probably aware that in consequence of the enormous number of new commissions issued a few years ago, an Act was passed dispensing with the necessity of the Sign Manual being affixed to them, the signature of the Commander-in-Chief being substituted. The arrear was so great it had not been all worked off yet; and, inasmuch as the Commissioners of Inland Revenue actually refused to affix the stamp to commissions till the stamp duty was paid, the charge was now being made against those officers who ought to have paid it at once.

CASE OF MR. O'MALLEY IRWIN. QUESTION.

MR. HENNESSY said, he wished to ask a Question of the Secretary for Ireland with reference to a Parliamentary Paper which was laid on the table on the 29th of June. The paper in question was one of four letters written thirty years ago relative to a charge of forgery against Mr. O'Malley Irwin, and which had hitherto been withheld from the House. It appears that a copy has been found by Sir Thomas Larcom in the Irish Office, and it was produced when moved for by the hon. and learned Member for Suffolk (Sir FitzRoy Kelly) in the course of the late debate. On Friday night a doubt was cast on the authenticity of this Letter by the Irish Attorney General. He (Mr. Hennessy) wished to know, Whether there is a Copy of that Letter in the Chief Secretary's Office, and whether the original has been abstracted from the Crown Solicitor's Papers during the trial of Mr. Irwin for forgery in 1834, and also whether this Copy is authentic?

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, he believed he might state that if the letter dated the 4th October was a copy of an original, its authenticity might be asserted. Thirty years ago was rather a long time to carry inquiries back, and to speak with accuracy on such a matter.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, a correspondence had passed between Sir Thomas Larcom and himself on this subject, and he distinctly stated that the original letter was not in the Office. He was not prepared to say this was a copy of an original letter.

MR. HENNESSY said, reverting to the subject of his Question, he wished to know, Who is responsible for the Note appended to the Return, as to the Original Letter having been abstracted from the Crown Solicitor's papers, and whether the statement made in that Note is correct?

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, of course the Irish Office was responsible. He was responsible for it to that House.

ARMY.

THE ARMSTRONG GUN FACTORY AT WOOLWICH.—QUESTION.

In reply to a Question from Mr. W. MONSELL,

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, he was not aware of the existence of any papers which would corroborate the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman on the subject of the Woolwich Gun Foundry the other night; but he had received private information upon that point, from which he had reason to believe that that statement was perfectly correct. He believed that the whole building, which was constructed at the time when the right hon. Gentleman was in office, with some trifling exceptions, was available for the manufacture of the Armstrong gun. The only loss was occasioned by the additional expense for the fitting boxes, amounting to £2,700, and for the casting pit, amounting to £4,000, making together £6,700. From this the sum of £836 must be deducted for the sale of old iron, leaving a sum of £5,864 actually lost by the change of machinery from cast iron to Armstrong ordnance.

FORTIFICATIONS (PROVISION FOR EXPENSES) BILL—[BILL 218.]

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. BERNAL OSBORNE observed that, in popular theory, the House of Commons was responsible for the keeping of the public purse. That was a delusion which was fast passing away; for what was the state of the representative system in the month of July? After two and a half hours' discussion on the Standing Orders, which came to nothing, they were exhausted, and were prepared to pass a Bill involving millions of money. What was really the state of the question regarding fortifications? At half past two in the morning during the last week the Bill went into Committee; that was to say at a time when it was impossible for those who were not present to know what had been done, for those able men who sat in the Reporters' Gallery were naturally as much fatigued as the House, and they were totally unable to record any remarks if they were made; the consequence was a blank in the discussions of the question, which involved first and last an expenditure of £20,000,000. How did the question actually stand at that moment? A material alteration had been made in the original plan for the defence of Portsmouth Harbour and Spithead, which he believed would not be effectual for its purpose, but would lead to a great increase of expenditure. The original plan, as given by the Defence Commissioners three years ago, proposed to flank the entrance to Spithead with two forts on the Horse Shoe and No Man's shoals. The House approved and adopted that plan. That was the outer circle of defence 6,000 yards from Portsmouth Dockyard. But within that outer defence the Commissioners proposed that midway between Ryde and Portsmouth another fort should be erected called Sturbridge, to command the anchorage at Spithead. From the Report of the Commissioners it appeared that was a most material point in the inner circle of defence. What, then, had been done? Mr. Hawkshaw, the engineer at that time, made a Report in which he stated he was very much afraid he would not find a foundation sufficient to carry the heavy guns intended for that fort. At the time Mr. Hawkshaw had already penetrated 30 feet, and he stated that if he went 15 feet further without finding any solid foundation he would have to give up the work. That depth was reached without the discovery of any solid foundation, and the consequence was that after the House had been misled and a large sum of money expended, Sturbridge Fort was abandoned. By the abandonment of that fort he maintained that the recommendation of the Defence Commissioners, as indorsed by Parliament, had been materially altered, for the result was that an enemy would be able to steam up a channel 2,000 yards in width and shell the dockyards with comparative freedom from molestation. The Defence Committee, with the addition of another officer, Sir Alexander Milne, after the want of success at Sturbridge in finding a solid foundation, were called upon for another Report, and he could not, when he considered the amount of money involved, avoid characterizing the haste which the matter had been dealt with as most extraordinary, if not indecent. The Committee were only called upon to report on the 15th of July, and on the 19th the Report was presented. No explanation was given with it. They had only that morning received the plan which should have accompanied the Report involving the alteration of the whole of our national defences, and which, if agreed to, would burden the country with a positive expense of £11,000,000, according to the estimates, and they were asked that evening to consent to the third reading of the Bill, which would give a Parliamentary sanction to the new plan. He believed the House was blind enough to pass anything, and the excuse they would urge would probably be that they shuffled off all the responsibility upon the Ministry. What did that responsibility amount to? The House voted the money, and its application might be found some years hence to have been of no service at all; and that was where the responsibility, as it was termed, began and ended. Three years ago they were told it was of vital importance that the country should be put into a state of defence, but what was the actual result? The result was that on shore they had enormous lines of trenches and casemates with neither men nor guns to defend them, while they were so much the weaker by the increased area which they had to defend; and at sea not a single floating battery had been made for the last three years. But the state of the gunnery was a question of still greater importance. The expiring moments of Parliament could not be better devoted than to the consideration of the state of the weapons which were placed in the defences, and by which the integrity of the country was to be preserved. He found that in the last five years, between 1858 and 1863, the country had expended £2,539,547 17*s.* 8*d.* upon the construction of new ordnance, and that the result had been an issue to the army and navy of 2,370 guns, of which number 799 were the 100-pounders, and to the efficiency of those guns he would allude. No doubt we possessed some excellent iron-clad ships, but had the Admiralty any guns fit to put into them? He held in his hand a most extraordinary pamphlet by a flag officer of great reputation on the active list, Admiral Halstead, in which that officer stated his opinion that "the British navy at present possesses no guns adapted for iron-plate warfare." The Duke of Somerset, too, on being asked by the Ordnance Committee as to his opinion of the 100-pounder, said that for naval purposes at 200 yards it certainly had not the greatest power for penetration, and that in that respect the old 68-pounder smooth-bore was the most effective weapon in the service. The Report of the Committee, after a review of the whole subject, was to the same effect, that the 100-pounders were of no service. The fact was that we had consumed two and a half millions of money during the last five years, and that we were as far from having an effectual naval weapon as we were at the outset. If the House thought that that was a subject with which it was entitled to meddle, it ought not to consent to the third reading of the Bill without having some more definite idea as to the future than was to be gathered from the Reports laid before Parliament. He wished to do full justice to Sir William Armstrong, and he must say that he could not think that he had been particularly successful in his large guns, but at the same time justice had not been done to him. They should remember that, as Mr. Armstrong in 1859, he never undertook to make any large guns; he only undertook to contract for the supply of light breech-loading field guns to the army. It was very true that a most extraordinary contract was entered into, but the House should remember the original circumstances. At the same time, subsequent experience and experiments had shown that the breech-loading system as applied to heavy guns was a complete failure, and at that moment Government was occupied in doing with their artillery exactly the reverse of what they were doing with the small arms. At that time 250 breech-loaders were being rifled upon the shunt principle, which was, in reality, nothing more nor less than an adaptation by Sir William Armstrong of the French principle, with a slight alteration. The House would easily understand the principle, which was the insertion into the gun of a projectile with ribs or buttons, but the material difference was that the shot entering by one chamber was discharged by another set of grooves. Complaints had been made, and most justly, of the great partiality exhibited by the Select Ordnance Committee with reference to Sir William Armstrong. Nothing appeared to go down with the Committee but Armstrong guns. Every inventor who had come before the Committee complained of the conduct of its members in that respect. On comparing our Select Ordnance Committee with a similar committee in France, he could not help arriving at the conclusion that its members had done wonderfully little in contributing to the service of gunnery. It was a most remarkable fact that with the one exception of Captain Blakeley, all the improvements in gunnery had been effected by civilians. Mr. Whitworth, Mr. Lynal Thomas, and Sir William Armstrong were all civilians, and Captain Blakeley was the only artillerist connected with the improvements. The House, perhaps, imagined, that these 110-pounder guns were tested by experiment before being adopted. No such thing. Sir William Armstrong was made a director of the Artillery; and when he was asked before the Committee to state upon what series of experiments these guns were approved, his answer was, "None at all. There was such a pressure that there was no time for experiments." Yet a great number of guns had been made which were utterly condemned in the navy, and he believed that no great confidence was felt in them by the practical men of the Royal Artillery. He now wished to draw attention to a comparison between the French gun and ours, because really we seemed to be in a sort of fool's paradise with regard to our gun, which was thought an invention superior to any in all the world. He was sorry to see that the Duke of Somerset ridiculed altogether the idea of the French gun, though his Grace gave no reasons; but a remarkable paper had lately appeared in the *Edinburgh Review*, evidently written by an artillerist of high standing, in which a very favourable account was given of this French gun, which, as compared with our 68-pounder,—the only one available for the armament of our iron-clads — was said to be as superior as cheese to chalk. Had the noble Lord (Lord Clarence Paget), above all men in the world—he who was such a great naval reformer in opposition, and who discovered then a waste of £5,000,000 which he had never proved — had that great naval reformer who had reformed nothing, sanctioned an expenditure of £2,500,000 upon a gun, while the navy was left without any except what was called the good and wholesome old 68-pounder? Captain Blakeley, who was an artillery officer of great attainments, and was driving an enormous trade in guns with foreign countries, where his guns were highly approved, was asked before the Committee whether he thought that the Armstrong gun would be effective against a side of *La Gloire*. His answer, in effect, was, "By no means. The French possess a gun so superior to the Armstrong, that if we unfortunately went to war with them at the present time our iron-clads would not stand a chance against that gun." Captain Blakeley went on to say that we had spent millions upon the formation of an iron-clad fleet, and if we sent the fleet to sea at the present moment it would cut a very sorry figure against the French gun. Was that a proper state of things? Could the House be content to go to what were called its duties in the country, not knowing at any time, if a war broke out, what would be the result? He could not rest content without making a last struggle to draw attention to the subject. As to the forts, he doubted whether there was a gun for them; and, after all, recent experience had not been such as to afford much encouragement with regard to heavy guns. At the siege of Charleston, where these monster guns had been employed, they had never fired above forty-eight rounds without bursting, though to that day Fort Sumter had never been taken; and an American paper took much credit for a heavy gun which was fired seventy-six times and did not burst till the seventy-seventh. Expensive experiments were going on at Shoeburyness, which, as the writer in the *Edinburgh Review* said, were made without precision and without judgment, and yet we now had no naval gun, while it was very much doubted whether we had a gun which was fit to be mounted in the forts when they were built. From the first he had always argued that the proper defence of our shores was the navy, and the navy alone. But although the House supported him by their cheers, they had withheld their votes from him. These fortifications had lingered, the original plan being altered, while it might be altered again. If it were not for the lateness of the Session he should be almost inclined to resist the third reading, to stop the digging of holes in which we were burying millions, and ask the House to pause in the rash outlay, and see whether they could not lay out the residue of the money to better advantage upon naval defences. Exhausted as the House was, he felt indebted to them for listening to his short explanation, but he felt the question to be one of such vital importance that it could not be pooh-poohed from the Treasury Bench, and was worthy the deepest consideration of the House.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, he was very glad that the hon. Gentleman had not carried out his intention of opposing the third reading of the Bill, especially as it had reference to the completion of a scheme for the defence of Portsmouth and Spithead. The subject had been so fully discussed in several former years, and the House had so distinctly asserted its determination that Spithead should be defended by a system of forts in combination with its floating defences, that it would be scarcely worth while to occupy time at that late period of the Session in discussing once again the merits of the scheme. It was true that it had been found necessary to abandon the site of one of these forts, and a modification of the plan had been rendered necessary, but that modification was very slight. But if the hon. Gentleman would look at the evidence before the Defence Commission, he would see that the Government had sufficient grounds to go upon with regard to the foundation for the Sturbridge Fort. Sir Charles Fox strongly supported the opinion that a site would be found; and although Mr. Hawkshaw expressed more doubt, still his evidence pointed rather to the probability of very great outlay being necessary than to the conclusion that a good and safe foundation would not be found. The hon. Member accused the Government of not having made greater progress with the works. But the House would remember that it was owing to the opposition of the hon. Member that the whole scheme for the defence of Spithead was suspended for more than a year, and that not only the work was suspended, but a great deal had to be gone over again. If, then, anybody was to be responsible for the delay in building the forts, and for the fact that the foundations were not yet above the level of the water, it was the hon. Member himself and the House. The hon. Member complained that the scheme had been presented in too hurried a manner. Now, the Report was presented the day before that fixed for the Committee on the Bill, and although the explanatory plan was not ready on the same day, the plan was conspicuously displayed in the House early that morning, and was tolerably certain to be seen by hon. Members who came down prepared to discuss the Bill. Hon. Members had not been asked to read a long and complicated Report; the Report presented was a very short one, and he did not know what possible benefit could have resulted from its being placed in the hands of Members at an earlier period. With regard to the plan, the object was that if the enemy's ships should succeed in penetrating the outer line of defences, they should be exposed at any spot where they might anchor to bombard the dockyard at Portsmouth to so concentrated a fire from the several forts that they would be unable to devote themselves to that object. By the Report of the Committee, without referring to the plan, it would be seen that those four works averaged about 3,000 yards' distance from each other, the greatest distance being a little over 4,000 yards. The experiments which had taken place a few days ago at Shoeburyness showed that the expectations of the Committee with respect to the ordnance which might be placed in our forts had been fulfilled to the letter. The experiments made on that occasion showed that at 3,000 yards a projectile fired from the 600-pounder gun with a full charge would break the plates of any iron-clad vessel. [MR. BERNAL OSBORNE: What! At 3,000 yards?] The experiments which had been fully reported in *The Times* showed that to be the fact. No ship could possibly pass between the forts at a greater distance than 1,500 yards from one of them; and no ship could take up a position to shell the dockyard at a greater distance than 2,000 yards from the combined power of the forts. The hon. Gentleman said we had not a gun to put in these forts; but the House would perceive that the experiments with the 600-pounders showed that when mounted on the forts those guns would do all that they had originally been expected to do. Though he quite admitted we were not as far advanced in the matter of ordnance as might be wished, still there was no reason that when those forts were finished they should not be armed with a certain proportion of 600-pounders, and a proportion of smaller guns. The foundation of the forts would not be ready till next summer, and another year or two must elapse before the structures would be ready to receive the guns. Surely, then, the hon. Member would not have had the Government manufacture more of these 600-pounder guns without instituting experiments to test their performance. In reference to what had been said by the hon. Gentleman on the subject of breech-loading guns, he was quite free to admit that, as explained by him, the breech-loading system of Sir William Armstrong, which had proved so successful in the case of smaller ordnance—of field guns—had not been found so successful in guns of a larger description. [Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE: Hear, hear!] But the hon. Member had mentioned that the Government were altering some of the old breech-loaders into muzzle-loaders. That statement was not strictly accurate. No finished breech-loaders had been altered. Certainly 250 guns which it had been intended to finish as breech-loaders had since been ordered to be finished as muzzle-loaders. The barrels had been formed, but they were in the state in which it was possible to finish them on the muzzle-loading system or as breech-loading guns; and considering that the system of breech-loading guns had not been found to answer satisfactorily, orders were given to finish them as muzzle-loaders. The hon. Gentleman had referred to the Duke of Somerset's evidence before the Ordnance Committee of the previous year, in which his Grace said that at 200 yards the 110 lb. gun was not effective against iron-plates; but the House must recollect that when that gun was ordered it was not intended to be used against iron-plates. There had been an opinion prevalent in the country that our ships should be armed with a rifle gun, throwing a ball a long distance. Accordingly those guns were ordered, and except with the few exceptions of their trials against iron-plates, they had been found to answer exceedingly well. The hon. Gentleman said that those were important exceptions. [Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE: Hear!] But he must repeat it had not been intended that those guns should be used against iron-plates, and there were a great many situations in which they could be exceedingly useful. The Duke of Somerset had given his opinion that the navy had not got too many of them. For all purposes of long range, and for use against wooden ships, those guns were most desirable; and unquestionably they would be most valuable on shores which were not exposed to the attacks of iron-clad ships. They could not be adopted as the staple arm of our ships; but both naval and military authorities concurred in thinking that too many of them had not been made. The hon. Gentleman said that we had not got anything better than the old 68-pounders against iron-clad ships. [Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE: The Duke of Somerset said it.] The Duke of Somerset made that statement last year; but since that a number of guns from 6½ to 7 tons weight had been made—that being, as we were told, the heaviest weight of broadside gun which a ship could carry. If heavier guns were put aboard, it must be to be used as other than broadside guns. The Government were also making some of the 12-ton guns, which, when smooth bore, had a calibre of 10½ inches, and when rifled a calibre of 9·22 inches. It might be said that they had not got any large number of those guns. They certainly had not; but surely the hon. Gentleman did not think the Government were wrong in making experiments before they introduced either the 7-ton or the 12-ton gun as a general arm of the navy. They had gone on with such haste in the case of the 110-pounder that no experiments had preceded its adoption; but the result taught them that they might go too fast, and those large guns which were being tried were very expensive. Next Session, if the House thought fit to vote the necessary sums, the Government would be prepared to go on faster in producing those large wrought-iron guns for the army and navy. He could assure the House that the hon. Gentleman was mistaken when he said that the French navy was better armed than ours. If the hon. Member was right, would he tell the House what this formidable weapon was which the French service possessed? [Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE: Read the article in the *Edinburgh Review.*] He had read it. The hon. Gentleman said that evidently it was written by a man possessing very great knowledge of the subject. He thought it quite evident that it was written by a person who was very friendly to the inventor of the gun to which he presumed the hon. Member referred. That gun was a weapon of great range, power, and accuracy, but it was a mistake to suppose that the French navy was armed with that experimental gun. He believed the French ships were armed with old 32-pounder guns which had been rifled, and which did not carry a charge of more than 8 lb. or 9 lb. of powder. If it was a fact that any other nation was very much ahead of us in its ordnance, that would be an argument to show that we should proceed to manufacture a large number of the best gun we had; but as that was not the case, there was no such necessity for such hot haste. If there was reason to believe that we could arm our ships with as good a gun as any other nation could bring against us, and that we could construct improved guns as fast as anybody else, that was a reason, not, perhaps, for delay, but for not proceeding with undue haste. The hon. Member said that recent experience seemed to be against large guns, and he referred to the short lives of the American guns at Charleston. The fact was that the Americans did not possess a wrought-iron gun at all, and experience had shown that cast-iron, however well made, was not suitable for large guns carrying a heavy charge of powder. Wrought-iron or steel was the proper material for the purpose; and although it might be more expensive in the first instance, yet as it lasted much longer than cast-iron, there was in the end not much difference in respect of cost. Therefore, he did not think we were in so deplorable a condition in regard to the armament of our ships as the hon. Member wished the House to believe. Heavier guns were being made, and he hoped that before long we should have a number of iron-clad ships armed with a gun much superior to the 68-pounder. As to the forts which would be exposed to attack by iron-clad vessels, an armament would be prepared for them before they could possibly be finished. In the course they had pursued, the Government had been carrying out the wishes of the House, and he thought that at so late a date, it would be a pity to stop the works then going on and resort to another mode of defence.

CAPTAIN JERVIS said, he regretted that, in attacking the Government for not paying proper attention to the defences of the country, the hon. Member for Liskeard should have cast reflections on a body of officers who deserved well of their country —the Ordnance Select Committee. [Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE disclaimed any intention of doing so.] The hon. Gentleman had accused the Committee of being prejudiced in favour of one system, which had disappointed everybody. The truth was that since the subject began to attract attention the Committee had been changed three or four times in order to please the hon. Gentleman and others. First of all it was composed of artillery officers, but a complaint was made that it was not purely an artillery question, and that engineering science should be brought to bear on it. Accordingly, engineer officers were put on the Committee; but even that did not satisfy people, and a mixed Committee was formed, comprising officers of artillery, engineers, and civilians, among the number being such men as Professor Wheatstone and Mr. Gregory. Objections, however, continued to be made, and further changes took place. The Committee now included artillery officers, engineer officers, line officers, and naval officers. Surely, when such a body of men, consisting of the best officers in the service and eminent engineers, concurred in a certain opinion, even the hon. Gentleman might be expected to bow to it. Great improvements had been effected during the last six years. In 1858, when the gallant General the Member for Huntingdon (General Peel) was at the War Office, there was a great cry for a rifled gun, and every effort was made to procure the best. Sir William, then Mr. Armstrong, a man quite unknown at that time, came forward with a plan, and after a long course of experiments he was pronounced to be the victor, and his gun was adopted. Indeed, such was the enthusiasm that the House and the country believed this inventor knew more about rifled guns than anybody else, artillery officers being quite ignorant on the subject; and so he was appointed Director of the Rifled Ordnance Factory.

MR. BERNAL OSBORNE: The House did not make the appointment.

CAPTAIN JERVIS: No; but when it was announced in the House that Mr. Armstrong was to be Director and K.C.B., and all the rest of it, the intimation was received with plaudits. Well, Sir William Armstrong having gained a high position, was naturally attacked by a number of men who tried to grapple with him and to take his place. Then came the question of a possible collision with France, and an alarm was raised that we had no naval guns. He recollected the Secretary to the Admiralty refusing to give Returns of naval guns, because we had then none at all. Sir William Armstrong succeeded in introducing 40 and 70-pounder guns which could blow any wooden ship out of the water. The French and other Governments finding that such powerful ordnance could be constructed, turned their attention to iron-plated ships; and as they went on from two, four, and six inches of iron, Sir William Armstrong kept up to them. We had now a gun which could pierce a ship plated with any thickness of iron that, as far as experiments had gone, could probably be used. It was for the Government to decide how many of these guns should be ordered; but hon. Members should not go on blowing hot and cold as they were doing. At one time they complained that the Government had done nothing, and then that they had done too much. Where should we have been, he would like to know, but for the money which had been spent? If the 100-pounder had been given up, it was because something better had been found. We had proceeded on step by step from one gun to another. It was only within the last few years that the great manufacturers had learnt how to make iron-plates at all. He recollected a year or two back when a ½-inch plate was deemed quite a wonder; and it was much to have found out in so short a time how to roll such enormous plates as were now produced. It was not a mere military question, but one which interested every man who worked in iron, whether master or mechanic; and he was not sure that as much credit was not due to the labourers at the furnaces as to anybody else. He trusted that the House would discuss the question without any party feeling, and that when it was found that we had got a good weapon, the Government would stick to it and carry it out.

Bill read 3° and *passed.*

INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE BILL.

[BILL 213] THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Viscount Palmerston.*)

MR. HENNESSY said, he had opposed the Bill at every stage, and it was rather singular that the right hon. Gentleman who had charge of the measure was never in his place when the Order was called. He was always out of the House when the discussion commenced. On a former occasion he ventured to say it was irregular that an opposed Bill should be moved by any one except the Minister in charge of it; and he begged leave to ask the opinion of the Speaker on that point.

MR. SPEAKER said, the right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench were responsible for such Bills.

MR. E. P. BOUVERIE: It is an Order of the House.

MR. HENNESSY said, that petitions had been addressed to the House by medical officers in Her Majesty's Indian service, complaining that the Indian Government were treating them very badly. Only a few days ago a petition was laid on the table from the College of Surgeons, reciting the grievances of these gentlemen, the gist of the statement being that changes had been introduced by the Government to the disadvantage of medical officers belonging, not only to the Indian, but also to the Home service. Under these circumstances the number of candidates for medical appointments had declined in proportion as the Government injured the service. In 1858 an Act was passed providing that all medical appointments in India should be given by open competition. The Secretary of State alleged that open competition had failed, because the number of candidates had fallen off more and more every year; but that result was attributable not to the failure of competition, but to the ill-treatment of the service. The right hon. Gentleman, instead of redressing the grievances of the medical men, proposed to do away with open competition and to appoint an efficient body of medical officers, thus endangering the safety of the Indian army. The Bill had been brought in late in the

Session, and hurried through to its last stage without opportunity being given for discussion in anything like a complete House. It proposed, in lieu of the present statutory regulation under which the appointments were made, to place the old and arbitrary power of selection in the hands of the Secretary of State. The right hon. Gentleman said he intended to obtain medical men for India from the Queen's army; but the army of the Queen itself was at that moment inadequately supplied with medical men. The right hon. Gentleman asked them to repeal the only statute which established open competition, and then he said he would avail himself of a warrant by which such competition was established. But that warrant might at any moment be withdrawn, and, moreover, the provisions of the Bill made no mention of it whatever. He begged, therefore, to move that the Speaker leave the Chair, in order that in Committee he might move the insertion of words which might make the Bill a useful measure.

Colonel NORTH said, he would second the Motion. The Queen's army, from which it was proposed to draw medical men for India, was most insufficiently provided with medical officers. If there was an army in the world which had a right to expect that no expense would be spared in supplying it with a proper medical staff, it was the British army. Some foreign armies might be more exposed to the bullet, but no army was so much exposed to every kind of climate. It seemed to be utterly impossible to make any impression on the Government on that subject. Even the disastrous experience of the Crimean war, in which thousands and thousands of men were sacrificed in consequence of the inadequacy of the medical staff, appeared to have been lost upon the Government. The medical service of the army was composed of a body of gentlemen who had never failed in their duty at home or abroad; but, owing to the treatment these gentlemen received, medical men of good standing could no longer be got to enter the service, and the Government were obliged to resort to the introduction of an inferior class of men. He protested on the part of the army against the manner in which the medical department had been treated, and unless something were done in the interval he would move an address to the Crown on the subject early next Session.

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the words "That the," to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "said Order be discharged,"—(*Mr. Hennessy,*) —instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, stand part of the Question."

Sir MINTO FARQUHAR said, he wished to know whether the right hon. Baronet meant to do away with open competition. The refusal to answer that question created suspicion. He had reason to believe that the competitive system had succeeded well, and he made the statement on the authority of an Indian medical officer. Several petitions, however, had been sent up to him that day for presentation to that House, protesting that the Warrant of 1858 had not been carried out. As things stood young men were deterred from entering the medical service; but, if an alteration were made, the services of a highly educated body of men would be rendered available and their rights secured. As to drawing assistant-surgeons from the Queen's army, they were told the other night that for the last eighteen months the supply of that body had fallen short by forty men. There must be something radically wrong in the system, either with reference to the position or the pay of these officers, for if they gave men sufficient encouragement to enter, there would be no difficulty in obtaining a proper supply.

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, that the hon. Member who spoke last had mixed up matters which bore no relation to each other. He had said he had several petitions to present from medical officers in India with reference to the Warrant of 1858, but he had entirely forgotten that there lay on the table the copy of a despatch sent to India three or four months ago, and remedying the grievances of the existing medical service of India by putting it entirely on the same footing as to pay and allowances as the Queen's army occupied, according to the rank which the officers held. The hon. Member said the object of the Bill was to get rid of the competitive system, and to introduce into the Indian service an inferior class of medical officers. The hon. Gentleman must either not have heard or had forgotten the statements that he (Sir Charles Wood) had made on three or four occasions in that House. The competitive system had not failed in the Queen's army at home, but it had failed in respect to the Indian army. That was, of course, before the improvements had been made in the condition of the medical officers in that country. The object was to get a better description of men for the Indian service. All the assistant-surgeons entered the Queen's army by competition. It was not possible to introduce into the Bill all the regulations that would be necessary to be made, but those regulations would be laid before Parliament. The object of the Bill was to enable the Secretary of State to make certain regulations under which assistant-surgeons of the Indian army might be induced to enter the Indian army, and he believed that the advantages of Indian service were so great that many officers would be induced to avail themselves of the opportunity held out to them. There could be no object in requiring two examinations in such cases. The assistant-surgeon passed a competitive examination upon entering the Queen's army, and it would be useless to call upon him to undergo a second and similar examination upon transferring himself to the Indian service. There were also good medical schools in India from which men might also be drawn. After these explanations, he trusted the House would assent to the third reading of the Bill.

MR. MONSELL said, that having listened attentively to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, he still entertained a belief that the object of the Bill was to get rid of a system which had been deliberately adopted by Parliament — the system of competition in the Indian medical service, and to substitute for it the arbitrary will of the Secretary of State. That was not an object which the House should sanction. It was said that there was a difficulty in getting medical officers for the Indian service, and the right hon. Gentleman told them that he was not going to get a worse class of officers than we had at present there. If so, there was no reason to depart from the present system. Let the right hon. Gentleman hold out proper temptations, and there would be a hundred candidates for each appointment. Either there was no reason for the Bill or the standard of efficiency was to be lowered. If, as the right hon. Gentleman assured them, he had introduced many important improvements in the condition of the Indian medical service, there would be a sufficient number of candidates at the next competitive examination. It was a mere question of demand and supply. If terms were proposed such as men of education could not accept, the right hon. Gentleman would not get a sufficient number of proper candidates. The right hon. Gentleman said he wanted to get assistant-surgeons from the Queen's army to enter the Indian service; but then they were told by the hon. and gallant Officer opposite that there was a difficulty in obtaining a sufficient number of assistant-surgeons for the Queen's army. The proposition had filled him with alarm, because he knew that there lurked in many departments a dislike to the whole system of competition. He believed that if the Bill were carried, although he was quite sure the right hon. Gentleman would not depart from his promises, yet in the course of a short time the competitive system would be destroyed root and branch. He implored the right hon. Gentleman to withdraw the Bill, and not to endeavour in the last days of the Session, by means of a Government majority, to pass a measure which could not be fairly discussed, and which appeared to be so opposed to a system which had received the sanction of Parliament.

MR. LYSLEY said, he rose to join in the appeal. The provisions of the Bill appeared to him to be clear to substitute a system of patronage for a system of competition. He protested against a Bill which professed upon its face to confer unlimited powers being explained by a promise that those powers should only be exercised within a certain limit. That promise would no doubt be observed by the right hon. Gentleman, but he could not bind his successors. If the Bill were passed, he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Monsell) in thinking that it would be fatal to the system of competitive examinations. As to the want of candidates for the Indian service, that was to be traced to the inadequate inducements that were held out, and he thought that nothing would be so unwise as to deal in a niggardly spirit with medical officers in such a climate as that of India. Those arrangements which would procure the most efficient medical officers for our troops in India would, in the end, be by far the cheapest arrangements this country could make.

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, he also would express a hope that the right hon. Baronet would not attempt to force the Bill through during that Session. The House should regard with jealousy any measure which tended in the smallest degree to destroy the competitive examination system.

COLONEL SYKES expressed his entire approval of a local medical staff in India, as preferable to putting so many thousands of recruits into the hands of inexperienced persons. At the same time, he denied that the service proposed by the right hon. Baronet was necessary, seeing that the medical service in India was fast improving. He disapproved altogether of the removal of the existing tests, and would point out that while the right hon. Gentleman proposed to form a staff corps, by drawing from Her Majesty's service, there were at the present moment no less than 200 vacancies in that service.

MR. CLAY said, he could not understand, if the object of the right hon. Gentleman was to do so little, why he should have taken power in the Bill to do so much. The fact was the service had been up to a recent time very unpopular, but candidates were increasing, and he hoped that as the improvement went on, if they increased sufficiently, the right hon. Gentleman would in the next Session bring in a Bill to do just what was wanted and no more.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR asked, whether the right hon. Gentleman would produce the regulations for the information of the House?

SIR CHARLES WOOD said, that he could not produce the regulations before the Bill was passed, because he had no power to do so.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 44; Noes 46: Majority 2.

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Order for Third Reading *discharged.*

POOR RELIEF (METROPOLIS) BILL.

[BILL 224.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

MR. C. P. VILLIERS said, that in rising to move that the House go into Committee on the Bill, he trusted that he might be allowed to make one or two observations, inasmuch as he had been charged, without due foundation, firstly, with not having made a sufficiently full explanation of the objects of the Bill, and, secondly, with having made it at a very late hour. He would appeal to the House not to allow the measure to be lost, inasmuch as it was likely to mitigate the sufferings and miseries of a very unfortunate class of our fellow-beings—perhaps even to save their lives. He understood there were Members who intended to impede the progress of the Bill, chiefly on the ground that it involved a new principle which they thought dangerous, and which, if carried out, would, they said, impose a burden on property from which it had hitherto been comparatively exempt; and they said that with that novelty in the measure it ought not to be passed at so late a period of the Session. He would not deny that if the principle of the Bill were new there would be something in the argument, but there was no novelty in the principle, and the statement was, therefore, unsupported by the fact. It was stated that the measure threw the charge of that class of persons upon the whole property of the metropolis; that that had never been done before; and that such a precedent was extremely dangerous. There was, however, an Act of Parliament which embodied the very same principle for the support and relief of the same class of persons, and it was because there were provisions in that Act which could not be carried out that he brought in a measure to supply its defects. The measure to which he referred was the 7 & 8 *Vict.*, which was brought in in consequence of a general desire in that House to remove what was felt to be a scandal and reproach to the metropolis—namely, that people wandering about without a habitation or settlement suffered the extreme consequences of want, so that everyone was shocked by the scenes that took place. There was a strong feeling that something ought to be done, and a Bill was introduced and passed to carry out the principle that the metropolis ought to bear the burden of the support of these wayfarers. That Bill divided the metropolis into six districts, and applied the principle of the equalization of rates to the relief of that class of the poor. Rich parishes were combined with poor ones, and inquiry was made how the rates thus required could be levied equally. That Act, the 7 & 8 *Vict.*, now existed, and embodied the principle to which the hon. Member for Westminster objected. When an attempt was made to enforce the provisions of that Bill, however, objections were made by the guardians, the overseers, and the ratepayers. They found that the machinery was cumbrous and costly—that the Bill required the creation of six great asylums, which were supplemental workhouses, and hardly adequate for the relief of the class of persons in question. These asylums were a great distance from each other, and from the relieving officers, and it would be necessary to keep up great establishments in them all the year round, while it was only at one period of the year that there was a great demand for admission. The Bill was so distasteful to the public that they refused to apply it. A Committee of that House inquired into the subject, and, by a majority of one, passed a Resolution recommending the Poor Law Board, which had the right of enforcing the Act, not to carry it into effect. Notwithstanding that, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Wilts (Mr. S. Estcourt), when he was President of the Poor Law Board, again tried to enforce the Act, but found that it was impossible. The question was brought before the Committee which sat to inquire into the general operation of the Poor Law, and they, after careful and deliberate inquiry, came to the conclusion that the reason why the parishes did not make adequate provision for that class of the poor was the unequal distribution of the charge, and therefore they proposed the remedy which was embodied in the Bill before the House—namely, that the charge should be made equal, that a common fund should be created from which these persons should be relieved, and that thus no parish should have an inducement to refuse to relieve them. That was important when they considered the nature of the opposition which was about to be offered. If the measure had originated with him as a private individual, or, indeed, as President of the Poor Law Board, there might have been some force in the objections which were about to be raised; but he did not think that the authority of those who were about to raise those objections would outweigh that of a Committee of which such sound Conservative authorities were members as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wilts, the hon. Members for Devonshire and Cheshire, he believed the noble Lord the Member for Stamford, the hon. Member for Petersfield, and the hon. Member for Whitehaven, all of whom had voted for the proposition which was embodied in the Bill. The whole opposition to the Bill arose from a fear that it might be a step towards the equalization of the rates throughout the metropolis. One objection would be that it contained no clause, such as was recommended by the Committee, giving to the Poor Law Board power to enforce upon parishes an effective provision by means of wards and buildings for the lodging of the poor. Such a power was already contained in the 4 & 5 *Will.* IV, but it was limited by a proviso which had reference to the expense, so that beyond a certain amount it was impossible to exert that authority. Under the Bill before them there need be no apprehension as to the expense, because the fourth clause cast the expense of providing wards or buildings, as well as that of maintenance, upon the new common fund. He did not believe that that was an honest objection, because it was impossible to tell exactly where the wards would be wanted, or what number might be required in any one parish. Indeed, some of the parishes which discharged their duty most efficiently had no wards. There was a variety of ways in which these people might be provided for; and if the liability to relieve them was fixed upon the parishes they would soon find some means of doing it, so that we should not be shocked by hearing of people starving in the street. If, however, the objection was persevered in, it might be met by an Amendment of a single line which he had ready, providing that no union or parish should have the benefit of the Act which did not comply with the requirements of the Poor Law Board. Another objection which might be urged against the Bill which proposed that the Metropolitan Board of Works should collect the rates by which the fund was to be raised, was that that Board had by a small majority expressed their wish to have nothing to do with the matter. He never supposed that they would desire to have anything to do with it. He did not believe a word of what the hon. Member for Westminster said about their being an ambitious body who were anxious to extend their jurisdiction, and whom it was necessary to watch. The casting upon a machinery or a public body the duty of collecting a rate which was not strictly applicable to the purposes for which they were originally created was not new in principle. The overseers and guardians at present collected, under the title of poor rate, a great deal of money which was not expended upon the relief of the poor. He had not consulted the Metropolitan Board upon the subject, but as a matter of courtesy he informed them of what he was about to propose, and said that he hoped they would not object to perform the merely ministerial act of collecting the sum of £5,000; and he believed that they were men of so much patriotism and good feeling, that if this duty were cast upon them they would not shrink from its discharge. It could give them no trouble, and they might be performing a great act of humanity by lending themselves to that purpose. To the objection that it was late in the Session, he replied that the Bill was a very short Bill, and that unless a factious opposition was raised to it there was plenty of time to pass it. Last year the Session was, he believed, slightly prolonged in order that a measure for the better protection of game might be passed, and he saw no reason why, if necessary, a similar prolongation might not be submitted to in order to enable the Bill before them to receive the sanction of Parliament. As to the incidence of the rate, in nine cases out of ten there existed arrangements between landlords and tenants by which the latter paid the sewer rate. It did not matter who paid the rate; it must come out of the rent. It was not, however, correct to say, that at present the cost of the relief of the poor was entirely defrayed out of sums raised by rates paid by the tenant. The State contributed to the payment of masters of workhouses and schools, of doctors and auditors, and when paupers were sent into the lunatic asylum or as vagrants to prison they were supported out of the county rate. He could not help thinking, under those circumstances, that it was extremely desirable that the facilities proposed by the Bill should be conferred, and he trusted that goodwill would be brought to bear upon the discussion, and that a great scandal would not be allowed to continue.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. C. P. Villiers.*)

Mr. E. P. BOUVERIE said, he was sorry he could not agree with his right hon. Friend in thinking that the mode in which the Bill was introduced or the time at which it was brought forward were not open to objection. He was ready to admit that the existing state of things required that some remedy should be provided, but his right hon. Friend did not appear to him to have a full appreciation of the great difficulties with which the Question was beset. He wished briefly to remind the House of the circumstances under which the present proposition was made. It professed to be founded on the recommendation of a Committee which sat three years on the Poor Law administration of this country, but he would endeavour to show that it did not precisely conform to those recommendations. The Committee reported on the 31st of May, and their Report was ordered to be printed on that day; but from that time until about a week ago the House had received no intimation that it was the intention of the Government to legislate on the subject. It was not, indeed, until his hon. Friend the Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Lyall) had asked a question with regard to it, that the right hon. Gentleman had announced that he had a Bill already prepared. In accordance with that announcement the Bill was introduced on the 19th of July, at a late period of the evening, as he was informed, for he did not happen to be present on the occasion. And what, he would ask, followed? Instead of affording a little time to those interested in the question to consider the measure, the second reading was moved on the following day, at an advanced hour of the day. There was some reason for complaining, therefore, that his right hon. Friend had rather stolen a march on the House in introducing a Bill of such importance at the end of the Session, and pressing it on for discussion in the very week when it was understood the sitting of Parliament was about to terminate. The Bill was, he maintained, one of the most important in its principle and operation which had in the present Session been submitted to the notice of the House. It involved a problem which was, perhaps, about the most difficult of solution of any connected with that difficult branch of administration with which his right hon. Friend had to deal. The evil against which it was directed no doubt existed in the great city, or rather, he might say, the immense mass of cities to which it applied. There was, it must be admitted, in the metropolis a wandering, houseless, destitute population, for which there was no adequate provision. About twenty years ago an attempt was made to deal with the very same question. Sir James Graham introduced and carried a Bill which had the same object as that before the House, but which was of a character far more judicious and better prepared. His right hon. Friend had quoted that as a precedent for the measure which he proposed, but there was a very broad distinction between the two proposals. The Bill of Sir James Graham established districts for the relief of the poor, and the relief was to be dispensed by those who collected the rates out of which it was to be administered. There was to be a Board in each of those districts, selected from the Board of Guardians, which was to be intrusted with the management of the asylums constituted under the Act. Those who were taxed were those who had the administration of the relief; but his objection to the measure before them was, that it proposed to intrust the numerous bodies throughout the metropolis connected with the relief of the poor with the administration of funds collected from the whole of the metropolis. There were thirty-eight of those bodies, and the rental of the area which would come under the operation of the Bill was between £12,000,000 and £13,000,000, or not far short of the rental of the whole of Ireland, and every one of the bodies in question would have the power to give relief without stint to the casual poor. [Mr. C. P. VILLIERS: No, no!] He certainly read the Bill in that way, and the auditor would have no check on the administration of relief or the discretion of the guardians in granting it. It should under those circumstances be borne in mind that those for whom provision was sought to be made was not a limited class which could be dealt with as a constant body. Indeed, the great difficulty in the matter was that indiscriminate relief had a tendency to increase the numbers of the vagrant class, and thus to throw an additional burden upon the country. Mr. Buller in 1848 published a minute on the subject of vagrancy, which was well worthy of the consideration of the House, and in which he stated that it had a tendency, as it were, to spring from the ground under the operation of a system of indiscriminate relief, until at last it became overwhelming in its extent beyond all contemplation. There was, he might add, a curious instance given in one of the early reports emanating from Mr. Commissioner Hall, in which a case of great alleged hardship on the refusal of relief to a pauper boy was brought before the magistrates, who indulged in some severe remarks on the conduct of the officials by whom the relief was refused; the consequence being that the provisions on the subject were relaxed; and as a result, as Mr. Hall stated, 15,000 persons applied for relief in eight weeks, and the evil at last became intolerable. The truth was the House, in dealing with the subject, were like the knights fighting about the two sides of the shield. There were two distinct classes by whom relief was sought. Everybody was disposed to look with sympathy on the case of the honest mechanic out of work, or that of the widow and of the orphan children who had nobody to succour them. But there was a very different class—a squalid *lazzaroni* class—who were always ready to live on charity; and in the minute of Mr. Buller, to which he had already referred, he found the rapid increase of vagrancy in England and Wales reported at the time to exist—attributed principally to the system which had been adopted for the relief of the casual poor. There might, no doubt, be an attempt made to grapple with what was unquestionably a great evil, but then the subject was surrounded by immense difficulties which gentlemen coming from all parts of the country had a right to expect sufficient time would be allowed as far as possible to solve, and which should not be sought to be disposed of in the last week of the Session by means of a measure which was to be shoved through Parliament without discussion, while those who objected to that course being taken were charged with factious opposition. His right hon. Friend said the Bill was founded on the Report of the Committee which he had mentioned, but the fact was that that Committee recommended a good deal more than he proposed. They passed the following Resolutions:—

> "In order to secure sufficient and convenient means for the relief of the casual and houseless poor within the metropolis, as defined by the Metropolitan Local Management Act, it is expedient that the charges incurred for the support of such poor should be paid out of a rate assessed on the annual rateable value of the whole of the said metropolis. That, in the opinion of this Committee, the machinery adopted under the Metropolitan Local Management Act might be made available for raising the amount of such charge, and your Committee recommend that authority be given to the Metropolitan Board of Works for such purpose."

Then they go on to say—

> "That the Poor Law Board be empowered to prescribe and enforce all necessary arrangements for providing the requisite accommodation in the several unions and parishes, and otherwise carrying the foregoing Resolutions into effect. That, with the view of suppressing vagrancy as far as practicable, the Committee are of opinion that the central authority, when invested with ade-

quate power for that purpose, should direct Boards of Guardians to provide suitable and sufficient wards for the reception of the wayfaring and wandering poor, and that the regulations for their management and relief should be on a uniform system throughout the country."

[Mr. C. P. VILLIERS: This is a recommendation only for the metropolis.] Just so, but it was a matter which affected not merely the metropolis, but all the districts of the country, and what he dreaded was, that by removing from the local Boards all motive for strict — nay, he would even say scurvy and stingy administration of relief—there would be an indiscriminate and lavish distribution which, instead of a godsend, would be a curse to the poor themselves. He hoped his right hon. Friend would not reckon him among those who he seemed to think were ready to give a factious opposition to the Bill; on the contrary, he should be willing to lend him all the assistance in his power to pass a satisfactory measure. It was only because he believed it to be impossible to pass a satisfactory measure at that period of the Session, and because he believed his right hon. Friend, by passing a Bill in a hurried way, was incurring a great risk, in which he should not be willing to share, that he begged to move that the House go into Committee on the Bill that day month.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day month, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. LYALL said, that although he concurred in many of the arguments of the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, he did not agree with his observation that there was no urgency in the case. On the contrary, the Committee of which he had been a Member thought it a subject which deserved the early consideration of Parliament. Some time back the right hon. Gentleman, in reply to the hon. Member for Norfolk, stated that the subject would require several Bills, and that no general Bill would be introduced by the Government during the year. After the harrowing cases of distress amongst the poor of London during severe winter weather, of which they all had read in the newspapers, it would not be a comforting reflection at Christmas that a Bill providing relief had been opposed and thrown out. The Bill did not involve the principle of an extension of the area of rating generally, nor of an extension of the area of rating in the metropolis. Twenty years ago the Act of the 7 & 8 *Vict.* recognized the principle of general rating in each of the six districts of the metropolis on the rateable value, on the ground that the relief of casual poor was on a different footing from the relief of the resident poor. The 7 & 8 *Vict.* could not have been a very good measure, as it had proved unworkable and had been a dead letter. He thought the time had arrived when Parliament ought to pass a workable measure for the relief of the casual poor, and he would suggest that the Bill should be restricted in its operation to one year. Perhaps, however, that might not be necessary, inasmuch as the whole system of the Poor Laws must come before Parliament next Session, as the Poor Law Commission would expire in 1865, unless renewed by Parliament.

MR. BRISCOE said, he felt great apprehension lest the Bill, instead of alleviating the misery of the vagrant population, would be the means of increasing it. The cases of starvation reported by the press had not been among the casual and the vagrant, but among the resident poor, who were unwilling to enter a workhouse, and would have been saved by a modicum of out-relief. The Bill would increase the number of vagrants. The proposal to put the relief of vagrant and casual poor in the metropolis on the general fund would be an invitation for all the beggars in the country to flock to the metropolis. He remembered asking a party of beggars, having the appearance of bricklayers and bricklayers' labourers, where they came from. They replied, "Windsor." "But," said he, "why come to London?" "Oh," was the reply, "we can get at any workhouse a night's lodging and some food, and then we chance it for the day." This the Bill would increase. Besides, it would have the effect of superseding all voluntary charity. Therefore, he should support the Amendment; and he hoped that the President of the Poor Law Board would consent to postpone the Bill for the future consideration of the House when it again opened.

LORD ROBERT CECIL said, he wished to say a word, as he believed he was the only Conservative Member present who was on the Committee, and who was in favour of the principle of the Bill. As such he felt he had a right to complain of the course taken by the right hon. Gentleman, for he had placed him and those who were in the same situation in a painful dilemma. Had the Bill been introduced at a period of the Session when it was possible to consider it properly, he would have given it his heartiest support. There was an enormous evil to be remedied. Every winter most frightful cases of death from destitution were recorded in the newspapers, causing the deepest dissatisfaction with the working of the Poor Law, and numbers succumbed to disease brought on by want, whose deaths never got into the papers at all. If they did not give some power to the guardians to relieve this distress next winter, a fresh contingent would be added to the tale of persons whose fate was already laid to the charge of Parliament, who had suffered them to perish in spite of the professedly humane principles of the English law. That was a terrible responsibility to impose upon them. It was an awful alternative to have to choose between disregarding the ordinary form and rules of the House, and passing a Bill on a novel principle, which might produce evils they could not foresee, as they had not time to consider it adequately, or encountering the responsibility of having contributed to the starvation of their fellow creatures. The right hon. Gentleman had no right to place that terrible alternative before them. Under these circumstances, knowing as he did how great the evil was, he hesitated to vote against the Bill. No other compromise appeared to be open to them, under the difficulties of the case, than to ask the right hon. Gentleman to allow the Bill to terminate in February or March next, so that it might be in force during the winter. He hoped they would not be held to pledge themselves to any principle in agreeing to that temporary remedy for the evil which pressed upon them so. Next year they could discuss the questions and settle the basis on which it should rest, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would assent to the proposal.

Mr. LOCKE said, he quite concurred in the noble Lord's suggestion, though he could not concur with the Mover of the Amendment as to the difficulties which might result from the passing of the measure. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bouverie) had stated that there would be no check upon the expenditure, but if he had looked into the Bill he would have seen provision was made by the first clause that on the part of the Poor Law Board the same checks that were now applied to the relief of the poor should continue, and thus that one uniform system must be adopted throughout the metropolis. He believed that the whole amount that would have to be raised by the Metropolitan Board of Works under this Bill would be about £6,000 a year, and when they considered the large area over which the authority of the Board extended, a rate of a farthing in the pound would answer all purposes. Were they, then, to talk of the lavish expenditure of money that might take place, and the number of vagrants that might come into the town? The argument of the hon. Member for West Surrey, when he observed that the measure would do away with private charity, applied to any poor law; but his belief was, that however the public arrangements for the relief of the poor might be enlarged, there would always be ample room for the exercise of private charity. When he first had a seat in that House the Member for Kilmarnock was President of the Poor Law Board, and looking at the right hon. Gentleman's career while he held that office, he could not discover that he ever did anything to ameliorate the condition of the poor, but, on the contrary, every proposition with that object had always been received by him with steady opposition. If on the present occasion the right hon. Gentleman, instead of opposing the Bill upon its principle, had brought his experience to bear to remedy its defects when they got into Committee, he would have taken a more worthy course. The Bill would do something to remedy those terrible stories which always appeared in the winter season, and if it was defective its faults might be remedied next year.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, the Question was, the right hon. Member for Kilmarnock's Amendment, and not his past career at the Poor Law Board. The Bill involved two important principles—the extension of uniform rating, and the transfer of the Poor Law affairs to the Metropolitan Board of Works. [Mr. C. P. Villiers: No!] He could not but regard these principles with apprehension and doubt. His noble Friend the Member for Stamford had described in touching terms the great evil which required to be remedied; but the greater the evil the more inexcusable was it in the right hon. Gentleman not to have brought forward the Bill at an earlier period. The Bill involved principles for the discussion of which the House had a right to expect time and opportunity, and it was neither decorous nor courteous to submit such a Bill in the very last week of the Session, when it might have been introduced at any time during the last three months. It was a dangerous precedent, which they ought to discourage. He felt the difficulty pointed out by his noble Friend, but he thought they had a right to look to the President of the Poor Law Board to prevent the recurrence of the evils in question during the winter, and to introduce the Bill at a proper time next Session.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY said, he had no wish to raise a factious opposition to the Bill; but he thought the House had a right to find fault with the President of the Poor Law Board for not having allowed more time for the consideration of the Bill, seeing that the Committee had reported so far back as May. He agreed with the noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Lord R. Cecil) as to the awkward position in which the House was placed. It was easy to say that those who objected to the Bill were wanting in proper feeling towards the casual poor, but there was no ground whatever for that assertion. The right hon. Gentleman urged that there was nothing for it but to bring in a Bill of that kind, the District Asylum Act having failed; but the reason why that Act failed was because it was permissive merely, and the right hon. Gentleman should have introduced a Bill to make it compulsory. That Act, as he believed, worked very well, till one Metropolitan Union made an objection, and directions were thereupon given that no further steps should be taken in the matter. He could not help suspecting that the Bill before the House was an attempt to get in the thin edge of the wedge, and that sooner or later it would be sought to have a district rating for the whole of the metropolis. One great objection which he had to the measure was that under it the money would not be expended by those who paid and who had an incentive to check its improper application. Moreover, the Bill went in direct opposition to the 90th clause of the Metropolis Local Management Act, which expressly provided that the Metropolitan Board of Works should have nothing whatever to do with the funds raised for the relief of the poor; and he was glad that that Board had upon consideration decided, by however small a majority, against its being mixed up with this matter. It would be much better for the Poor Law Board, if it had the power, to compel Boards of Guardians to do their duty. Without denying the claims of the casual poor upon their commiseration, it should not be forgotten that there was one class of vagrants in all parts of the country, and especially in the metropolis, between whom and the really deserving it was necessary to discriminate. He alluded to the class of sturdy beggars, who had a strong repugnance to work for their living; and it would, he thought, be dangerous to teach such persons that they had only to come up to London to get food and lodging for nothing. Indeed, he did not see why if that Bill was really good for the metropolis it should not be good for Liverpool, Birmingham, and other large towns. In conclusion, he firmly believed, after the discussion which had taken place in that House, that no Board of Guardians would dare to neglect its duty in this matter.

MR. HARVEY LEWIS said, that feeling strongly that in a rich and prosperous community no person should run the risk of starvation, he regretted that the Bill had not been introduced at an earlier period of the Session. The Bill was founded upon a wrong principle, and was opposed to the whole of their legislation for relief of the poor. He denied, therefore, that those who opposed the measure were fairly open to the charge of factiousness or hard-heartedness. Nothing could be more objectionable to the ratepayers of the metropolis than the proposal to give such powers to the Metropolitan Board of Works as were contained in the Bill. It was wrong to impose on that Board duties inconsistent with those which they were elected to perform. Their hands were already full and they had solemnly expressed their aversion to have these foreign duties imposed upon them, which they could not perform with satisfaction to themselves or to their constituents. Not only did the Bill do so, but it sought to apply funds raised for one purpose—the sewage of the metropolis — to another, the relief of the poor; and it involved the proposal of shifting the burden of supporting the poor from the occupiers to the owners of property. Marylebone parish contained one-twelfth of the valuation of the metropolis; and if the entire relief for houseless poor was to amount to £6,000, that parish must pay for its quota, £500, though it might not be called upon to relieve houseless poor to the extent of £100 a year. Thus that parish would suffer by the change to the extent of £400 a year. But the metropolis ought not to be singled out for the application of a measure of this kind. If it were a good one it ought to be applied to the entire country, and ought not to be brought in at a time when Members were out of town. The noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Lord Robert Cecil), who was a Member of the Committee on the subject, suggested that the measure was only to continue in operation until March next, when the severity of winter should be over, and he (Mr. Harvey Lewis) objected to a measure of this kind being made permanent.

MR. GOSCHEN said, that the objection to the measure seemed to be directed more to the manner in which it was proposed to be administered than to the raising of the funds from the entire metropolis. It was an objection, however, based rather on sentiment than on principle, and was worthy rather of the vestry room than the House of Commons. It was said that if relief were expanded the number of destitute poor would increase. But would it be for a moment contended that the present state of things should be allowed longer to exist over another winter. The floating poor were of necessity driven eastwards — the residents of the West End were relieved of their presence—they said they were willing to contribute to their support, and if they were sincere in their profession they ought not to object to the Bill. The houseless poor did not belong to east or west, but were the common charge of the entire metropolis, and any measure which made the metropolis support them was a proper one, and did not at all interfere with the principle that every district should provide for its own poor.

MR. C. S. BUTLER said, he should support the Bill. It was to be regretted that more time had not been allotted for consideration, but he hoped that another winter would not be allowed to pass without some measure to afford relief to the destitute classes in whose behalf the Bill was introduced being adopted. He had communicated with the various Boards of Guardians in the eastern districts of the metropolis, and they were in favour of the Bill, and were anxious that it should become law.

LORD FERMOY said, that whether the proposed legislation was good or bad it was at all events hasty, and hasty legislation was always open to objection. He agreed in the principle of the measure so far as it declared that provision ought to be made for the homeless poor. But was there no alternative to passing the Bill? He maintained there was. The central authority had power enough by the present law to compel recusant Boards of Guardians to provide refuge wards for the homeless poor. His constituents had done this, and public opinion in the metropolis was in favour of that course. Let the right hon. Gentleman try the power he had, and he would find it unnecessary to pass such a Bill as that before the House for one winter. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that every Member of the Committee was bound by its recommendations. Now, he must say, while he felt bound by the Report as a whole, he objected to piecemeal legislation. The Committee had certainly agreed to the principle of the Bill; but they did not stop there. They proposed, by the power of the central body, to compel all Boards of Guardians throughout the country to deal liberally with the casual poor; but the right hon. Gentleman brought in a Bill to deal with the metropolis, and ignored the whole country. Was that fair to the metropolis? The result of not providing for the casual poor elsewhere would be to send them in greater numbers to the metropolis. The right hon. Gentleman ought to have dealt with the whole country in a comprehensive way, instead of which he had brought in a limited and one-sided measure, which he felt perfectly free to vote against. He advised the right hon. Gentleman to withdraw the present Bill, and let the country consider the whole subject in the recess; and when a general measure was introduced next Session it would probably pass without much altercation.

SIR MINTO FARQUHAR said, he wished to know whether the right hon. Gentleman had consulted any of the parishes in the metropolis with respect to the Bill, and what answers he had received. On the general question it was impossible for any one who lived in the metropolis, or read what appeared in the newspapers, not to feel that something should be done to relieve the casual poor. It was no party question. It was one of simple humanity. Still the principle of the measure was so important, and the opportunity for considering it so brief, that he hoped the Bill would be limited to the month of March next.

MR. C. P. VILLIERS said, he would

answer the Question put to him by the hon. Baronet, Whether he had taken any steps to ascertain the feeling of the metropolitan districts with respect to this Bill? Distinctly he had done so; and with respect to the lateness of the period when the Bill was introduced he might say, the Report of the Committee was made on the 31st of May; it was printed and delivered on the 18th of June. He did then take the course which the hon. Baronet seemed to think he ought to have done—to ascertain what the opinion of the metropolis affected by the Bill was, and as soon as he had ascertained that he gave notice of the Bill; at least he announced his intention in reply to a question put by the hon. Member for Whitehaven. He took steps to legislate on that portion of the Report which he thought most urgent. He had not during the course of the discussion been able to collect any real objections to the Bill. The existence of the evil which the Bill was proposed to remedy had not been denied, nor had it been urged that the Bill was not likely to meet those evils. He had not heard a single Member say that the Bill did not fairly represent the Report and the recommendation of the Committee, or that it would not have the effect of preventing those shocking occurrences which they all regretted so much. All that they had heard was that it had been introduced at a wrong time, and there never was a measure against which its opponents upon other grounds failed to urge the same objection. One objection to the Bill was an apprehension as to what might follow. [Sir MINTO FARQUHAR: What were the replies of the parishes?] He believed that only one out of the whole of the metropolitan parishes was unfavourable to the measure. The hon. Member for Marylebone (Mr. H. Lewis) appeared to object to the Bill on account of an apprehension as to the increase of cost, but he might mention that a portion of the hon. Gentleman's constituency, the inhabitants of St. Pancras, an important district of the borough, had, as far as he could gather from their communications, highly approved the Bill. They had passed a resolution and appeared to be unanimously in its favour, but thought that the district was hardly large enough, and that it ought to be a police district. The noble Lord the Member for Marylebone (Lord Fermoy) had given notice of his intention of moving an Amendment with that object. It had been urged against the Bill that it would afford increased temptations to vagrancy, but he could not perceive anything in the mode of relief which could possibly lead to that result. The hon. Member for Westminster (Sir John Shelley) objected to the Bill because he believed it would attract vagrants from the country from the circumstance that no one would be turned away. He did not, however, regard that as a result which was likely to follow. He had believed it to be better to bring in the Bill late in the Session rather than not at all, and, as he was confident in the success of the experiment, he was willing to agree to the proposal which had been made to limit the operations of the Act to the first of April next. That limit would cover the period within which the shocking cases which had been referred to would be likely to occur.

MR. E. P. BOUVERIE said, that he would withdraw his Amendment upon that understanding, but he must insist upon satisfactory evidence being adduced to show that the Boards of Guardians possessed proper places for the reception of the casual poor previous to the reimbursement of their expenses by the Metropolitan Board of Works.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow* at One of the clock.

MUTUAL SURRENDER OF CRIMINALS (PRUSSIA) BILL—[BILL 231.]—(*Lords.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. WHITE said, he rose to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee upon the Bill on that day month. The measure had arisen from a convention signed in London, March 5, 1864. He held that it was not respectful or decorous to the House that such a Bill should be delayed to so late a period of the Session. The Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs had just informed him that this measure had passed the House of Lords. That might be a strong recommendation to the hon. Gentleman, but with all respect to the House of Lords, it was not the slightest recommendation to him (Mr. White). The

Prussian Government would have the power, under the Bill, to follow an unfortunate exile into this country, and, upon suspicion that he had attempted to commit murder, to have him captured, and sent back to Prussia. After the atrocious conduct of Prussia in Posen — he would say nothing of later transactions—he thought there were very strong reasons to hesitate before they entered into an extradition treaty of this kind with that country. If any Prussian subject were supposed to have sympathy with the Poles across the frontier, and had entered the British territory, the Bill would give the Prussian Government power to persecute that individual by trumping up a charge of attempting to murder against him, and demand that he should be given up to them. The Bill also gave the Prussian Government power to demand the extradition of a subject who had fled to this country, who was supposed to be guilty of robbery with violence. There was something ludicrous in the idea of Prussia coming to ask for justice against persons who had been guilty of robbery with violence. The murderer of Mr. Briggs was believed to be a German; but with regard to such a man there was no difficulty, as our laws were sufficient to meet a case of that kind. Now that we had a well-grounded belief in an association or a Holy Alliance of the great Northern Powers it seemed to him (Mr. White) somewhat suspicious that M. Bismark should want a Bill of this character. If the measure were passed, the time would come when Austria would apply to us for a similar measure; and Russia afterwards. He believed that the Bill was not intended for its ostensible purpose. He looked upon the measure as one aimed against political exiles andt ha t it was intended to prevent us affording an asylum to patriots who fled here for refuge from the persecutions inflicted upon them in their own country. If there were any real value in the Bill it should not have been delayed until the end of the Session, when it was almost impossible to discuss its merits. The conduct of Prussia was not of a nature calculated to secure the good opinion of England. At all events, the Bill was not of such pressing importance that it ought not to be postponed until the next Session. Under these circumstances he should move that the House should resolve itself into a Committee upon it that day month.

MR. HENNESSY seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day month, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. James White,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. LAYARD said, that the object was merely to confirm a simple extradition treaty such as we had with Italy, France, and other Powers. Although the convention bore date the 5th of March the ratifications had not been exchanged till the 8th of April. The Bill had no political tendency. We had similar conventions with other European nations for mutual convenience; and his hon. Friend (Mr. White) must remember that the provisions of the convention could not be put in force without a legal process. The convention applied to persons accused or convicted of murder; comprehending the crimes of assassination, parricide, infanticide, and poisoning, attempt to commit murder, forgery, fraudulent bankruptcy, burglary, robbery with violence to the person robbed, larceny, or embezzlement by clerks and servants. It would be a great convenience to us to have the convention, and he could assure the House that there was nothing in it which ought to alarm even a Gentleman of the advanced political opinions of his hon. Friend, for there was no desire on the part of the Government to put an end to the patriotic feeling of Prussian patriots.

LORD ROBERT CECIL said, he could not agree that the question was quite so simple a matter as the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs would have them believe, neither did he feel satisfied that the political element was excluded from the treaty. The great difficulty they had to look at was the law of conscription, and what he feared was that under the Bill they would be called upon to apprehend deserters for a despotic Power. Now, a case in point had just happened? Certain Poles escaped from the Russian army and fled to America, and they were demanded by Russia from America under a similar extradition treaty. Conscription was often used as a mere engine of oppression, and deserter was very often used as only another name for political exile, and what he wanted to show was that something of the same kind might be included in the Bill. Burglary by the law of Germany meant a nocturnal breaking or forcing into any dwelling-house or any building thereunto belonging with the intention of committing a crime. It did not mean an English crime but a Prussian crime, and that might mean desertion. So that a soldier who escaped from his barracks and broke through an outside building for the purpose of desertion would come within the clause in the Bill. He thought it would have been much better if the Bill had stated distinctly the exact nature of the crime, and not have given two lines of German to explain an English word. [Mr. LAYARD: That is childish.] He would thank the hon. Gentleman to refute his argument. What he objected to was that the Bill took cognizance of a Prussian crime and not an English crime, without any attempt to define it. The same kind of objection applied to the crime of embezzlement. We might call it embezzlement, but by the German it was breach of duty; and what he feared was, that by the terms of the treaty we should be delivering over those who came to our shores to an extent we little thought of. He did not say that all the things at which he had glanced would happen, but they might happen. The Bill was not drawn with that caution and circumspection that was necessary, considering the particular country with which we were dealing and the spirit of our own laws. He thought the Bill should be delayed and further time given for its consideration.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he thought his noble Friend had not rightly apprehended either the provisions of the Bill or the general principles which pervaded all measures of the same nature. If his noble Friend would consider the matter he would see that in conformity with the treaty itself the Bill provided expressly that no one should be delivered up except such evidence was produced as according to the English law would justify a magistrate in committing him for the offence in this country. That principle was perfectly well settled. The matter was fully considered in the case of the slave Anderson, who was demanded for extradition from Canada on the ground of his having committed what by the law of the United States was considered murder —namely, killing the person who sought to apprehend him and deliver him back to slavery. But it was held by the highest authorities in this country that he could not be delivered up, for this reason—that a man who killed another while defending his own liberty could not be guilty of murder according to the laws of this country. And in the cases instanced by the noble Lord the crimes should, according to the laws of the United Kingdom, have amounted to burglary or embezzlement, and that was the language not only of the statute but of the treaty also. In truth, the words to which the noble Lord had referred were used only for the purpose of making clear to the German mind what the English words burglary and embezzlement meant. English words must be interpreted by English magistrates in an English sense — the German terms were merely equivalents. No one could doubt that according to the Bill and the treaty an English magistrate must be satisfied that the accused person had been guilty of what would be the offence of burglary or larceny according to the English laws.

MR. HENNESSY said, he would remind the House that the Question had really arisen, not as between England and Prussia, but as between Russia and Prussia. He found that one of the crimes included in the schedule was robbery with violence. Now what had happened? A certain number of Polish refugees were apprehended in Prussia, under a similar treaty between Russia and Prussia, and when England and France remonstrated, the answer was that they had been apprehended on a charge of robbery with alleged violence, they having stolen some forage, or something of that sort. The consequence was that the political refugees had been given up to Russia. Now it was remarkable that it was the first time not only that the Prussian word for burglary would come into an Act of Parliament, but also the words "robbery with violence." That was the definition of burglary which it was sought to introduce into an English Act of Parliament. He had no confidence in the Bill after what our Government had done with our own police. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, unfortunately for his own reputation and also that of the Government and the country, sent two English detectives, at a critical time, to Russia. He (Mr. Hennessy) stated at the time that the two detectives received £1,000 each from the Russian Government, and he would now inform the House why it was they were paid that money. Before the Polish insurrection broke out the Grand Duke Constantine applied to this country for two detectives to be sent to Warsaw, and by the Home Secretary's permission they went there, at a time when the severity of the Prussian rule was so great that almost every country in Europe had remonstrated. A Polish exile, who had been many years in this country, went to Warsaw with a British passport in the name of Brett. He (Mr. Hennessy) heard when at Cracow, that Walker, one of these detectives, saw Brett in the streets of Warsaw, recognized him, and he was arrested. That was before the insurrection. Brett was cast into prison, and three months after the insurrection broke out Brett was taken out and hanged in the streets of Warsaw. That man travelled under a British passport in an assumed name. He was a refugee, but he never fought against Russia. However, the unfortunate man was hanged, and the two English bullies received £1,000 each. It was notorious that the Duke Constantine was assisted by the English and French police in detecting the Polish refugees from Paris and London, some of whom it was desirous to place in the list of proscriptions, and others in the list of conscription. They had seen enough of these proceedings to be cautious how they allowed a Bill of this kind to pass. The Prussian Government strained laws such as that before them against political offenders, and he hoped the House would reject the Bill.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, the hon. Gentleman had recurred to a subject with regard to which the fullest information had been afforded last year. Every paper connected with the matter had been laid upon the table; the hon. Gentleman did not last year make the charge which he had just now made, and he (Sir George Grey) utterly disbelieved that there was any foundation whatever for it. The House was perfectly satisfied, when the subject was last year before it, with the explanation that had been given. The hon. Gentleman had said that Prussia had delivered up the Polish refugees under a treaty similar to that before the House. But had the hon. Gentleman compared both treaties? If he had he would admit the force of his argument; if not, he could not admit that it was good for anything.

MR. AYRTON said, that no answer had been given to the Question asked by his hon. Friend (Mr. White)—namely, whether a person was to be given up charged with murder or attempt to murder without any qualification. It was said he was not to be given up unless he was guilty of an offence the commission of which would make him liable to be convicted of murder in England. If a man engaged in an insurrection in England he might be liable to be tried for murder, because any act contrary to law that ended in death was murder in England. Therefore, under the Bill, all political refugees might be given up if engaged in acts which in England would be illegal if carried on against the Government. If so, he did not see what was to prevent the Poles who took refuge in England after an insurrection being charged with simple murder—that is to say, killing or attempting to kill any of the subjects of the Czar. They would all be liable to be claimed and given up under this Bill.

SIR FRANCIS GOLDSMID said, that the explanation of the hon. and learned Attorney General appeared to be satisfactory as respected persons accused; but the convention also contained a provision that fugitives convicted of crime should be given up on a copy of the conviction being produced. Some further safeguards were necessary.

MR. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD said, he thought there was great force in what had fallen from the hon. Gentleman (Sir Francis Goldsmid). In foreign countries a man might be convicted of crime in his absence *par contumace*. A man who was a political refugee might be convicted of any crime in his absence. There ought to be something to guard against a conviction such as that. If he understood the Attorney General, the learned Gentleman stated that a man could not be given up unless a magistrate here was satisfied that the circumstances were such that the man would be convicted of the crime if the circumstances occurred in this country. But take the case of burglary. That was a technical crime, and must be committed in certain hours between night and morning. Was it meant that the same circumstances which constituted the crime of burglary in this country must be proved in every case under the treaty?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he had no hesitation in saying that the circumstances required in this country must be proved in order to justify extradition.

MR. CLAY said, he wished to know if there was any difference between the treaty and other extradition treaties which we had concluded with foreign countries. The other treaties had worked well, and inasmuch as we had not been called upon to give up under them political offenders or persons who had been engaged in insurrection, he did not see that there was any objection to that before the House, if it was similar to the rest. An answer to that question would, he thought, prevent the discussion being protracted.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: I think the explanation given by my hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General ought to be sufficient. It is not true, as has been supposed, that a Foreign Government would send here and claim a man, requiring that a statement of his guilt should be taken without any further inquiry, and that its own explanation of its own law is to be the rule according to which a man should be given up. The treaty requires that proof shall be given to satisfy a magistrate that if the offence charged had been committed in this country, it would, according to our law, justify the committal of the man. Therefore, that clearly excludes any foreign interpretation of any crime under which a man can be claimed under the treaty in question. This treaty is exactly the same with what has been concluded with Denmark. I may state from my own knowledge, that in regard to the treaty with France difficulties have arisen, and complaints have been made by the French Government in consequence of the conditions attached to the delivery of the man. We have required that witnesses should come over, and that oral testimony should be given to prove that the man has committed in France a crime which in England would justify his committal. The French Government required that written documents should be sufficient. But this we have not admitted, and that has sometimes prevented our delivering up a French criminal claimed by the French Government. It is quite clear that no political offender could be claimed under this treaty. As to the notion that the fact of a man having been concerned in an insurrection would bring him in this country under the description of a murderer, that is really not for a moment to be entertained. The laws of this country would not construe that to be murder which is simply being engaged in civil war against the Government of the country. Therefore, there can be no sort of apprehension that this treaty could be used for the purpose of enabling Foreign Governments—whether Prussia, or Russia, or any other—to claim a political offender. As to the assertion of the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Hennessy) that political offenders may be claimed, as between Prussia and Russia, under the extradition treaty between those countries, that may be true, because the crime of insurrection may be a crime which under that treaty may justify one Government in claiming a refugee from another. It does not, however, follow that a political refugee can, under the operation of the English law, be claimed under the provisions of this treaty.

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, that the hon. Member for Hull (Mr. Clay) had asked the noble Lord whether the present treaty was identical with the extradition treaties with other countries? He understood the noble Lord to state that this was quite a different extradition treaty. [Viscount PALMERSTON: I said it was the same.] The noble Lord had pointed out the inconvenience which the present extradition treaty with France had caused.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON said, he wished to explain. He had stated that the present treaty was the same as other extradition treaties, and, as a proof of the safeguards which the treaty gave to persons claimed, he stated that with regard to the treaty with France difficulties had arisen about giving up a man because oral proof had not been given that the man had committed a crime in France which in England would justify his committal.

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, that there was an inconsistency between the noble Lord's explanation and the second clause of the Bill. It would be necessary for some legal Member of the Government to point out the words in the clause that corresponded with the terms of the extradition treaty now in force.

SIR CHARLES WOOD said, he thought the Attorney General had clearly explained that it must be proved that a fugitive had committed an act which in this country would justify his committal, otherwise he would not be given up.

MR. LOCKE said, he wished to point out that the paragraph of the section headed "thirdly" provided that, in the case of a fugitive convicted of crime, an authenticated copy of the conviction should be produced, and proof of the identity of the person convicted be given to the satisfaction of the magistrate. Therefore, if either a man was convicted in Prussia *en contumace* of an attempt to murder, and was convicted in his presence and afterwards escaped, his only offence having been that he was engaged in an insurrection, all that the Prussian authorities would have to do to obtain his surrender by this country would be to produce an authenticated copy of the conviction and give evidence that the man they claimed was the person named in it. He did not know whether that provision was identical with those contained in other extradition treaties, but we certainly ought not to strain any point in favour of Prussia, who was doing her best to put down liberty on the Continent.

MR. FERRAND said, that as it was a Bill which greatly affected the character of the country, he should move the adjournment of the debate, in order that the measure might be discussed at a proper period of the evening.

MR. CRAUFURD said, he wished to call attention to the circumstance that the paragraph of the second section headed "secondly" contained a provision—

> "That depositions or statements on oath, certified under the hand of the magistrate by whom the original warrant was issued, and attested by the oath of the party producing them to be the original depositions or statements, or true copies thereof, may be received in evidence of the criminality of the fugitive apprehended."

That appeared to be a departure from the principle upon which the noble Lord stated that we had acted under the treaty with France. If he was not mistaken, in consequence of the objections of the French Government, an Act was brought in which would have authorized the reception of depositions under the treaty with that country, but was rejected by the other House, the late Lord Campbell saying that he would never admit such a departure from the principles upon which criminal justice was administered in this country.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that he held in his hand the treaty with France, and it was in all the points that had been mentioned exactly similar to that before the House. In the treaty under consideration, however, murder was much better defined than it was in that one. Here it was stated to comprehend assassination, parricide, and two other offences. [MR. HENNESSY: Assassination ?] He apprehended that the laws of no civilized country would say that "assassination" included the taking of life in an insurrection where the parties were openly and fairly in the field. The provisions of the French Treaty as to the production of convictions were precisely the same as those which were contained in this convention. In both cases, of course, it would be necessary that the magistrate should be satisfied not merely that the fugitive who was claimed had been convicted of an offence which was called murder, or whatever it might be, in the country from which he had fled, but that the offence of which he had been convicted was such as would have amounted to that crime in this country. The House must be satisfied that in carrying out the treaty which had been entered into with Prussia there would be no risk of our abandoning those safeguards of liberty which had in all similar cases been maintained in this country. It ought to be remembered that the administration of this law would be in the hands of the judges of the realm, who had always been most jealous of any extension of the interpretation of Acts of Parliament of this kind, and who would take care that the law of this country was not made instrumental to the surrender of persons as criminals for acts that would not in this country constitute the offences charged. He trusted that the House, having regard to the fact that this treaty had actually been entered into with Prussia, would not hesitate to give it its sanction.

MR. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD said, he begged to point out that there was a most extraordinary difference between the convention with France and that before the House, and the hon. and learned Gentleman, when he said that the cases were exactly similar was entirely in error. According to the clause of the Bill before them a fugitive convicted of crime might be given up on authentic proof of the conviction and identity of the party. Now, in the 6 & 7 *Vict.* there was not a word enabling this country to give up a person on certificate of conviction, on the ground that he had been convicted before. So far from the cases being identical, they were exactly the reverse. The treaties between England and France were the same as between England and Prussia; but Parliament had omitted the clause which was inserted in the present Bill. He should like to know what justification there was for putting into this Act a clause which had no effect between this country and other powers. The noble Lord had intimated that the treaty was the same, and that the Acts of Parliament were the same. Now, if any hon. Member could prove that the stipulations between this country and foreign countries were the same as in that case, he should be out of court; but he contended that the Bill proposed to give powers for the extradition of criminals which were not given in the case of France, and he for one was not disposed to extend the law in favour of Prussia.

Mr. WHITE said, that when the Attorney General, with that eloquence by which he was characterized, had talked in glowing terms of English principles and English justice, he could not help thinking that the American term "bunkum" might with great propriety be applied to his speech. The fact was that the Bill before the House had nothing to do with English principles or English justice, but rather with Prussian law and Prussian injustice. Political offenders were frequently condemned in their absence by foreign courts as they termed it *par contumace,* as was the case with M. Mazzini, who if he had been a Prussian might be delivered up on the following day under the operation of the Bill at the request of the Prussian Ambassador. That being the nature of the measure, he should offer it all the opposition in his power, believing it, as he did, to be a flagrant and atrocious violation of the right of asylum which was the boast of this country.

Sir GEORGE GREY said, he would point out that the treaty between England and France, to which the hon. Member for Horsham (Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald) had adverted, was not that which was at present in force. The treaty to which the hon. Gentleman referred was that of 1843; whereas there was one of 1852, to which an Act giving effect had been passed in 1853.

Viscount PALMERSTON: As there appears to be some doubt about the treaties, I have no objection to the adjournment of the debate.

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

EDUCATION—(INSPECTORS' REPORTS).

RESOLUTION.

Viscount PALMERSTON: I rise, Sir, to ask this House to do an act of generosity and of justice. This House is one of the highest authorities in the realm. There is, technically speaking, no appeal from its decision. But if by circumstances it should have been led to do that which is not founded in justice, there is an appeal which I am sure must always be successful when made. We know that the approval of the House of Commons is one of the highest objects of ambition to every man engaged in the service of the country; and we also know that its censure is felt most deeply by any man on whom it may happen to fall. I have said that, technically speaking, there is no appeal from the decision of this House, but there is, nevertheless, an authority to which, in reality, such an appeal can be made; and that authority is one which is always ready to hear everything that can be alleged in favour of the person wronged, and is always open to listen to the truth when stated, though the truth may be in opposition to its original belief and conviction. The authority to which I allude is the House itself. I am quite sure that if it can be shown to the House that the decision at which it may have arrived in any case, whether affecting an individual or a department, has been arrived at hastily, or without full consideration, or upon inadequate grounds, an appeal to its sense of justice can never be made in vain, and that it will always be ready to set right that which it may have done wrongly. On the 12th of April last there was a debate in this House, and a Resolution was proposed inculpating a right hon. Member as well as a Department of the Government. The right hon. Member is my right hon. Friend the Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe), and the Department of the Government is the Committee of Council for Education. The noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Lord Robert Cecil) moved a Resolution affirming that the Report of the Inspectors of Schools had been mutilated as produced to this House, that that mutilation had deprived the Reports of their proper value, and that the practice was at variance with the understanding on which those Inspectors were originally appointed. My right hon. Friend, feeling that in the course of the debate a question had arisen which, in his opinion, involved an imputation on his veracity, with a nice sense of personal honour, and at variance, I am bound to say, with the advice of his friends, tendered the resignation of his office, and took upon himself the censure which the Resolution implied. That being so, we thought the matter could not be allowed to rest there; and the decision of the House having been founded on a misconception, and on a want of sufficient explanation, we deemed it right that a Committee should be appointed to investigate the matter, and to ascertain on what grounds the Resolution had been proposed. I am not at all seeking to impugn the conduct of the noble Lord who moved the Resolution, or that of those Members who voted for and carried it. They acted on their honest and sincere conviction, though I think I can show that that conviction was founded on error. It was determined, at all events, that a Committee should be appointed; and our first Motion was that the Members of that Committee should be named in the usual way. We thought it essential that my right hon. Friend should serve on it; but he declined to do so, and we were unable to persuade him to retract the decision. The Committee were eventually nominated by the General Committee of Elections. That Committee met and made the Report which is in the hands of the House. Now, the Resolution of the 12th of April has been, in my opinion, entirely negatived by the Report, and, that being so, I propose to the House to rescind a Resolution at variance with the deliberate Report of a Committee so appointed. The Resolution passed by the House was to the effect that the Reports of the Inspectors of Schools were mutilated, and, therefore, were deprived of their value; but the Committee reported, as hon. Members are well aware, that, in point of fact, it was not correct to state, as was stated in the Resolution, that from those Reports was excluded everything that was unfavourable to the views of the Committee on Education, or that those things only were inserted which were in their favour. The Committee found that passages were admitted—some favourable to them and some unfavourable—that there was no partiality in that respect, and that a fair representation was given of the opinions of the Inspectors of Schools. The Committee say that disquisitions on matters not belonging to the cognizance of the Inspectors had been omitted, and that they think such omission was right and proper. They also say that such a supervision is essential to the working of the Committee of Council as it is now constituted. Therefore, the Report of the Committee appears to me entirely to exculpate my right hon. Friend and the Department to which he belonged from the charges which were implied by the Resolution of the 12th of April. I therefore propose to the House the Resolution which I now place in your hands—

"That this House, having considered the Report of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the practice of the Committee of Council on Education with respect to the Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, is of opinion that the Resolution passed on the 12th day of April last, with reference to such Reports, ought to be rescinded, and the said Resolution is hereby rescinded."

MR. HOWES: Sir, as Chairman of the Committee I should wish to say a few words on this Question. If it had come on at an earlier period of the evening I should have thought it my duty to go at some length into the matters connected with it, but at this time of night I cannot be expected to do so. In the first place, however, I trust sincerely that the House, although this Motion has been brought on at a late time of night, and at a late period of the Session, will not object to it on the ground of time, knowing as we do that the noble Lord is extremely limited as to time, and it being absolutely imperative that this question should be set at rest once and for ever. Whatever different opinions there may be on this point and on others which may arise in the course of the debate, I hope there will be no difference upon one on which the Committee were unanimous — that the personal honour of the right hon. Member for Calne is absolutely and entirely clear and untouched. If any doubt of the sort has existed in the mind of any man in or out of this House, I trust it will be set at rest henceforth and for ever. As to the conduct of his Department, it is quite clear that for many years it has exercised a censorship and control over the Reports of the Inspectors. The Committee found unanimously that such a power existed, and that it had existed for many years, and, moreover, that it had been exercised with fairness and without excessive strictness. The noble Lord has analyzed the terms of the Resolution to a certain extent. I should be unwilling to discuss the meaning of the word "mutilation." The Committee considered that point. They refer to it in their Report, and they say that it must always be a matter of opinion whether the omission or alteration of any portion of a document has or has not an important bearing with reference to that which is admitted or is permitted to stand. The following words of the Resolution of the 12th of April are to the effect that there has been an exclusion of matter unfavourable to the views of the Department, and matter admitted which is favourable to them. If that is true, it is true to the letter, and yet the converse is also true; and if the converse be added to the Resolution it has no effect whatever, and becomes a *caput mortuum*. Then comes the point which is really at issue. The Resolution affirms that the censorship of the Reports is at variance with the understanding originally existing on the appointment of the Inspectors. It seems to me that this Question entirely depends upon this consideration —Is this body of men entirely under the control of the Department and under the orders of the Department, or is it a body of men absolutely independent of the Department? If it is a body independent of the Department, then, of course, any supervision or alteration of their Reports is a most improper proceeding; but if it is considered that the Inspectors are clearly officials of the Department and subordinate to its regulations, then, of course, no complaint can arise. The mistake—for so I must call it—appears to me to have arisen in this way: When the Committee of Council was originally formed, Parliament, no doubt, required information on various matters connected with education, and was anxious to receive not only facts, but opinions, however discordant, to assist the Department in hitting on some system of education which might be supported by the Government. That necessity for ascertaining these various opinions ceased in the course of a few years, when the system was established. Then the Reports became quite of a different character, it became no longer necessary to have this mass of opinions, and the Reports assumed their present character. It seems to me that the error of the noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Lord Robert Cecil) originated here. I trust, however, that there will be no opposition to the Motion of the noble Viscount. I trust that the noble Lord the Member for Stamford and the hon. Member for Berkshire (Mr. Walter) whom I see opposite, and other hon. Members who supported the Resolution, will acquiesce cordially in the noble Lord's Motion for the rescinding of that Resolution. The Resolution of the 12th of April appears to me quite unsupported with facts, and I may say is entirely at variance with them. I do not see, indeed, how the Resolution can assist the views of the hon. Members to whom I have referred in the matter. Their views appear to me to be to reassert the right to receive from the Inspectors all the information they may choose to give, both as to matters of fact and matters of opinion. If that be their object they ought to proceed, not by a Resolution of this kind, but by an entirely different course. They ought to move for an inquiry in far more general terms; in some such terms, in fact, as those suggested by the right hon. Member for Droitwich (Sir John Pakington) when the appointment of the Committee was proposed, and which would have considerably extended the inquiry of the Committee. If such a Committee had been obtained, those who supported the Resolution of the 12th of April might have appeared before it to support their views; but I believe they would be far more free if they were relieved from the Resolution now standing on our books. Therefore, I cordially support the Resolution of the noble Lord.

Mr. WALTER: Sir, I have no hesitation in saying at once that I have not the slightest desire or intention to oppose the Motion of the noble Lord, both because I think that the main object aimed at by the Resolution which it is now proposed to rescind has been fully attained by the inquiry, and also because I should be sorry to be guilty of want of respect towards the Committee, which, I think, was selected with great fairness, and which has also conducted the inquiry with great fairness, and whose Report, though I cannot concur to the full extent in the description of it given by the noble Lord—indeed, I should be disposed to take exception to some of his expressions—still points in the direction indicated by his Motion. The only thing I do complain of is, that the noble Lord should not have availed himself of the power which he might undoubtedly have exercised to give this Motion precedence over the Orders of the Day, so as to afford to many hon. Members who have been forced to quit the House from sheer exhaustion an opportunity of stating their opinions upon it. The Report states that the principle involved in the object of this inquiry, and in the Resolution of the 12th of April, is important. That is undoubtedly the case; and I may add that it has acquired an adventitious importance from the unfortunate circumstance to which that Resolution led—the resignation of my right hon. Friend the late Vice President of the Committee of Education—who, actuated by feelings most honourable to himself, but hardly called for, in my opinion, by the occasion, considered the Resolution to be a reflection on his personal honour. I never took that view of it myself, as my right hon. Friend well knows; and many hon. Gentlemen, whose authority my right hon. Friend would be the first to acknowledge, fully shared that opinion. It appears to me that this misunderstanding, as it is termed in the Report, was owing to the construction put upon the word "mutilation." I believe the word was chosen rather from the want of a better word than from any other reason; but it certainly never was intended by it to throw any personal reflection on my right hon. Friend. In fact, if instead of the word "mutilation" we had used the words by which is described the practice of the Department—of which I may say we knew nothing at the time—if the Resolution had said, "In the opinion of this House the practice of sending back to the Inspectors their Reports to be altered by them and brought into conformity with the Minute of 1861, &c.," instead of "the practice of mutilating," &c., it would equally have answered my purpose, and would have been strictly consistent with the fact. The question is, what really was the practice of the Department in the matter. It appears to be thought that the essence of the charges against the Committee of Council was their alleged practice of marking Reports; but I wish it to be distinctly understood that that is not a practice I should complain of. Nor should I object to the Department overhauling the Reports and exercising a kind of censorship over them. My right hon. Friend explained at great length, on several occasions, the history of the practice. He said it always had existed, but on one occasion a passage occurred in an Inspector's Report so wholly irrelevant and improper—a comparison between the state of chastity of Protestants and Catholics, or something of that sort—that the Minute of 1861 was framed. I am of opinion that such a Department could not be carried on without some degree of censorship over the Reports, and without the power of striking out irrelevant passages. But the gist of my complaint was that passages bearing on questions in controversy were unfairly struck out, and that the House had not the benefit of statements of fact made by the Inspectors within their own official experience. My right hon. Friend gave his own explanation of the practice of the Department. He stated that the reason which induced him to frame the Minute of 1861 was as follows:—

> "The reason was my reluctance to strike out anything myself, as a matter of authority, from the Reports of the Inspectors. It appeared to me that it was a bad plan to strike anything out as a matter of authority, and then present the Report to Parliament, as the Report of the Inspector. I thought it might raise a controversy between the Inspector and the Office, and that he would say, as, I believe, in some cases he did say, that the context was interfered with by striking out portions, and that the meaning of what remained was altered. I preferred very much, and it seemed to me, and to Lord Granville, to be the better course, to make the Inspector his own censor, and to collect into one Minute, instead of into different Minutes, what it was necessary to say on the subject of the Inspectors' Reports; and, if an Inspector happened seriously to offend, to call his attention to it, and to leave him to alter the Report."

The practice therefore was, instead of striking out any passage in a Report, to send back the Report to the Inspector, with a notification that if he did not make it conform to certain instructions it would be suppressed. That, however, was more objectionable, as it seems to me, than marking the Report, and for an obvious reason. Here is a case in point. Mr. Watkins addressed a letter to the Committee of Council in the following terms:—

> "I have the honour to return to you herewith the manuscript of my general Report for 1862, which I have received from you by this post, and to point out to you that, though it has been returned to me under the circular of August 27, 1862, no passage in it is marked as objectionable; I am therefore utterly at a loss to know what it is in my Report that is censured; I drew it up most carefully in conformity with your letter of instructions, and I believe that it is entirely both according to the spirit and the letter of that document; but I shall be most happy to consider any objections which may be pointed out to me and, if I can, conscientiously, alter the passages censured."

I do not know what satisfaction Mr. Watkins got on that occasion, for it is not mentioned. I suspect it was very little, because in answer to another question Mr. Lingen said that my right hon. Friend the Vice President "considered it part of the policy of the Minute to say to an Inspector, 'This is not a Report which we will print at the public expense.' If the Inspector said, 'Why?' there was no answer to that question; he was merely referred to his instructions." Again, in another part of his evidence, Mr. Lingen said—

> "I should like to substitute the actual communications that passed between the Office and the Inspectors. Here is the Minute, stating what the Report ought to be; here is a Report sent in; here is the judgment of the Committee, that it does not conform to the Minute; the Inspector says, 'Why?' The answer is, that we do not consider it good policy or for the interests of the service to tell you; that was the course of things."

I ask the House whether there can be a more unfair way of dealing with these gentlemen than this, to send back their Reports unaltered, and when they inquire, "What is it that you object to?—tell us, and we will revise it," to reply, "You must find that out for yourselves—we will not tell you; but if you do not make your Reports conform to the instructions we will not print them." That is the practice of the Department, and it is, I must say, as unsatisfactory and unpleasant a mode of transacting business with the Inspectors as anything one can possibly conceive. Such, then, being the existing practice, I wish to call the attention of the House to a statement in the Report of the Select Committee, to which I take exception, because it is at variance with fact—

> "No objection," say the Committee, "is made to statements of facts observed by the Inspectors within the circle of their official experience, whatever may be their bearing on the policy of the Committee of Council."

The House will recollect that the question turned very much on the alleged suppression of a particular Report by Mr. Longueville Jones. My noble Friend opposite and myself at the time the Resolution was passed stated that, as we were then informed, a passage containing statements not of opinion, but of fact, was suppressed because it was deemed at variance with the policy of the Department. I have here the Report of Mr. Longueville Jones. Four passages in it are marked in pencil. It is treated as an exceptional case, and the Select Committee, I am sorry to say, endorse the statement. It is an exceptional case, just in the sense in which when a respectable young woman gets into a scrape that is called an exceptional case. It is a flagrant case. It is the distinct suppression, not of an opinion, but of a fact which had a direct bearing on a question on which the House had voted only a few months before, and in which I myself take a strong personal interest—I mean the question of the value of schoolmasters' certificates. It is said the Report was suppressed because it contained throughout an animus hostile to the Department. I must own I am at a loss, in looking over the Report, to discover the hostile spirit. I do not say it is a good Report — that is not the question, but I will leave the House to judge of its tone. The passages which are marked, and in which alone the hostility can be supposed to lurk, are these. The first passage relates to the excuses alleged to have been made by teachers and managers of schools for the bad reading, writing, and arithmetic complained of in their schools. The second passage contains a simple objection to the practice of granting money for school buildings. The third passage merely mentions that the writer had met with opinions and declarations from all quarters among teachers, but that it would be of no use stating what these opinions and declarations were. To the fourth passage I beg the attention of the House. It is as follows:—

> "There are several notable examples, however, of admirable infant schools in Wales; and I beg leave to name that of Conway, as realizing, in my opinion, more than any other similar institution I ever saw, all the highest and best requisites and results connected with infant teaching. The schoolmistress is the best infant teacher in my district, admirably fitted for her duties in every respect, and deserving of the greater credit because she is not certificated, though she is aided by pupil-teachers."

Now if that is not a statement of fact I should like to know what is. I am bound to do my right hon. Friend the late Vice President the justice to say that he treated the passage as rather foolish, because he said it had no bearing on the subject, but as quite harmless, and such as would never have led him to think of condemning the Report. Mr. Lingen, however, saw a great deal of mischief in it. Mr. Lingen was asked—

> "You thought the statement made was intended to harass the Department?"

to which he replied,

> "Yes. Taken with the rest it appeared to me to be a certain case picked out at a rather critical time of the discussion to show this—here is the best teacher of a particular class in my district who is not certificated."

No one can doubt that the passage was marked out because it stated the very kind of fact which I wanted to ascertain — namely, the case of a good school kept by an uncertificated master or mistress. I have contended all along that there are plenty of good schools conducted by uncertificated teachers. The object of the Department was to prove the contrary; and they had Reports stuffed full of cases to show how worthless uncertificated teachers were. Here, however, when an instance occurred of a school, held up to commendation, which was kept by an uncertificated schoolmistress, they would not allow the statement of that fact to appear, because it told against their side of the question and in favour of mine. It was a flagrant and foolish suppression of a fact, which would have done little harm to the Department if published, but which has done them great harm by its suppression. I have myself been exposed to some taunts in this matter. Mr. Longueville Jones was severely censured for "his disloyalty and baseness" in furnishing me with the Report. I protest, not only on constitutional, but on personal grounds, against any such imputation. I will not surrender my right as a Member of Parliament to receive any statement either of private grievance or of any matter affecting the public welfare from any official of the Government whatever. We are privileged men. I do not say that officials have a right to send letters to the newspapers, or to confide the secrets of their Departments to any persons; but in this House we are entitled to know what is going on, what abuses exist in Departments, what the opinions of the officials are. I have not used any of the information I received except in this House; and I will not allow charges of "disloyalty and baseness" to be made against my informant, or of improper violation of confidence against myself for what I did. Besides, I have another reason. Hon. Members will, perhaps, recollect that in 1862 a correspondence with Mr. Norris, one of the Government Inspectors, was forced on me—it was not courted, but, at the same time, it was not declined by me. Mr. Norris, the Inspector, endeavoured to dissuade me from proceeding with my Resolution, and entered into a correspondence with me, which he conducted in a fair and able manner. I did what I could to reply to his views; but the Committee of Council, thinking, I suppose, that Mr. Norris had the best of the argument, deemed the correspondence of sufficient importance to be laid before the House. Well, I ask, is one Inspector to be allowed to write to me, with the sanction of the Department who lay the correspondence on the table, because they think it supports their position, and is another Inspector to be prohibited from communicating to me materials which strengthen my case? That is a position which any Member of this House will see at once is most unreasonable. I shall not at this hour (one o'clock) trouble the House with any further statement on this case. I would only say, in conclusion, that I think this whole inquiry will have been of very great service to the country. I hope it will make the Privy Council Office somewhat more cautious, and lead them to understand that the country is not disposed to submit to be ridden too hard by the Gentlemen at the head of that Department. You may be quite sure that if the Privy Council system is to work at all, it must be made to work harmoniously with the great body of school managers in this country. I assure the Department that, so far from caring for its assistance, I should have no objection myself to see its whole system swept away; for I think the education of the country could go on perfectly well without it. But I say that, if the system is to continue, it must be made more applicable than it is now to the wants of the community, and it cannot be made more simple and more applicable to those wants as long as it is clogged by the existing conditions and restrictions. With these remarks I do not oppose the rescinding of the Resolution. I do not wish to cast any censure upon the Department, and still less upon my right hon. Friend who then had charge of it; and if it be necessary I shall support this Motion.

MR. F. S. POWELL said, he was unable to concur with the hon. Member for East Norfolk (Mr. Howes) in thinking that although at the earliest stages of the present system of education it was desirable that the Inspectors should act with entire independence and afford the fullest information, yet that we had now arrived at another era in the history of the movement when the Inspectors should not be free agents, and report according to their own discretion, but should only be the mere instruments and servants of the Department, expressing the opinions of the Committee of Privy Council only, and not their own. The Report of the Committee had been so lately circulated, that he did not think the House was acquainted with a letter dated August, 1863. It was stated in the Report that the House was aware of the system that had been pursued, the real fact being that neither the House nor the country was aware of that system until that Report was published. It had been generally supposed that a certain censorship was exercised over the Inspectors' Reports, but that something of freedom was nevertheless allowed them, and that they were permitted to express opinions contrary to the judgment and practice of the Department. But in the letter of August, 1863, the Inspectors were informed that their practical suggestions for the improvement of the schools in their respective districts must be consistent with the existing Minutes, and the principle sanctioned by Parliament. Nothing had been allowed to appear in the Reports for that year which was contrary to the Minutes of Council. Take the case of the Factory Inspectors. One of those Inspectors recommended, the year before last, certain alterations in the factory system of Scotland, requiring a change in the law to carry them out; and the Government introduced a Bill to give effect to his suggestion. Now, if a Factory Inspector was permitted to do that, why should not a School Inspector be permitted to make a suggestion, even although it might militate against some particular Minute of Council having indeed, in a certain degree, the sanction of Parliament, but certainly not having the force of law? He could not admit that entire impartiality had been shown in the exercise of that censorship. In a former year Mr. Watkin's Report complained of a change made in regard to having Inspectors and assistant Inspectors, and his Report was suppressed. Then there was Mr. Norris's case, which had been referred to by the hon. Member for Berkshire (Mr. Walter). He would not weary the House by quoting the evidence taken before the Committee at that hour of the night, but if any hon. Member would carefully consider it, he would find that there had been an excision of facts and opinions unfavourable to the views of the Department, while facts and opinions favourable to those views had been inserted.

LORD ROBERT CECIL: Sir, I am sorry that the noble Lord the Member for the East Riding of Yorkshire (Lord Hotham) is not here, because I think he would have informed us that it was not the unanimous opinion of the Committee that, as the hon. Chairman has stated, any time however late, any day however late in the Session, is a fitting one for bringing this Motion forward. [Mr. HOWES: No!] I understood the hon. Member to express a hope that there would be no protest from any part of the House as to time; because, whatever might be the time, this matter ought to be disposed of this Session. I think the noble Lord the Member for the East Riding would have shown that there are members of the Committee who would not agree in that opinion. This Question, Sir, consists of two parts—the one a personal part, and the other a matter of policy. I thought that the noble Lord at the head of the Government carefully confined himself to the personal part of the Question, and if I am right in that impression, and am to understand him as merely wishing to clear the right hon. Gentleman the late Vice President of the Education Department from the shadow of anything reflecting upon his veracity, then I have no objection to join the noble Lord in his Resolution; but, if he wishes, at this late period of the Session, and at this late hour of the night, to ask the House to commit itself to a reversal of the decision on a question of policy to which it came deliberately in the middle of the Session, then I can only enter my protest against a proceeding which seems to me highly unconstitutional and improper. But I gathered from the expressions of the noble Lord that he desired to confine himself strictly to the personal aspect of the question. [Viscount PALMERSTON signified assent.] I have from the first done all in my power to remove what seemed to me the extreme misapprehension of the late Vice President of the Education Office, that there was any intention on the part of any person in this House to cast any personal reflection upon him. With regard to the Committee of Council, I cannot extend to them the same complete exculpation as to the wisdom and entire fairness of their proceedings, but still I am perfectly willing to admit that they were actuated by right intentions, and I certainly do not mean to oppose this Motion. But as respects the matter of policy, I beg that my conduct on this occasion may not be misunderstood. I do not admit that the Committee of Privy Council have a right to mutilate or cut to pieces—call it what you like—these Inspectors' Reports. I do not agree that they have the right so to alter or cause to be altered the Reports intended for the use of this House as to change their meaning. I contend that the Committee of Council have no right to alter any document—that no Department has a right to alter any document that is placed before us, without saying at the same time, on the face of such document, that it is not the true original production of the person whose name it bears, but has been dealt with by the Department through which it has passed. That seems to me not only to be a principle essential to the proper conduct of any public office, but an elementary principle of morality. I trust that on a future occasion the House will go further and deeper into this matter—that the whole question of the Inspectors' Reports may be inquired into by a Committee familiar with educational subjects, and that we may come to some decision as to the extent and nature of the censorship which may be exercised in these cases. That irrelevant matter should be excluded I freely admit; but I cannot admit that argumentative matter—that is, matter which differs from the opinions of their superiors on questions of policy—I cannot admit that that is rightly excluded from these Reports. At all events, wherever it has been excluded, hon. Members of this House who read the Reports ought to be warned that that species of censorship has been exercised. There is much in the Report of the Committee which I should have wished to criticize if the hour had not been so late; but I know that my right hon. Friend the Member for Droitwich (Sir John Pakington) at the earliest period in the next Session intends to ask for a Committee of Inquiry into the whole constitution of the Committee of Council. That may be a fitting opportunity of reviewing these proceedings and of inquiring into the nature of the practices which that Committee have really adopted—that may be a fitting opportunity of also answering the observations which have been made by the hon. Member for East Norfolk (Mr. Howes), which I could not answer now without detaining the House at an inconvenient length. I will only add that I hope I may not be held by my silence on this occasion to have assented to principles which I cannot admit.

Motion *agreed to.*

Resolved,

That this House, having considered the Report of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the practice of the Committee of Council on Education with respect to the Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, is of opinion that the Resolution of the 12th day of April last, with reference to such Reports, ought to be rescinded, and the said Resolution is hereby rescinded.

CIRCASSIANS (TURKEY).

PAPERS MOVED FOR.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR said, that he rose to move for papers relating to the immigration into Turkey of Circassian exiles. A great amount of suffering had been caused by the proceedings of the Russian authorities in Circassia, owing to the great miseries and suffering entailed upon an immense number of the unfortunate natives of the Caucasus. The course pursued in that quarter seemed to be but a portion of the policy of the Russian Government towards rebellious or resistant races. In Poland the same course had been pursued, and the Poles had been forbidden to hold any land in Lithuania. The object of Russia appeared to be to get rid of every people opposed to her rule, and to replace them with the pure Russian race. In short, everything pointed to a revival of that policy, which rendered her an object of so much alarm some time since. He would also remind the House that England had a great interest in the subject, besides the general one of humanity, as Russia was employing her resources in extending her power eastward.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copy of further Papers showing what steps are being taken by the Turkish Government relating to the Immigration of Circassians into Turkey,"—(*Mr. Henry Seymour.*)

MR. KINNAIRD said, he was glad that the subject had been brought before the House, as a great and lasting feeling existed against the proceedings of the Russian Government, by the course it had pursued with regard to the gallant race of the Caucasus.

MR. LAYARD said, he quite agreed in the opinion which had been expressed of the great crime which had been committed by Russia. The Turkish Government had behaved with great humanity. The Sultan had subscribed £50,000 from his own privy purse for the relief of the poor refugees. There was some difference as to their numbers, one account describing them at 100,000, another at 300,000. The probability was they numbered about one-half. The Russian Government had done nothing beyond placing at their disposal three or four vessels. The British Government had given every assistance in their power, by furnishing transports, and sending a large amount of biscuits. With regard to papers, he had none that he could produce at present.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

House adjourned at half
after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, July 26, 1864.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Cranbourne Street* (No. 252); Poor Relief (Metropolis)* (No. 253).

Second Reading—Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* (No. 247); Limited Penalties* (No. 97).

Committee—Weights and Measures (Metric System)* (No. 164); Harwich Harbour Act Amendment* (No. 210); Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* (No. 215); Judgments, &c., Law Amendment* (Nos. 250 & 251); Local Government Supplemental (No. 2)* (No. 190); Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension* (No. 231); Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues* (No. 232); Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan)* (No. 233); Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* (No. 237); Poor Removal* (No. 239); Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* (No. 216); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental* (No. 221); West Indian Incumbered Estates Acts Amendment* (No. 225).

Report—Harwich Harbour Act Amendment* (No. 210); Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* (No. 215); Judgments, &c., Law Amendment* (Nos. 250 & 251); Local Government Supplemental (No. 2)* (No. 190); Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension* (No. 231); Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues* (No. 232); Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan)* (No. 233); Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* (No. 237); Poor Removal* (No. 239); Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* (No. 216); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental* (No. 221); West Indian Incumbered Estates Acts Amendment* (No. 225); Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation* (No. 151).

Third Reading—Metropolitan District Railways*; Judgments, &c., Law Amendment (Nos. 250 & 251); Expiring Laws Continuance* (No. 208); Highways Act Amendment* (Nos. 227 & 228); Railway Companies Powers* (Nos. 229 & 230); Contagious Diseases* (No. 234); Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* (No. 236); Corn Accounts and Returns* (No. 238); Westminster Bridge Traffic* (No. 240); Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment* (No. 241); Thames Conservancy* (No. 226); Railways Construction Facilities* (No. 222).

JUDGMENTS, &c., LAW AMENDMENT BILL—(Nos. 250 and 251.)

COMMITTEE. THIRD READING.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

Lord ST. LEONARDS said, this Bill effected some improvement in the law relating to judgments which he had himself in vain endeavoured to accomplish, and, therefore, he could not find fault with the measure. But he had never attempted more than to protect *bonâ fide* purchasers or mortgagees against judgments. But one clause of the Bill took away the right of every judgment creditor as against the property of the debtor, unless and until he actually sued out execution upon his judgment. That, in his opinion, was not expedient, and very unwise. There was another provision of the Bill which was of the utmost importance. By the law as it at present stood execution could not issue upon any judgment so as to affect the land until twelve months after judgment had been obtained; but under the provisions of this Bill the son of a tenant for life of an estate, who was entitled to the remainder, and who might, as eldest sons had done before, and most probably would do again, be desirous of anticipating his inheritance; he might go to a Jew money lender, who would advance him money, the borrower giving him a judgment on his interest in the estate; and by this Bill the creditor, the moment he obtained that judgment, might sell the reversion, and thus the property of the youth might pass from him for a very inadequate consideration. It might be said, that with the quickness with which business was now transacted in Chancery this might be effected under a mortgage. But the answer was, that a mortgage was a contract. He considered this a very important measure, and would have divided the House upon it if he had been in a position to do so.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that the Bill and every clause of it had been carefully considered by a Select Committee, and every noble and learned Lord who was a member of that Committee, except his noble and learned Friend, had approved it.

House in Committee accordingly.

An Amendment made; Standing Orders, Nos. 37 and 38 *considered*, and *dispensed with*; Amendment *reported*.

Bill read 3ª, with the Amendment, and *passed*, and sent to the Commons.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

OBSERVATIONS.

The Earl of ELLENBOROUGH rose, pursuant to Notice, to call the attention of the House to the Changes which have taken place in the State of Foreign Affairs since Parliament met, and said, my Lords, I avail myself of this opportunity, which is almost the last which will be afforded before the prorogation of Parliament, to draw your Lordships' attention to the great change which has taken place in Foreign Affairs since we met in February — a change affecting not merely the integrity of the Danish dominions, which almost every State in Europe a few years ago thought of great importance to the balance of power and the interests of peace, but affecting also the sacredness of the obligations of treaties by which all the States of Europe are bound together—affecting the security of all the smaller and weaker States which may dread the aggression of neighbouring Powers, and, above all, affecting that steady progress of constitutional government on the Continent of Europe, which for several years we have witnessed with so much sympathy and satisfaction. I confess I rise to address your Lordships now with very different feelings from those by which I was animated when I addressed you on more than one previous occasion this Session on the subject of Foreign Affairs. I then had some hope of doing good. I have now no such hope, and I speak only because I think it right to endeavour to lay the actual state of affairs before this House and the country. I then appealed to the higher and nobler feelings of Parliament and the nation, believing as I did that a course which was dictated by generosity was also recommended by policy. Others, with more success, appealed to more common feelings—to love of ease, to love of repose, to love of quiet, but, above all, to that love of money, which is now become the engrossing passion of the people of this country. My Lords, Her Majesty's Government declared that they would afford no assistance whatever to Denmark in her difficulties, after the Conference was at an end. At the commencement of the Session, Her Majesty's Opposition stated that it was not their business to find a Foreign policy, although they did not appear to disregard the obligations of finding a civil policy. Having declined, however, to find a Foreign policy, they saw fit to adopt the policy of the Government, and declared that they too were not prepared to give assistance to Denmark, while they condemned at the same time in the strongest terms the conduct of the Government throughout the course of the negotiations. I regret, my Lords, this decision of the two great parties which divide this House and the State, but I am convinced it would be idle to seek to force any opinion of mine on a reluctant House and a determined Ministry. I must, however, say that in looking back to the past, I do not think the policy now so generally adopted would have been adopted by any one of the great Ministers of former times whom history delights to honour; nor can I find in all our history more than one reign in which this policy would have been congenial to a Government, and that was the reign of King James I., when the noble Earl opposite might have carried out his policy of abstinence from war with the cordial favour of his Sovereign. There was, however, in those days a great man who thought differently. I recollect a passage in a work of one of the greatest of mankind—Bacon—who in his *Moral and Political Essays*, which contain perhaps more wisdom than any uninspired book, says, "Let no State expect to be great that is not awake upon any just occasion of arming." That he, great moralist as he was, believed to be the true principle of public conduct. But see in what a state Denmark is now. She lies prostrate at the feet of her unscrupulous enemies. She is without fortresses; she is weak and has no one to defend her, unless it be the Emperor of France, who perhaps at this moment may come forward on her behalf. At the commencement of the Session, Denmark stood in the position in which she was placed after the Congress of Vienna. She was shorn of the prestige and honour of her ancient glory—greatly through our means—by the destruction of one of her fleets, and the carrying away of another, and by the loss of Norway, which had been given to conciliate Sweden during the great war. But she was still in possession of the ancient provinces which she had held for 400 years, and which she would have continued to possess but for the intrigues of the Germans. Consider, my Lords, by what steps the enemies of Denmark proceeded. The German Confederation first decided on the Execution in Holstein, and based it mainly, if not entirely, latterly, upon certain Royal Letters Patent issued by the late King on the 30th of March last year. But before that Execution commenced, those Letters Patent had been withdrawn, so that the ground of their proceeding was entirely cut from under the feet of the Diet. Within less than three weeks after the Federal Execution commenced, Austria and Prussia appeared on the scene as substantive parties, not as members of the German Confederation, and proceeded to occupy Schleswig as a material guarantee for the execution of certain diplomatic arrangements made in 1852. Among those arrangements was this, that Denmark should do nothing that could even tend to the union of Schleswig with Denmark. The act of the 18th of November, which was especially complained of, made little or no change in the relations which had existed between Schleswig and Denmark from the year 1858. In that year, Holstein, which had before been represented in the Parliament of Denmark, was withdrawn from it in consequence of objections taken by the German Confederation. Schleswig, however, remained, without any objection on the part of Germany until this period of 1863, when it was first stated that this measure, which added little to the connection between Schleswig and Denmark, was contrary to the arrangements of 1852. During the whole time that that Act of November was discussed in the Parliament of Denmark, no objection was made by the German Powers until the last two or three days; indeed, it was supposed that the measure was in entire conformity with their desire. That measure of November 18 contained one provision, however, which was undoubtedly a contravention of the arrangements of 1852. It contained a provision for extending the electoral law of Denmark to the province of Schleswig. The Germans, no doubt, had reason to expect that that would not be done; but they never openly objected to it. They did not wish to put forward their desire to prevent the progress of liberal and popular government as their reason for declaring war; but their reason it was. It was admitted by M. Bismark; and Austria and Prussia desired the King, on pain of instant war, of his own authority, after the dissolution of his Parliament, to annul that Act, which he could not constitutionally do; which he could not do without violating his oath. M. Bismark coolly suggested that if the King could not constitutionally repeal that Act he might declare a state of siege, and then he could do anything—anything, no doubt, in crime, but nothing in rectitude. If the King had acted on that suggestion he would undoubtedly have deserved dethronement, and he would have lost the character not only of an honest monarch, but of an honest man. War was declared, and the Germans entered Schleswig. That was the second passage of this war. They had not been there long before they took steps, under a mere pretext, to invade Jutland. Austria at first evidently had strong objections to the occupation of Jutland, but she was induced to accede to the desire of Prussia, and Jutland was soon occupied as well as Schleswig. Now, my Lords, what do these various successive steps prove? What I infer from them is, that this war between Denmark and Germany did not begin *uno intuitu;* that there was no original plan to do what they have done and what they are doing; but that, seeing the impunity which was granted to them, seeing that no opposition was made to their first, second, and third steps, they went on further in wrong and stand thus where they are now. The other day there was some conversation about a Holy Alliance, and it was said that there was no Holy Alliance, nor any probability of one. There may not be, I dare say, any Treaty of Holy Alliance, nor should I attach much importance to it if there were; for I consider that when the Powers of Europe tore to pieces the Treaty of 1852, they tore to pieces all treaties and destroyed all their authority. If the Powers had agreed to a Treaty of Holy Alliance, they would stand by it just as long as was convenient to them, and no longer. But, although I believe there is not a Treaty of Holy Alliance, there is an understanding—not a holy understanding—an understanding which seems to me to be worse than a Holy Alliance. The Holy Alliance was a combination of Princes who bearing in mind the French Revolution, then recently terminated, and all its disastrous consequences, saw danger in every movement of the people to force new Constitutions on their Sovereigns, and who, widely differing from us, who revere Magna Charta, and look back with pride on the events which led to King William coming to this country, determined to avert the dangers they apprehended by suppressing all the institutions which were thus forced on Sovereigns. But while they committed these acts of hostility to public liberty they had at least honour among themselves. They adhered to their words—they declared that they would not carry their intervention further than the necessity of the case, and that they would only occupy a country until things were put into their former position. They declared that they had no views of self-aggrandizement, no desire for the acquisition of territory, and that they would leave the dominions of the assisted King as soon as the necessity was passed; and so they did—nor did they exercise any undue rigour in enforcing the payment of their expenses. I believe the debt owing by France to Spain for the expenses of the Spanish expedition to be not yet paid, so that it does not appear that there has been any heavy financial pressure on Spain, nor was there on Naples. But these German princes, who have arrived at an understanding hostile to liberty, carry their principles much further. They prohibit the action of the King of Denmark, in conjunction with his Parliament, to extend the electoral franchise to the people of Schleswig. They even propose to take altogether from the King of Denmark the province to which, in concert with his Parliament, he desired to give a more popular constitution. That is going much further than was ever attempted by the Powers connected with the Holy Alliance. I am not surprised that these Sovereigns, proceeding in this manner, were disposed to think that they might go on with impunity. The noble Earl did not conceal that it was his opinion, and that of the Government, that no assistance should be afforded to Denmark. There were other things besides the declarations of Ministers upon the subject which instructed the German Powers yet more clearly and significantly as to the course we intended to pursue. Within a few days of the commencement of the Session the Naval and Military Estimates were laid on the table. They contained a reduction, not a large one, both in our naval and military strength. Economy was to be the order of the day; it was thought necessary to show a balance and to get that small balance our naval and military strength was reduced. But not merely was there this reduction, but the Estimates were ostentatiously declared to be Peace Estimates. There could be no mistake about it; it was quite clear from their conduct, as well as their declarations, that Ministers intended to stand by without giving any assistance to Denmark. It would be most unreasonable if we were to demand that a British Minister should succeed in all he undertakes, or that he should always get what he asks for. But I think we are entitled to demand from a British Minister that he shall not adopt a course which renders success in his negotiations impossible. That, I think, is a just demand. But when the noble Earl, or any other negotiator, enters into negotiations by making it distinctly understood that, however much he may be defeated in his propositions, he will not lift his arm to enforce them, and that in no case will he resort to war, he at once loses all his strength. Diplomacy is armed reason. It is not pure reason; if it were, the Ministers of Portugal, of Greece, and of the Pope would have as much influence in a Conference as the Ministers of the great Powers of Europe. But the strength of Powers in a Conference is the strength they have behind them, and if they declare that they will never use that strength they might as well have none. They would be in the disagreeable position which would have been occupied by a gentleman in Dublin about the time of the Union, if he had made it publicly known that he intended never to fight, and had then gone about interfering in the business of everybody, and saying the most unpleasant things in the most disagreeable way. I leave to the judgment of the House what would have been the influence of that gentleman in society. No doubt he would have been continually insulted until he would have been compelled to violate his own resolution and fight at a time when, perhaps, he was least prepared. My Lords, I consider it of the deepest importance and the most dangerous import, that in the Conference the neutral Powers of Europe should have decided on not regarding the Treaty of 1852 as the basis of their proceedings. I can see nothing whatever—I can see no change of circumstances—which could have justified a departure from the obligations of that treaty; and the only excuse I can find for it is this—that it is now said to be established, that nations are to decide who shall be their governors. But, my Lords, the application of that rule to the present case of Schleswig-Holstein is a complete fallacy. When a great homogeneous people declare by a vast majority in favour of any particular form of government, no doubt it is just that their will should prevail. The Duke of Wellington, in recognizing that principle, rendered to this country and to Europe as great an act of civil service as he ever performed. When the French people put aside Charles X., the Duke of Wellington at once recognized the new Government; but no injury was done to Europe by acknowledging the change of rulers decided on by the French people. Depend upon it, whether a Bourbon, a Member of the House of Orleans, or a Bonaparte sits on the Throne of France, there will be little or no difference in the conduct of the French Government as regards Foreign policy. The French people will impress their character on the Government, and it matters little to the world at large who may be at the head of that nation; but it is a different thing when the people of Holstein say, "We desire to separate ourselves from the country with which we have been so long united." They may desire that; but they cannot give effect to their wish without disturbing the balance of power in every part of Europe, and, as they owe a duty to Europe, the substitution of one Sovereign for another in Schleswig-Holstein becomes a question for the European Powers. Again, ought we not to consider this matter with reference to the binding power of treaties generally? Because, if this new principle of dealing with treaties is sanctioned, the more ancient a treaty is, the longer it has been established among the laws of Europe, the less, in point of fact, may be the justification for its continuance. I see in this very great danger; for what is a precedent to-day will be a rule to-morrow, and there will be no security left except in strength for the preservation of anything. But, my Lords, observe how dangerous it is to permit a small and weak State to be overcome, spoliated, and dismembered by the coalition of great and powerful States, no one assisting her or endeavouring to arrest the blow. There is not one of the weak States of Europe which may not feel her security greatly impaired by what has occurred in Denmark. If the two great German Powers, without being interfered with by the neutral Powers, may take possession of Schleswig and Holstein, and plunder Denmark as they will, what security is there that when they have obtained possession of Kiel for a naval station Prussia may not get up a quarrel with Holland about Limbourg and Luxembourg, for the purpose of obtaining the port of the Texel? The same consideration applies to a weaker State, Belgium. What is to prevent France from moving on Belgium and obtaining possession of the ports on the Scheldt? My Lords, this question of Denmark is the question of Sweden, of Holland, of Belgium. It is the question of all the smaller and weaker States of Europe; and the ruin which is now, without any attempt to prevent it, brought upon Denmark will terrify all the smaller States, and destroy altogether their feeling of independence. More than all, my Lords, I look on this movement of Prussia and Austria as more particularly a demonstration of the despotic Powers against the growing freedom of Germany and the spread of constitutional principles. We know the position of the King of Prussia and his Parliament before the commencement of hostilities in Denmark. We know also how things went on in Austria, though there they were better and there was much more hope; but no one who reads the papers on the Danish Question — no one who has watched the progress of Affairs in Europe—can doubt that this was, I will not say a well laid, but a wickedly laid plan to destroy the liberties of the people of Denmark, and likewise to destroy the liberties of the people of Prussia and Austria. I dread this, not because it is a thing which will last—not because its authors will continue to enjoy an immunity from punishment—but because some few months ago I saw the steady and tranquil flow of a fertilizing stream which would have passed through the whole of those territories bringing peace and happiness to the people. Their rulers have thrown up a dam against it; for a time that dam will prevent its flow; but before very long it will burst over its bounds, and, sweeping onwards with the violence of an avalanche, it will destroy those who attempt to restrain it. It is because the things that are being done cannot be done without bringing after them a retribution—a terrible retribution—I now speak with so much alarm of the course which Prussia and Austria have been permitted to take. I think we cannot disguise from ourselves that there is in those transactions something behind more dangerous than that which we see. There is a mystery we cannot fathom. We cannot give any reasonable explanation of the conduct of Russia and France. What, then, must be our course? We must look to ourselves—we must consolidate our own strength—improving in every way our national defences not only in fortifications, but in our land forces, regular and irregular, and also in our navy. We must also endeavour to be, as we ought always to be, on the best understanding with France; but, at all events, I hope we shall yet revive the ancient spirit of this country, which did not consider lucre to be the only great good, but ever had regard to honour and the justice of the cause it espoused. Vice and crime seem now to stalk unchallenged from one end of Europe to the other. Does history record so cruel an edict as that which has driven the Circassians from their homes without any assistance on the part of the Government that has consigned them to banishment? Does history record an instance of a people so trodden under foot as the Poles have been in recent times? Women, children, and old men and young men, the hope and glory of their families, mercilessly exiled — apparently on the principle that the best man is the best exile —forced to travel on foot from Warsaw to Siberia, many dying on the road, and those who survive destined on their arrival to a life of slavery. When we see, besides, this act of wrong to Denmark — Prussia and Austria proceeding after their own requisitions have been complied with—marching from one excess to another, till they have appropriated to themselves a large portion of an ancient country—my Lords, when I see such flagrant offences against right and justice, such reckless provocations of Providence, I feel that they cannot go on without a decided chastisement and retribution; and I only pray that we who have not taken a part in this dreadful wrong — that those who have not participated in it — may, by the Divine mercy and permission, be exempted from the punishment; and that, if it is to come, it may only be inflicted upon those who have designed, and those who have been employed in perpetrating the crime.

EARL RUSSELL: My Lords, the noble Earl has spoken with his usual ability and eloquence on a very important subject; but he has admitted in the beginning of his speech that he does not agree with the Government nor with the Opposition; and he might have added that he does not agree with the country. I shall not pretend to enter at any length upon the subject, seeing that it has already been fully debated in both Houses of Parliament, and they have expressed their decisions with regard to it; but there are some of the statements of the noble Earl which appear to me to require so much correction in order to reduce them to the actual state of facts, that I cannot altogether avoid noticing them. The noble Earl throughout spoke of Denmark as if it was a country of a homogeneous population, which had been invaded by two great Powers for the purpose of wresting away from it some portion of its territory. Now, the difficulty of this question throughout has been that, while Denmark is a small country, it is inhabited by two different races, and the one possessing the capital and seat of power, and controlling the government of the whole country, is at issue with the other race which occupied certain of its provinces. But there was another difficulty still, and a complication beyond this—namely, that while the majority could exercise, unjustly and oppressively if they chose, their power over the minority, that minority had the opportunity of appealing to a nation on their frontier, containing more than 40,000,000 of inhabitants, whose feelings, passions, and sympathies were with the minority. In that situation of affairs the great Powers of Europe made a treaty, which I took the liberty on a former occasion of styling an artificial treaty. It was the best thing that could at that time be done; but it depended for its favourable operation on the temper, moderation, and good sense of those who had the rule in Denmark, as well as of the other parties. It must be remembered that at the beginning of the contest in 1848, when Prussia invaded the Danish provinces, and when Austria likewise appealed to arms, those Powers only retired from the territory of the King of Denmark after obtaining engagements by which they were justified in interfering in the internal government of Holstein and Schleswig. They were justified in interfering in regard to Holstein by the general law of the Germanic Confederation, and in Schleswig by those special engagements made in 1851. When, therefore, during eleven years there were disputes and discussions between Denmark and the Germanic Confederation, the other Powers, parties to the Treaty of 1852, who were bystanders in this disturbance, were obliged to ask themselves whether Denmark was entirely blameless in the matter, and whether she had fulfilled all the promises she had made. For my part, having thought it my duty to look into this subject, I could neither say that the Government of Denmark were blameless, nor that they had fulfilled all the promises by which they had bound themselves to the Germanic Confederation and to Austria and Prussia. Therefore the question came to this—that the other Powers would not have been justified in purely and simply defending Denmark; for while they held up the right hand to defend Denmark, it would have been necessary for them with the left to compel her to fulfil her promises, to govern according to her engagements, and treat her German subjects with the same fairness and justice as her Danish subjects were treated. Therefore, the question was in itself extremely complicated, and no one could say that in going to war for Denmark purely and simply and without demanding anything from Denmark, an entirely right course would be taken. This appears to me to be the difficulty of the question. It was not a question whether you should go to war or not. You could not draw the sword without being convinced that you were in the right. If you are to go to war and to ask the people of England to contribute large subsidies for carrying on the war, let the people at least be sure you are fighting in the right cause. When I say that Denmark did not stand perfectly upright in this matter, I by no means intend to take the part of the German Powers against any of the accusations made against them by the noble Earl. I think, and I have always said, that if they had been willing to submit this matter to the decision of those Powers of Europe not so immediately concerned as themselves—if the parties on both sides had listened to fair terms—this question might have been settled by negotiation. But, unfortunately, while Denmark had for eleven years continually and persistently put herself in the wrong, Germany at length determined to listen to no reason, to accept no promises of redress, and hastened on to war, resolved to settle the question by the arbitrament of arms. I thought that that conduct was not the result of the real judgment of Austria and Prussia, but that it was a means, perhaps, by which they sought, together or separately, to obtain the popular feeling in Germany in their favour; and it was rather to content that feeling, than because they thought their cause was right or their actions in accordance with their professions, that the war was precipitated on. Now, I do not mean to discuss the question which the noble Earl has raised, that though France and Russia refused to be our partners, we should ourselves have interposed, and by our own means have defended Denmark. That question has been discussed already in both Houses of Parliament, and I hold in my hand the Resolution arrived at in the House of Commons on the subject, and the Address which that House presented to Her Majesty, after a discussion, I think, of four nights. The other House, which is the only constitutional body to which, in case of war, an appeal could be made for the means of carrying on the war, after thanking Her Majesty for laying before them the papers on the question, and expressing regret that the Conference was brought to a close without accomplishing the important purposes for which it assembled, went on to express the satisfaction with which they learnt that at this conjuncture Her Majesty had been advised to abstain from interfering in the war between Denmark and Germany. It is, therefore, clear, that if the Government had called on the Commons for the means of carrying on war, in which, as I have said, France and Russia refused to take part, the House of Commons would not have supported the Government. The noble Earl supposes that in the course pursued the honour of England has been neglected. I ask in what respect has the honour of England been in any way involved in this contest? Is it the case that you had a treaty by which you were bound to assist Denmark? No such treaty exists, neither is there any obligation of honour which compels to involve ourselves in war for the sake of Denmark. I am fully convinced that if ever a case should arise in which the honour of this country requires war, you would have the House of Commons deciding, not by a small majority, but by overwhelming numbers, to support any obligations involving the honour of the country. My Lords, the noble Earl has spoken of the effect which the war in Schleswig and Holstein may have upon the liberties of Germany, and the constitutional question in Prussia. Well, it is quite true that there has been for a considerable time a contest going on between the Crown and the House of Commons in Prussia with regard to points which vitally concern the constitutional liberties of that country. It would almost seem that we might repeat now what Mr. Burke said in that most eloquent speech of his delivered ninety years ago on the pacification of America. Speaking at that time of the contest in America, he said, "Slavery is a weed that grows anywhere. They may have it in Spain, they may have it in Prussia." Now one would be loth to think that the people of Prussia in the course of those ninety years have not learned both to love and to value or to understand liberty. My belief is that neither on the part of the Crown, on the part of the House of Lords, or on the part of the House of Commons of Prussia, have they yet arrived at a complete understanding of that complex machine called a Constitutional Monarchy. I do believe, however, that the spirit of liberty exists in Prussia, that it exists throughout Germany, and that it requires no aid and no assistance from us. But after this question of Denmark has been decided, as it will be decided, without any interference on our part, I believe the best prospect of seeing liberty and constitutional monarchy established in Germany will be to leave that brave and intelligent people to settle for themselves the differences which may exist between them and their Sovereign, and there is no need that England should in any way interfere in the settlement of that dispute.

Earl Russell

I am far from thinking, if we compare the state of things now with what it was fifty years ago, at the time of the Treaty of 1815, or with what it was forty years ago in 1821 and 1823, at the time of the Holy Alliance, that the people of Europe have not made great progress in the study of political questions. I believe that that which was possible for the Sovereigns of Europe in 1823, that which was possible for the Sovereign of France at that time, when he put down the Cortes of Spain, and established absolute monarchy there, would not be possible now. I believe that no Sovereign who reads the signs of the times would attempt any such thing. On the contrary, I believe that the Sovereigns will find it to be their interest to make such an ageement with their subjects that constitutional monarchy will in time prevail in all the countries of Europe. That is my belief; and I am far from thinking that if we had rushed into war, and the States of Europe had been pitted against each other in a bloody contest, we should have promoted the cause of liberty any more than we should have promoted the cause of peace. I believe, on the contrary, that by leaving it to the people and the Sovereigns of Germany to settle their differences among themselves, we have done not only that which is good for the honour and interests of England, but that which is best for the interests of Europe at large.

VISCOUNT STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE: My Lords, I cannot allow the speech of my noble Friend the Foreign Secretary to pass without making a few observations. My noble Friend appears to me to have taken up a position somewhat unfortunate, for while he opened his speech by saying that he found no reasons which would have justified us in taking up arms on behalf of Denmark, he proceeded to condemn in the strongest terms the conduct of the Powers who were the other parties to that conflict. My noble Friend (Earl Russell) then asked where we can find anything to justify the observation that the honour of England has been sacrificed in these negotiations. I humbly conceive, my Lords, that the question is not a question of the honour of England, but of the management of affairs; and, I must say, with all deference to my noble Friend, and with all due consideration for the difficulties with which he has had to contend, and for the questions which he has justly described as of so delicate and complicated a nature, comparing the result with the objects to be obtained, the disappointment of the public has been fully justified. The great object which I understood the Government to have in view was to maintain peace in the North of Europe. Well, we had not peace, but war. We are told that the treaty which provided for the integrity and independence of Denmark was to be maintained. That treaty has been given up by the English Government itself. And so through every phase of the negotiations we find the same unfortunate contradictions between the objects sought and the results brought about. Hopes have been raised, and have been disappointed. We went into a Conference without a basis, and consequently without a chance of success. And what was the end? Total failure. Putting all these things together, it seems impossible not to perceive that there is too much justification for the impression that we have incurred a certain amount of discredit. And such, unfortunately, has been the case on several occasions within the last two years. It is not only with regard to Denmark that we have incurred discredit, but also in the negotiations with Russia last year on the affairs of Poland. I will not unnecessarily go over ground which has been so often trodden before—it will be sufficient if I ask your Lordships to call to mind the circumstances under which we entered into negotiations with respect to Poland, and to compare them with the circumstances under which we abandoned her. The Poles in the end were left in a situation far worse than they would have been in had they been left to their own independent efforts. We had then the advantage of the co-operation of Austria in conjunction with France. Austria has since taken a different course, and we have reason to apprehend that it is in consequence of the policy which we then adopted. Then with respect to that much-vexed question, the proposal of a Congress by France — what we have to regret is not that we declined the proposition, but the manner in which we declined it. I cannot conceal from myself that the tone which pervaded our answer went far to justify the very strong feeling of disappointment which prevailed in France. I, for one, never could perceive in the proposal for a Congress any just grounds for suspecting the motives of him who made it. He was placed in a very painful position by the result of the negotiations with Russia; it was natural for him to seek for some resource at a critical moment, and I should have thought that that was the very time when we should have taken the utmost pains to make a favourable impression upon the mind of our ally. All these circumstances when put together are quite sufficient to account for the general feeling of the country that we have incurred a certain amount of discredit. But when we hear from the echoes of another theatre of discussion that those mistakes are to carry with them the necessity of adopting a new code of foreign diplomacy, notwithstanding the very high authority by whom this proposition has been laid down, I must say I see no reason whatever for any such change. What I have always understood, and what I believe to be the constitutional view, is this—that questions of peace and war and foreign politics belong to the Crown of this country. The Ministers are the responsible advisers of the Sovereign. Parliament sits in judgment upon them when the conduct of any negotiations come before them. My noble Friend turns and appeals to the judgment of the other House; it is very natural that he should do so in his own vindication. But to say that the whole course of policy of our foreign affairs is to be altered is a proposition which I, for one, cannot accept. There is no question before us, and the subject has been so fully discussed already between my two noble Friends on opposite sides of the House, that I am unwilling to trespass further on the attention of your Lordships. At the same time, I cannot sit down without lamenting the course recently pursued by those great Powers who must exercise so vast an influence on the affairs of Europe. When we see Russia, notwithstanding the appeals made to her to reconsider her policy, adding cruelty to cruelty, not only in her treatment of her own subjects, but those over whom she had no right to tyrannise, and reducing her cruelty to a system that is calling down upon her the reprobation of all who are possessed with any feelings of humanity—when we consider how the hopes of those who thought that Austria was entering upon a course of constitutional Government have been disappointed—we can but feel the deepest regret that these great Powers should have entered upon a course so dangerous and so threatening to the peace of Europe. With regard to Prussia, no language can adequately express the degree of censure which is due to the Government of that country. The manner in which it has acted would justify the suspicion that there were political designs in the first instance in the course it pursued towards a weaker Power which has so many claims upon our interest. I am sorry to observe the manner in which blame has been thrown on the Danish Government, and the extreme severity with which some part of their conduct has been criticized. It is hardly fair to omit to mention the very difficult circumstances in which Denmark has been placed, and it is impossible not to admire the spirit and bravery shown by her people. Her resistance may seem to some to have been pushed to extremes; but we can hardly wonder that a country placed in a situation in which its dearest interests were attacked and its very existence called in question, should in defence of its liberties expose itself to a contest with Powers of overwhelming strength. Your Lordships must feel the deepest regret at the sad condition of an empire whose gallant struggles have everywhere called forth feelings of the strongest admiration; and we must, at the same time, regret that the circumstances of the country do not allow us to express our feelings of sympathy in another and more tangible manner.

POLICE (IRELAND).—QUESTION.

The Earl of LEITRIM rose, pursuant to Notice—

"To call Attention to a Return pursuant to an Address of the House of Lords, dated the 31st of May, 1864, relative to the Proclamations of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland under the Provisions of the 11th Victoria, Chapter Two, for the Preservation of the Peace in the County of Donegal and Barony of Kilmacrenan: And a Copy of any Warrant issued by The Lord Lieutenant of Ireland for the Search of Arms, within the Parish of Clondavadock in the Barony of Kilmacrenan, within Twenty-one Days previous to the 21st Day of April, 1864: And to ask The Lord President if there is any Law to authorize the Police in Ireland to enter the Dwelling House of any of Her Majesty's Subjects without a Warrant, and to search it, or carry off any Property of any Kind whatsoever from such House without any such written Authority."

Earl GRANVILLE said, that the police had received information that a certain person—a bailiff of the noble Earl—was in possession of arms without a licence. That information was not acted upon because the police had no regular warrant; but on a later occasion, when the police were on revenue duty, they found the gun and took it away in a legal manner.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said, he looked with some doubt and anxiety upon the working of a system under which the police were required to exercise the duties of revenue officers as well as their own proper duties. In this case the officer having entered under a warrant authorizing him to search for illicit spirits, found in the house a gun and seized it, upon the ground that the man had no licence to keep a gun.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Order of the Day for the Lords to be Summoned, read: *Moved*, That the Standing Orders relating to Private Bills be dispensed with for the Remainder of the Session: — *agreed to.* — (*The Chairman of Committees.*)

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, July 26, 1864.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Committee*—Naval Discipline* [Bill 233].
Report—Naval Discipline* [Bill 233].
Considered as amended—Poor Relief (Metropolis) [Bill 224].
Third Reading — Poor Relief (Metropolis) [Bill 224]; Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment* [Bill 210].
Withdrawn—Masters and Servants* [Bill 232].

The House met at One of the clock.

POOR RELIEF (METROPOLIS) BILL.

[BILL 224.]

CONSIDERATION. THIRD READING.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

MR. T. J. MILLER said, he had no intention of opposing the Bill, but he felt bound to protest against the principle involved in it, and he begged to express a hope that the measure would not be cited as a precedent for future legislation.

MR. C. P. VILLIERS said, that he only proposed to accomplish by the Bill the special object set forth in its clauses. He certainly had no intention of sanctioning by the measure the principle of the equalization of the rating for the relief of the poor throughout the metropolis.

Amendments made; to be now read 3°; read 3°, and *passed.*

BRADFORD RESERVOIRS.

QUESTION.

MR. FERRAND said, he rose to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether Messrs. Rawlinson and Beardmore, the Government Engineers, did not report to him that the bursting of the Sheffield Reservoir was caused by the fracture of the outlet pipes under the embankment; whether these outlet pipes have not been examined since their Report and found uninjured and undisturbed; and, if so, whether it is not necessary for the safety of the public that a Commission should be immediately appointed to inquire into the making of Reservoir Embankments?

SIR GEORGE GREY: Sir, as the Report of Messrs. Rawlinson and Beardmore has been presented to the House, and has been printed and circulated, any hon. Member can refer to it for himself. But I do not find in it the statement ascribed to them in the question of the hon. Gentleman. They did not pretend to state precisely what was the cause of the accident. But they did say that, in their opinion, what they considered the objectionable mode of laying the outlet pipes most probably fractured not the pipes, but the puddle wall at the point of crossing. I do not know whether the pipes have been since examined, but if they have, and have been found uninjured, that would not be inconsistent with Messrs. Rawlinson and Beardmore's Report. I have already said that the possibility of laying down some general rule in future Waterworks Acts will be considered.

MR. FERRAND said, he wished to know whether the Government intend appointing a Commission?

SIR GEORGE GREY: I do not think that there will be any necessity for a formal Commission. Two or three engineers of experience might be consulted on the matter; but the Question is still under consideration.

MR. FERRAND said, he would also ask whether the right hon. Gentleman is aware that the lives of thousands of people are now endangered by the state of these Reservoirs, and that great anxiety naturally prevails to know whether anything will be done before Parliament separates?

SIR GEORGE GREY: Such a Commission as is suggested by the hon. Member for Bradford, and to which I suppose the hon. Gentleman refers, would not affect any works now existing, but only those to be constructed in future. If there really is the danger which is alleged, the hon. Gentleman, or those whom he represents, had better adopt the remedy which I pointed out the other night, and which will be found quite effectual.

SIERRA LEONE.
CASE OF MR. FITZJAMES.
QUESTION.

MR. ROEBUCK said, he wished to put a Question to the Secretary of State for the Colonies which required a few words of explanation to make it intelligible, and in order that he might be regular he intended to conclude with a Motion. There was at Sierra Leone some time ago a gentleman of colour, named Fitzjames, a very respectable man, who had been called to the bar by the Middle Temple, had been first Law Officer of the Crown at Sierra Leone, and had acted for a time as Governor. The Governor of Sierra Leone, entertaining some hostility towards this gentleman, had used means to get rid of him, and the Colonial Office had lent themselves to that unworthy proceeding. In a Return, which he had moved for, and which had been presented to that House relating to the matter, statements were made by a Dr. Bradshaw aspersing the character of two respectable inhabitants of Sierra Leone. In order to try the merits of the case these two gentlemen had instituted proceedings against Dr. Bradshaw, and to prove the libel they wanted the original documents containing the libellous statements. The originals were in the hands of the Government of Sierra Leone, and the copies in the hands of the Colonial Office here. He wished, therefore, to ask, Whether the right hon. Gentleman would order that these papers, the contents of which had been circulated by the House, should be really at the command of the persons who wished to try by a jury whether they had been libelled or not? Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman might say that if the Court at Sierra Leone demanded these papers they would be given, but that without such a demand they would not. But he would impress on the right hon. Gentleman that a Judge at Sierra Leone was not in the independent position of a Judge at Westminster Hall, and would fear to do anything contrary to the wish of the Governor. He wished, therefore, to ask, whether the right hon. Gentleman will not send out peremptory orders that these documents shall be placed at the command of the party who brought the action? He would move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."

MR. CARDWELL said, that this question was one not of politics but of law. A reference was made by the Governor of Sierra Leone to the person named by the hon. and learned Member; and that reference having been answered, the answer was laid last year, with other papers, on the table of the House. In the course of the year the solicitor of another party applied to him, as Colonial Secretary, for an order for the production of the paper in question. He had fortified himself with the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown, which was to the effect that the communication was privileged, and would not be called for by any court of law. He intended, therefore, to leave the question to the decision of the court of law, with whose province it was not for him to interfere. The hon. and learned Gentleman said the court of law at Sierra Leone was not fit to decide the matter, but he did not believe that. If it was not fit to decide that question, it was not fit to be a Court of Justice for the decision of any question.

MR. ROEBUCK said, he would withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

THE DISTURBANCES IN NEW ZEALAND—QUESTION.

MR. ARTHUR MILLS said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether he has received a document entitled "Terms of Peace," bearing the signature of Mr. Fox, a Member of the Executive Council in New Zealand, and threatening extreme penalties on all Natives who shall not accede to the said terms; and whether he is aware that this Proclamation was issued and circulated in New Zealand without the cognizance of the Queen's Representative in that Colony?

MR. CARDWELL, in reply, said, he had received no such Proclamation, nor had he received from the Governor of New Zealand any complaint that such a Proclamation had been published without his authority.

FLOGGING GAROTTERS.—QUESTION.

MR. HADFIELD said, he wished to call the attention of the Secretary of State for the Home Department to a paragraph which has appeared in some of the morning papers in reference to the flogging of two garotters in a prison in the county of Durham. The circumstances of the case he said were extremely brutalizing, and he wished to know if the Government will make some inquiry in reference to the subject?

SIR GEORGE GREY said, he did not know what inquiry the hon. Gentleman wished him to make, for the infliction of this punishment was strictly in accordance with the Act passed last Session. By that Act the Judge specified the number of lashes to be inflicted, and the instrument which was to be used on the occasion, and doubtless there had been no departure from the law in this case. The punishment, of course, could not be otherwise than disagreeable.

PUBLIC RECORDS (IRELAND) COMMISSION.—QUESTION.

MR. MONSELL said, he wished to ask, Whether the Commission relating to the Public Records of Ireland has been issued, and if so how soon it is likely to report?

MR. PEEL said, in reply, that it was proposed to have an inquiry into the charges made against Mr. Moran; and the Master of the Rolls in this country, at the request of the Government, had selected Mr. Duffus Hardy and Mr. Brewer to conduct the inquiry. These gentlemen were very competent persons for the task, and they were likely to commence their inquiry during the present week.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.
QUESTION.

MR. RICHARD HODGSON said, he wished to put a Question with regard to an alteration which had taken place in the arrangement of the business on the Order paper for this evening. Yesterday certain Resolutions relating to the revision of the Standing Orders on Private Business were fixed for further consideration at six o'clock to-night, and many hon. Members had come down to the House to take part in the discussion. It appeared, however, that at the morning sitting to-day, without notice to the hon. and gallant Member for North Lancashire, who had brought forward the subject, and without notice to the House, these Resolutions were postponed, at the instance of some hon. Member, till to-morrow at twelve o'clock, when many who took great interest in their discussion would be unable to attend. He wished to have some explanation of these facts, and to ask, Whether they could not now revert to the notice paper as delivered this morning, in order to proceed with the Resolutions?

MR. MALINS also complained of the course which had been adopted, and stated that he had come down to the House to consider this business, and then found that it had been postponed until the morrow, when he would not be able to attend.

SIR GEORGE GREY stated, that perhaps the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Lancashire (Colonel Wilson Patten) would be able to answer the Question. He understood that when the adjournment of this private business was fixed for six o'clock that day, it was suggested that it would be better to fix it for twelve o'clock, because it could not otherwise come on till after the Motions were disposed of. He was under the impression that his hon. and gallant Friend had stated that he could not bring it on until twelve o'clock on Wednesday.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, that the right hon. Baronet was in error in saying what he intended to do. He had suggested that it might be irregular to fix six o'clock for taking the adjourned debate, and stated that if that were so he should have no objection that it should go over till Wednesday. But he that morning found the Order set down for that day, and he had, in consequence, made arrangements to proceed with it that day. He, therefore, suffered as much inconvenience as other hon. Members on finding it postponed to Wednesday.

MR. SPEAKER said, the Order was set down for the six o'clock sitting, but it should be remembered that there was no power to vary the Standing Orders of the House. As an Order of the Day, it could only come on after all the Notices had been disposed of, which, he thought, would have created more inconvenience to hon. Members than the course which had been subsequently adopted. He understood the hon. and gallant Gentleman to say that he had foreseen the inconvenience himself, and to declare that it would be more suitable for his purpose that the matter should stand over as the first thing on Wednesday. Consequently at that morning's sitting a

Motion was made which seemed in accordance with the views of the hon. and gallant Gentleman, that the adjourned debate should stand over till Wednesday, at twelve o'clock.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN expressed his regret that this business had been placed on the paper for six o'clock, and that hon. Members had been put to some inconvenience by its postponement.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY asked, with regard to what had occurred, and believing that there would not be a sufficient attendance on Wednesday, whether it would not be better to postpone the Order until Thursday, or until next Session? [*Cries of* "No, no!"]

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, he had been pressed very urgently not to lose the chance of bringing on this business in the present Session, and therefore it would be taken on Wednesday as fixed.

CASE OF MR. O'MALLEY IRWIN.

ADDRESS MOVED.

MR. HENNESSY rose to call the attention of the House to one of the most extraordinary cases ever brought before Parliament, and he should conclude by moving that a certain petition of right might receive the fiat of the Queen. The case of Mr. O'Malley Irwin was one of gross and grievous injustice; and the statement which he (Mr. Hennessy) was about to make would, he believed, convince the House that this injustice had been suffered for the last thirty years through the culpable neglect of the Officers of the Crown. Mr. O'Malley Irwin, who in the year 1834 had been receiving seven guineas a day for performing judicial functions as deputy assistant barrister in Ireland, in the year 1835 was tried on a charge of forgery, was convicted, was imprisoned for nine months, and fined £50—all this being attributable to the fact that a certain important letter had been kept back at his trial by the Officers of the Crown. In 1840 the late Mr. O'Connell gave a professional opinion on the case, and stated, after carefully investigating all the documents, that Mr. Irwin was entitled to have his petition of right fiated owing to the loss of a letter of the 12th of October, 1834. That letter was written by Mr. Robert Johnston, who was the Assistant Barrister, Mr. O'Malley Irwin being his deputy. The letter which Mr. Irwin was charged with forging was dated the 3rd of October, 1834, and was signed by Johnston, and addressed to the right hon. G. Littleton, then Chief Secretary for Ireland, and was to the effect that he (Johnston) wished, in consequence of ill health, to resign his position as Assistant Barrister for the County of Mayo, and expressed a hope that he would receive a retiring pension. He would read to the House what was the opinion of the present Lord Chancellor of England upon the case, which had been referred to him by the right hon. Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Walpole), then Home Secretary. Sir Richard Bethell wrote in 1858 that, assuming the documents produced to him to be genuine, and the account of the manner in which they have been obtained to be true, he felt bound to say there was *primâ facie* secondary evidence of the fact of Johnston having written the letter thanking the Government for having accepted his resignation, which Mr. Irwin is charged with having forged, and if that were so, he appeared to have suffered grievous injustice. Now, as to the lost link which the Lord Chancellor said was necessary to prove that Mr. Irwin had suffered grievous injustice. [MR. ROEBUCK: He was not Lord Chancellor then.] It was true that he was then only Sir Richard Bethell. The hon. and learned Member for Sheffield seemed to think that made all the difference, but he could not adopt that view, as he believed that, whether as Sir Richard Bethell or as Lord Westbury, the sense of justice was equally keen in that eminent personage. The letter of the 12th of October, 1834, had, after thirty years' concealment, been laid before Parliament. He had in his hand a Return that was moved for by the hon. and learned Member for Suffolk (Sir FitzRoy Kelly), for a copy of that document and also of a letter of October 7, 1834, from the Chief Secretary for Ireland, acknowledging the receipt of the letter of the 3rd of October, from Mr. Johnston, and he would first read to the House this letter from the Chief Secretary to Mr. Johnston—

> "Sir—Your letter of the 3rd inst. was delivered to Mr. Craig by Mr. Irwin only yesterday evening. I am commanded by the Lord Lieutenant to express his regret that the state of your health is such as to render it necessary for you to resign the situation of assistant barrister for the county of Mayo. That part of your letter in which you express your hope that the number of years you have discharged the duties of that office will be considered by his Excellency as constituting a claim to the retiring pension of an as-

sistant barrister will be made the subject of consideration by parties to whom the Lord Lieutenant has directed me to refer it, but his Excellency is desirous that you would have the goodness to detail more especially, either in a letter or in a memorial, the grounds of your claim, stating especially the date of your appointment."

Then came the missing letter, dated Clare, October 12, 1834, from Mr. Johnston to the Chief Secretary—

Sir,—I have had the honour of your favour of the 7th inst., having been addressed to Castlebar, only reached me the 12th. Your letter of the 8th, addressed to Thomas Gildea, Esq:, the Clerk of the Peace, from his illness, not being able as yet to attend here, had received from him on the evening of the 10th. I had, consequently, sat two days in Crown business before any communication on the subject of my retirement. Your letter of the 8th, which I received, expressed Mr. King's appointment only to be temporary. Mr. Morris King arrived here on Friday, the 10th inst., and notified his appointment to me, which having forwarded, I have signified my retirement to him, and requested he would take up the civil business to-morrow. Your letter of the 7th, in a great measure insuring my retiring pension, is of the greatest satisfaction to me. I beg leave to express my most grateful thanks to his Excellency for the kind expressions concerning me on my retiring. I shall forward by to-morrow's post, not having time this day, the date of my appointment and my claim to the pension."

Now, if that letter was genuine, Mr. O'Malley Irwin had been, beyond all doubt, improperly convicted; and upon that point he was authorized by his hon. Friend the Member for Mallow (Mr. Longfield)—who regretted that he was not able to remain in the House—to state that he was present at the trial of Mr. O'Malley Irwin thirty years ago, and the impression left upon his mind was that that gentleman was innocent and had been improperly convicted, and that Johnston was the guilty man. Appended to the Return was the following note, which explained how it was that the letter of the 12th of October, 1834, had not been produced until now:—

" The foregoing copies of the letters of the 3rd and 12th of October, 1834, have been made from copies in the Chief Secretary's office, the originals not being in the office. The letter of the 12th of October was abstracted from the Crown Solicitor's papers during the trial of Mr. O'Malley Irwin, in 1835, for forgery of the letter of the 3rd of October, and has never been recovered."

Let the House understand that Mr. O'Malley Irwin was on his trial, the Crown Solicitor with his bundle of papers before him sat at the table, and yet the letter was abstracted. Who abstracted it? Not the man in the dock whose innocence it would have proved. He might surmise that in the vicinity of the Crown Solicitor was Mr. Johnston, whose character was such that the hon. Member for Mallow declared the Bar of Ireland thought he was the guilty man. Fortunately, an official copy of the letter had been kept, which Colonel Larcom had at last succeeded in discovering. He (Mr. Hennessy) saw the hon. and learned Member for Wallingford in his place—who would, perhaps, be astonished to learn that, notwithstanding his conviction, Mr. O'Malley Irwin had never been disbarred. And how was that? Because it appeared to the Benchers of King's Inn that if that mysterious letter had been produced, Mr. Irwin would not have been convicted, and therefore they refused to disbar him. He had an old Dublin newspaper of 1841 in which was published a letter from Chief Justice Pennefather to Mr. O'Malley Irwin, in which he said that great injustice was done to Mr. O'Malley Irwin by the non-production of the document in question, which, if produced, would have entitled him to an acquittal. That letter was published and commented on ten years before the death of the Chief Justice. He had also a letter from Mr. Baron Greene, which proved that the leading Benchers of King's Inn were aware of the fact that evidence had been kept back at the trial. What then did Mr. O'Malley Irwin do? He had been unremitting in his efforts to obtain justice. When Mr. Irwin came out of prison he brought an action against the late Lord Normanby, then Lord Lieutenant, for keeping back the letters in question; and as it was understood that the papers had been sent to Lord John Russell, then Home Secretary, the noble Lord was subpœnaed to attend and produce them at the trial against the Lord Lieutenant. It was important to know what happened in relation to that summons. The person who served the summons in his affidavit said he had great difficulty in serving it, and at last left the copy in his Lordship's bosom at the House of Commons. That was in June, 1839. Lord John Russell, however, was guilty of contempt, and did not obey the summons. An attachment for that contempt was issued by Judge Coleridge, in reply to which Lord John Russell made an affidavit. He might mention that Lord John Russell communicated with Sir J. Campbell, at that time Attorney General, respecting that affidavit; and there was a letter from the latter, in which he said, "You can't prepare your affidavit until we see what the lunatic says," meaning this unfortunate gentleman. No doubt Sir J.

Campbell might have considered Mr. Irwin a lunatic, for he was constantly endeavouring to obtain the discovery of the letter which would have vindicated his innocence, a copy of which had at length been brought to light. Lord John Russell then made an affidavit. The writ recited three documents by date, and twice recited the letter of October 12, 1834, giving a precise description of the document. Lord John Russell in his affidavit swore that he attended in pursuance of the said writ at the court at Westminster; that he was detained on his way to the court by several persons who spoke to him about public business; that he did not reach the court until the case of the plaintiff was closed, and the Attorney General was addressing the Court on behalf of the defendant; that he was asked whether he had brought with him the documents required by the *sub pœnâ duces tecum*, to which he replied that he had not brought them, though he admitted that the said papers were in his custody as Secretary of State. So much for Lord John Russell as a witness. But Lord John Russell as a correspondent was equally interesting in this case. He (Mr. Hennessy) had seen some twenty letters written by Mr. O'Malley Irwin to Lord John Russell, begging and imploring his Lordship to search for the letter of October, 1834, and asking that such letter, or a copy of it, should be sent to him. These letters, which had recently been tumbled out of the Home Office, were all marked *nil*—Lord John Russell would never condescend to give any reply to them. Mr. Irwin, having failed in his action against Lord Normanby, had from that day to this brought actions against almost every Minister of the Crown. He had been most unremitting, because he was conscious of his own innocence, and felt that the day would come when this important document would be raked up. So he persisted in bringing actions and in calling the attention of Parliament to the case. In 1838, Mr. O'Connell asked for a Select Committee to recover the letter, and the hon. and gallant Member (Colonel French) presented a petition with a similar prayer. Among other documents which had turned up at the Home Office there was a note marked "R.B.," in which the present Lord Chancellor, remarking on Mr. Irwin's case, said in effect—"It depends on the proof of Johnston's letter. That letter cannot be found, but if it can be produced, Mr. Irwin has suffered grievous injustice." He (Mr. Hennessy) believed that no doubt would be expressed to-night as to the authenticity of this letter. He had felt some surprise the other night at the ambiguous reference made by the hon. and learned Gentleman to the document. [The ATTORNEY GENERAL: At that time I knew nothing about it.] He understood that information since then had reached the Government as to this letter, and that its authenticity would not be denied. His statement would thus be rendered much shorter than it must otherwise have been. The Motion he was about to submit was for an Address praying Her Majesty to grant her fiat to the petition of right of Mr. Irwin. This petition had been drawn up by an hon. and learned Member of this House, and it was approved by an hon. and learned Gentleman who had held the office of Attorney General in this country, and by one of the most eminent common law pleaders at the English Bar. He understood that the Motion was to be opposed by the Government, but in doing so they would be taking a very serious step. The Home Secretary and the Attorney General were said to be of opinion that they had the power to refuse the fiat. But who were they who refused the fiat? They were the real defendants in this case. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, and above all the Attorney General, would be practically on their trial if the fiat were given, and this case were allowed to go before a jury. They were the defendants, and yet they constituted themselves judges, and assumed the power to refuse the petition of right. Now upon the constitutional question he would read a few lines from a speech delivered in this House by the hon. and learned Member (Sir FitzRoy Kelly) in July, 1863 —

> "After the passing of the Act of Parliament, for which the country was indebted to his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Guildford (Mr. Bovill), Mr. O'Malley Irwin caused to be prepared for presentation to Her Majesty a Petition of Right; but the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department felt it to be his duty to advise the Crown to withhold its fiat to that Petition of Right, and Mr. O'Malley Irwin was again baffled in his endeavours to procure justice. Now he (Sir FitzRoy Kelly) was prepared to maintain, as a proposition founded upon the constitution and the law of this country, that it was not competent or consistent with the duty of any officer of the Crown to advise the Queen to withhold her fiat to any Petition of Right upon any ground, whether right or wrong, whether well or ill founded. Such an interference was only to be justified in a case where a petition appeared to be founded on fraud, or upon gross and manifest error." [3 *Hansard*, clxxii. 1174.]

Mr. Chitty, in his work on the *Prerogative*, said that a petition of right was the birthright of the subject, and it was maintainable at common law. Mr. Manning, a high authority, said in his *Exchequer Practice*, "As the prayer of the petition is grantable *ex debito justitiæ*, it is called a petition of right." These authorities fortified him in the opinion that the Government had no right to refuse the fiat of the Queen to this petition. Let the case come before a jury. For thirty years Mr. Irwin had been trying to obtain justice, but had been baffled for the want of a certain document, of which at last he had got an authentic copy, and that copy, with the note appended that it was abstracted from the Crown official papers, afforded, in the opinion of the hon. and learned Member, a sufficient ground for the petition of right. It would probably be urged in answer to his Motion, that the Act of Parliament said that the Queen must be "graciously pleased" to issue the fiat, but those very words were used in connection with writs issued by other Courts. Lord Cottenham had said in 1846, in reference to a case on this point, which had not the same claims as the one now before the House, but which was evidently frivolous and vexatious, "What a bar it would be to justice, if parties having a claim against the Crown could not proceed without the permission of the Law Officers of the Crown!" And Lord Brougham had expressed a similar opinion. In dealing with this matter he hoped the hon. and learned Gentleman would remember the position he occupied. If the Government, after the merits of the case had been fully set forth, adopted the unprecedented course of refusing a fiat, he did not know what other course would remain to Members of the House who, like himself, were firmly convinced of the innocence of Mr. Irwin and the guilt of the Crown Officers, than to bring forward a more serious Motion. Of one thing, however, the Government might be sure—that they could not succeed in keeping from the public a case which, according to the Lord Chancellor, exhibited such grievous injustice, by withholding it from a jury. The hon. and learned Member concluded by moving

> "That a humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to grant Her Fiat to the Petition of Right of George O'Malley Irwin, esquire, or to satisfy his claims without suit."

MR. O'HAGAN (THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND) said, that his hon. and learned Friend the Member for the Queen's County had very properly addressed his observations to his right hon. Friend the Attorney General, whose special duty it was to deal with this Question; but he conceived that it would be a convenient course, and perhaps more fair to the House, if he stated some facts which he had ascertained within the last two hours in reference to this case. His attention had only lately been drawn to the case, and he at once felt it to be his duty to take means to ascertain as far as he could the real facts by reference to Ireland. He had received, in consequence, a multitude of genuine and contemporaneous documents, which he had endeavoured to master as well as he could during the last two hours, and he believed that he would be able to give an explanation of the case to the House which it did not receive when it was last presented to their notice. What had struck him most particularly when his attention was first drawn to the matter was the fact that, if there were anything in Mr. O'Malley Irwin's case at all, it necessarily involved imputations of the grossest and most terrible kind against distinguished persons both living and dead. The case was this. In 1835 Mr. O'Malley Irwin was tried for an offence which he believed at that time rendered a person on conviction liable to transportation—at all events, to very serious consequences. The Attorney General of that day, now Lord Justice of Appeals—Mr. Blackburne—acted as prosecutor, and he was assisted by the Solicitor General, Sir Michael O'Loghlen, afterwards Master of the Rolls, and by Mr. Serjeant Greene, afterwards Baron Greene, than whom three men more distinguished for ability and integrity it would be difficult to find. On the second trial he was prosecuted for the same offence by Sir Michael O'Loghlen, then Attorney General, and the Solicitor General, Mr. Woulfe. The imputation to which he had alluded was that a document known by the Crown Officers to be in existence had been deliberately kept back from the jury under the direction of those distinguished persons, and that they, together with the Crown Solicitor for Ireland, Mr. Kemmis, were concerned in a conspiracy against Mr. O'Malley Irwin, the object of which was to get him unjustly convicted, and that they obtained that result by the suppression of this document. At the time when he first heard that statement, it struck him that the charge was of a nature not only grave, but most incredible, although for the moment he was unable to explain the facts. He now asked the attention of the House for a short time while he gave the real explanation of the affair. It was now thirty years old, and a great many of the personages concerned had died, but living evidence could still be produced to verify his statements. Among the documents sent to him, he held letters under the hand of Mr. O'Malley Irwin himself. The statement of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the Queen's County was, that a letter was suppressed and concealed for thirty years; that though the existence of the letter was not unknown to Mr. O'Malley Irwin, he was not acquainted with its terms; and that successive Governments in England and Ireland had refused to do him justice. Mr. Kemmis who, he was sorry to say, had died within the last ten days, had stated that for nine years he was not aware that Mr. Irwin had any imputation against him, and that on coming to London to attend in the great O'Connell case before the House of Lords he was astonished to find himself arrested in the street at the instance of Mr. Irwin, on the charge of stealing this document from the Castle of Dublin. As would be expected, the case was at once dismissed; and on returning to Ireland Mr. Kemmis made a statement to the Government of the facts of the case, which he should now very briefly communicate to the House. When the case first came on for trial in February, 1835, the charge against Mr. Irwin was that he had, for the purpose of obtaining the chairmanship of a county in Ireland, presented, without the authority of Mr. Johnston, the chairman of the county, a document purporting to be the resignation of that gentleman. There appeared to have been some attempt at a corrupt arrangement between Mr. Irwin and some of the friends of Mr. Johnston, the object being to induce the latter gentleman to resign his office, and the bargain contemplated seemed to be that Mr. Johnston, in addition to the Government pension, should receive £2,000 from Mr. Irwin. On the case coming on for trial, Mr. Blackburne, the Attorney General, in stating the facts to the jury, read the very letter which was now before the House, and which formed the subject of the hon. Gentleman's charge. [Mr. HENNESSY: Was this at the first trial?] Yes, it was; and Mr. Blackburne also read to the jury the letter of the then Chief Secretary to Mr. Johnston, Mr. Johnston's reply, and some other correspondence. In the course of the case, however, the document of the 12th of October was abstracted from the court, and although read by counsel was not put in evidence by the Crown. The trial went on, and Mr. O'Malley Irwin was convicted. The case must have been removed by *certiorari*, and thereby acquired the incidents of a civil suit. Application was then made for a new trial, and one of the grounds put forward was that the original of the document of the 12th of October had not been given in evidence. Some months after the new trial came on, when Sir Michael O'Loghlen, the Attorney General, stated in terms the letter to the second jury, everything having been done to establish it as secondary evidence. Notice was given to Mr. Irwin himself to produce the letter, if the original came into his hands, and a copy of it was sent to him, with a notice that it would be used at this the second trial. Accordingly, the copy was admitted as secondary evidence of the original; it was commented on by Mr. Irwin himself, and further by the Judge, who gave full effect to it in its bearing on the crime with which Mr. Irwin was charged. That having been done, the second jury, like the first, convicted Mr. Irwin; and were they now to be told that this letter, which had been read on two trials, by two Attorney Generals, a copy of which had been furnished to Mr. Irwin, and on which he had commented at the second trial, had been concealed for thirty years, and had never been seen by Mr. Irwin till it was placed on the table of the House? [Mr. HENNESSY said, he did not state that.] The House must remember that this was not at all a new case, and that it had been thoroughly investigated when all those were alive who could give evidence on it, and who had conducted the case. Mr. Irwin was sentenced to nine months' imprisonment and a fine of £50. A month or two after the term of imprisonment to which he was sentenced had expired, Mr. Irwin applied to the Law Officers of the Crown to obtain the remission of the fine, on the ground that he was unable to pay it. That letter was dated the 20th September, 1836, and contained some important admissions. The writer said—

> "Without impugning in the remotest degree the verdict of a jury or the decision of the Court of King's Bench, which sanctioned that verdict, I beg leave most respectfully to submit, in order to justify your compliance, that the prosecution

against me was not founded upon a statutable indictment, but at common law; and I venture to impress on you there is no guilt if the mind be not disposed: *Non est reus si mens non est rea;* and that it is not by isolated passages, but by the context of what goes before, and follows after, a correct judgment can be formed. In refutation of an intention of fraud or to deceive, what stronger evidence can be adduced than that my letter of the 15th of September, 1833, addressed to the Private Secretary of the then Lord Lieutenant, was sent by me before the resignation, expressly referring to the then Solicitor General (Mr. Justice Crompton), and stating 'that the resignation of an assistant-barrister (alluding to Mr. Johnston) had been placed in my hands;' and that after the resignation, Mr. Johnston, the assistant-barrister, by letter, expressed 'his greatest satisfaction' and returned 'his' most grateful thanks to his then Excellency for his kind expressions concerning him on 'his' retiring; in reply to the Chief Secretary's letter, officially acknowledging the receipt of his resignation, and expressing his Excellency's regret on the occasion of his retiring, and that 'I' personally delivered it (the resignation). Conscious of the rectitude of my motives and of the soundness of the immortal spirit of Alfred's policy (if to him we owe the common law), I await your judgment with confidence; and, completely borne down by the grievous consequences of the adverse verdict and the great weight opposed to me, I trust you will consider the punishment already inflicted, and not sanction *le droit du plus fort.*

"I am, gentlemen, your most obedient and humble servant,

"GEO. O'MALLEY IRWIN.

"To the Law Advisers of the Crown, Chief Secretary's Department, Dublin Castle."

That letter clearly proved two things—that the case of Mr. Irwin as to the missing letter was a mere afterthought, and that on the 20th of September, 1836, at all events, he had a copy of the letter in his possession, for he quoted expressions from it between inverted commas. Mr. Irwin did not venture to say to the Law Officers who prosecuted him that they had suppressed evidence. Sir Michael O'Loghlen, in his indorsement of this letter from Newgate, said that it was usual in such a case when a prisoner was unable to pay the fine to remit it, and added—

> "In the present case the prisoner has been detained nearly two months in default of payment of the fine, and though I would not have considered a more lengthened imprisonment than that to which he was sentenced too severe punishment for his offence, I would recommend that he be discharged if he is not able to pay the fine."

That was dated October 14, 1836; and the recommendation was acted upon. In an affidavit on June 5, 1835, Mr. Johnston declared that he wrote the letter of the 12th of October "under very great embarrassment and enervation of mind," in consequence of his being under the impression that he was to be superseded by the issue of a new appointment; and Sir M. O'Loghlen indorsed that affidavit to the effect that in his opinion there was no ground for interfering in the case, and that the sentence should not be mitigated. In 1841 an application for a petition of right was made by Mr. Irwin; but Chief Baron Pigot expressed his opinion that such a proceeding was wholly inapplicable to such a case, and that Her Majesty could not with propriety be advised to fiat the petition. The Chief Baron, than whom there was no more astute or conscientious man, in the investigation of evidence, said, that the copy of the letter of the 12th of October, 1834, was read in evidence at both trials; that that copy, with respect to the authenticity of which there was no dispute, was placed in the hands of Mr. Johnston, who was examined in reference to it by Mr. Irwin; that the letter was commented on by Mr. Irwin in his address to the jury, before whom the testimony was fully laid, with Mr. Johnston's explanation; and that one of the questions left to the jury was whether they believed Johnston had given Irwin authority to convey to the Government his resignation of the office of assistant barrister. Now, it should be remembered that all that happened only six years after the trial of Mr. Irwin had taken place; but there was also a statement of the present Master of the Rolls in Ireland, who was not a person likely to allow anything which came before him to escape unnoticed, to the effect that in his opinion Mr. Irwin's charge against Mr. Kemmis was devoid of foundation. Such was the view taken by the Master of the Rolls when he was Attorney General in 1844, and it was idle after so great a lapse of time for his hon. and learned Friend to contend that a petition of right was to be fiated by the Crown because what he seemed to regard as all-important documents had been suppressed. So far as he was concerned in the matter, he would not trouble the House further, save so far as to make a few remarks with reference to what had been said about very distinguished persons having given a sort of approval to Mr. Irwin's case. Now Mr. O'Connell, than whom there was no more eminent man in his profession, got Mr. Irwin's statement of the case from himself, and, as his retaining counsel, no doubt gave an opinion in his favour. Mr. O'Connell, however, was unaware of the facts which had just been laid before the House; he had not the truth disclosed to him, and, that being so, his opinion could not be regarded as worth a farthing, while the opinion of the present Lord Chancellor was wholly based on the assumption that Mr. Irwin's statement was to be relied on, and that there was no opposing testimony. He himself, proceeding on that assumption, was equally ready to admit that Mr. Irwin had suffered a great wrong; but it was not fair to construe an opinion accompanied by such qualifications as an absolute expression of opinion. He could only say that he entirely concurred with Chief Baron Pigot in thinking the case was not one for a petition of right, and he maintained that the Government would disregard their duty to society if they were to grant one after a full consideration of the facts which had been disclosed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that after the exhaustive statement of his right hon. and learned Friend he should not have risen but that the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite had raised an important legal and constitutional question. It so happened that the last of these so-called petitions of right was presented by Mr. O'Malley Irwin in the time of his immediate predecessor, who added another to the numerous Attorney Generals who had all felt it to be absolutely inconsistent with their duty to endorse the fiat on a petition of right of that description. He could assure the House that the position taken by the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite went to subvert the most fundamental principles of our law. Let him take the dates and facts from Mr. Irwin's own statement. Mr. Irwin himself said that in July, 1844, he transmitted through Sir William Follett, then Attorney General, his petition of right to the Secretary of State. He was informed there had been an earlier petition of right which Sir Frederick Pollock did not think fit to direct to be fiated. But Sir William Follett was of opinion that it was no petition of right at all, and accordingly nothing was done upon it. In 1852, when Mr. Walpole was Secretary of State, and Sir Frederick Thesiger and Sir Fitzroy Kelly were the Attorney and the Solicitor Generals, Mr. Irwin again renewed his attempt. It was a mere matter of course that when that which called itself a petition of right came to the Home Office it should be laid before the Attorney General to ascertain whether he would advise the usual endorsements to be put upon it, and the fact that that was not done showed that Sir Frederick Thesiger like all other Attorney Generals, was of opinion that this was no petition of right at all, and not a document which could properly be endorsed. Nevertheless, the right hon. Gentleman then the Home Secretary, whose kindness of heart they all knew, was desirous to have the matter inquired into in some way, in order that it might be seen whether there was any case upon which anything could be done for this unfortunate gentleman. Mr. Walpole accordingly referred the document to Sir Richard Bethell, then a private barrister—the last thing which the Home Secretary would have done if he had thought it a petition of right. Nothing came from that reference, nor was anything done in regard to the matter when Sir Richard Bethell himself for the first time succeeded to office. In 1858, when Lord Derby again came into power, the hypothetical and most guarded opinion was given by Sir Richard Bethell, that if all Mr. Irwin's allegations were right, and there was no case to the contrary, then he had suffered grievous injustice. But then occurred another change of Government, and another petition of right was presented by Mr. Irwin on the 24th of April, 1861, when Sir Richard Bethell was Attorney General, and he of course was the Law Officer to whom that petition must have been submitted to determine whether it could be endorsed as a petition of right. He advised, like all his predecessors, that it could not be so treated; and Mr. Irwin in a letter spoke of that Law Officer in no complimentary terms in consequence. A fundamental fallacy had pervaded the arguments of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite. Misled by the words "petition of right," he seemed to think that any document to which any man chose to give that name was a petition of right within the meaning of the law, than which there could be no greater mistake. Both before the recent Act, and since the passing of that Act, the petition of right was the remedy which applied where the property of a subject was alleged to be in the hands of the Crown, or where money was claimed under contract by a subject from the Crown, and where there was an absence of an appropriate compulsory remedy against the Crown. Where there was a want of such a compulsory remedy against the Crown, then, and then only, a petition of right would lie to recover property or money due under contract. In the present case they had merely the allegation that Mr. O'Malley Irwin had been twice convicted by a jury of an offence against the laws of the country; that that conviction remained unreversed, and that he was entitled to compensation. It was ridiculous to argue, therefore, that he was in the position of a person who could not use the ordinary compulsory process of law against the Sovereign. It was a fundamental maxim of our law that the Crown could do no wrong; and that principle, rightly understood, was almost the corner stone of our liberties. It meant that they could not impute to the Crown any wrong that was done; and for that reason not even the personal command of the Sovereign could exonerate any person by whom a wrong was done from personal liability for the wrong; and if it were true that in the course of all these proceedings there had been any dereliction of duty on the part of the vast number of public officers who had been more or less connected with them—if the Crown prosecutor had, for example, withheld evidence when he ought to have produced it—they were personally liable under the law and constitution for such acts. To say, then, that the Crown was to be responsible for all the wrong done by its servants was to contradict principles of law so fundamental that he was really astonished that a Gentleman with the hon. and learned Member's knowlege should rise in that House and gravely attempt such a thing. What were the rules laid down by the highest authorities on these matters. Here were the words of *Blackstone*—

> "Petition of right is of use where the King is in full possession of any hereditaments or chattels, and the petitioner suggests such a right as controverts the title of the Crown, grounded on facts disclosed in the petition itself."

As to the impossibility of the King doing no wrong, *Blackstone* said—

> "The King can do no wrong, which ancient and fundamental maxim is not to be understood as if every transaction by the Government was of course just and lawful, but means only two things—first, whatever is exceptionable in the conduct of public affairs is not to be imputed to the King, nor is he answerable for it personally to his people; for this doctrine would destroy the constitutional independence of the Crown; and, secondly, that the prerogative of the Crown extends not to do any injury."

To this, Lord Chief Justice Erle, in a case in the Common Pleas, had added the following remark:—

> "This maxim has been constantly recognized, and the notion of making the King responsible in damages for a supposed wrong tends to consequences that are clearly inconsistent with the duty of the Sovereign."

Lord Lyndhurst had investigated the subject in 1843, when Lord Canterbury brought a petition of right to recover the value of certain property destroyed at the fire in the Houses of Parliament. That was a very flimsy case; but there was an element of property as well as a supposed contract by the Crown to do all that was necessary to preserve the property from fire. Lord Lyndhurst, in that case, said—

> "Is it supposed that the Crown is responsible for the conduct of all persons holding public offices and appointments, and bound to make good any loss or injury which may be occasioned by their negligence or delinquency? At least some authority should be cited in support of such a doctrine. . . . *Stamford* says:—Petition is all the remedy the subject hath when the King seizeth his land or taketh away his goods from him, having no title by order of his laws to do so, in which case the subject, for his remedy, is driven to sue unto his Sovereign lord by way of petition only, for other remedy hath he not. He speaks of this proceeding as applicable to the illegal seizure by the King of the lands or goods of a subject; and, although, this is not conclusive against its application to other cases, yet no instance has been cited, &c. . . . The *Year Books*, with the abridgments of Fitzherbert and Brooke, and other authorities, have been carefully searched, and no case has been found to warrant this proceeding. The decisions go back several hundred years, and in the absence of all precedent during so long a period, I think I should not be justified in deciding, for the first time, that such a proceeding can be maintained. Indeed, if the Crown cannot be guilty of negligence or personal misconduct, and is not responsible for the negligence or personal misconduct of its servants, it follows, of course, that in those cases there can be no such remedy; and, on the other hand, the absence of all trace of the remedy would itself afford a strong argument against the liability."

Still more recently in the Court of Common Pleas it had become necessary to investigate the same principles in a case in which the Law Officers thought it their duty to grant a petition of right, as a question of property was involved. A vessel had been seized by our African squadron on suspicion of being engaged in the slave trade, and there was a sort of question whether the Crown might not be supposed to be wrongly in possession of the property thus seized. In that case Lord Chief Justice Erle said—

> "To these reasons and authorities we would add an opinion, that there is good ground for maintaining that which we find to be the law on this subject. We think that if each of the Queen's subjects who believed he had been at any time in any reign wronged in the administration of civil or military affairs could sue the Sovereign for the time being for the amount at which he might

estimate his damage, the extent of pernicious result would be great."

The House probably was aware that Mr. Irwin had passed his life since the time of this trial in bringing actions against everybody—Lord Normanby, Lord John Russell, Sir George Grey; and only last Saturday his right hon. Friend (Sir George Grey) was charged by him before a magistrate in London with no less a crime than high treason. The magistrate, however, was so sensible as not to entertain the charge, for which failure of justice, no doubt, in due course of time, Mr. Irwin would apply for another petition of right. Lord Chief Justice Erle went on in this very judgment to refer to the action against Sir George Grey as an instance of the absurdity of sanctioning a petition of right in every case where it was applied for. He said—

> "And we refer to the petition of right adduced in evidence in 'Irwin *v.* Sir George Grey' (3 *Fost. & Fin.* 635) as an example of the mischief which might arise if such was the law."

Since he had the honour of holding his present office he had been asked to endorse a petition of right for a man who had an action pending at the time, when it pleased Parliament to pass a general Act which might be pleaded in bar to his action. According to the doctrines which had been stated on this subject, if an Election Committee unseated a Member he might have a petition of right for wrongful deprivation of his seat. Nothing could better illustrate the extravagant notions which seemed to be held as to these petitions than a document which had lately been forwarded to him. It was a petition to Her Majesty from a Mr. Clare, who had had an action against the Admiralty by a petition of right on some patents and had lost the verdict, at which, of course, he was very much discontented. Mr. Clare had made some most extraordinary statements and accusations in this document. For instance, he said—

> "If ever a trial at law were won by the plaintiff, and proved by the defendant for the plaintiff, the case of 'Clare *v.* the Queen' is the one, from the fact that all the Admiralty witnesses were broken down on cross-examination. If ever a trial were garbled by the press for the defendant, to the prejudice of the plaintiff, the case of 'Clare *v.* the Queen' is the one. If ever a Judge sat on the bench biassed, the Lord Chief Justice's speech for the Admiralty in the case of 'Clare *v.* the Queen' is a ratification *in toto.* If ever a verdict was given against the weight of evidence, it was in the trial of 'Clare *v.* the Queen.' If ever subornation of perjury were divulged, it was on the trial of 'Clare *v.* the Queen.' If every conspiracy were made use of to swindle a plaintiff of his property, it was on the trial of Clare *v.* the Queen.'"

And he concluded by these extravagant prayers—

> "1. To see that I am settled with in full, with interest, for my patents and inventions, both for the past and for the future, and that all my claims for losses that have accrued to me by the Admiralty withholding from me the payment of my just rights, along with all the expenses I have been put to in developing and promoting this great modern question of metal shipbuilding, and the legal charges contingent on this case to be paid me. 2. That my knowledge shall be set free throughout the Royal Dockyards, and that I am remunerated in accordance with my capabilities upon a percentage on outlay. 3. That the appointment of Naval Mechanical Constructor to the British nation, with hereditary title, in unison with the paramount importance of my patents and inventions to Great Britain, be granted to me, per patent. 4. That hereditary titles be presented to those gentlemen who have so nobly stood by me on public grounds during my oppression from the Admiralty, to their eternal fame—namely, Mr. W. Titherington, of Dee Hills, Chester, and Mr. Edwin Haigh, of Cote Brook, Tarporley. 5. That your Majesty disqualify Sir Alexander James Edmund Cockburn, the Lord Chief Justice of England. 6. Ex-office Mr. Collier as Solicitor General, and withdraw his patent as Q.C. 7. Withdraw the patent of Q.C. from Sir William Atherton. 8. Cause the Lord Chancellor to disbar Sir W. Atherton, Mr. Collier, Mr. West, and Mr. Macrory."

It was absurd to say that the Attorney General was not to exercise his common sense as to endorsing these petitions of right. He (the Attorney General) had acted as his predecessors had done, and refused to advise the Crown to act on the document in question. The Court of Chancery protected itself against frivolous proceedings by requiring the signature of counsel to petitions, and the House of Lords required the certificate of counsel that appeals were proper and reasonable. It was also the duty of the Law Officers to exercise a judgment as to whether what was called a petition of right was not an abuse of the name; and if the present Law Officers had put their fiat on this gentleman's petition, they would have adopted a different course from that which had been pursued by their predecessors during a period of thirty years, and would have given advice the tendency of which must have been most pernicious.

Mr. MALINS said, that the case of Mr. O'Malley Irwin, as brought forward by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for the King's County, if not contradicted, would have required some consideration; but when it appeared from the statement of the Attorney General for Ireland, that the letter of the 12th October, 1834, was used both at the first and second trial, the case of Mr. O'Malley Irwin became perfectly ridiculous. Mr. O'Malley Irwin had pursued him for several years. Wherever he went, up started Mr. O'Malley Irwin (invariably armed with the opinion of Sir Richard Bethell and other authorities) in a manner that was magical, and poured forth his grievances. He had taken some pains to investigate the case, and had come to the conclusion that it was unfounded; and, as Mr. O'Malley Irwin had vexed every lawyer and every tribunal for twenty-eight years, he became afraid that that gentleman might bring an action against him for not having paid sufficient attention to his papers and statements. He held that the privilege which the Law Advisers of the Crown had of refusing their fiat to a petition of right ought to be exercised with great caution, but he believed that they were right in refusing it in the present instance. Mr. O'Malley Irwin had been tried by the laws of his country, and, in addition, had had the unusual advantage of a second trial; and although he was convicted on each occasion, he had been pestering all the Courts of the country for redress ever since, while a person who had been convicted at the Old Bailey thirty years ago would have as good a right to claim it as Mr. O'Malley Irwin had. The case had been thoroughly investigated, and he hoped Parliament would hear no more of it.

MR. HADFIELD said, that to demands at law there was a statutable limitation of six years. He thought there ought to be some such limitation in respect to demands on Parliament. If they heard claims of thirty years' standing, why not hear those of 300? He was surprised that, after the lapse of thirty years, so satisfactory an answer could have been given to the present case.

MR. HENNESSY, in reply, said he wished to say a few words, both on the question of fact and the question of law. He again quoted to the House the opinion of the late Mr. O'Connell, who had been employed by Mr. Irwin as counsel in the case, to the effect that he was entitled to proceed by petition of right. Mr. Kemmis's statement of the case was totally false. That document was prepared for Lord John Russell, and was minuted by him, but it contained a grave misstatement of fact. [The hon. and learned Gentleman here quoted some documents which bore the endorsement of Lord John Russell when at the Home Office.] Mr. Kemmis, in his account of the transaction, did not give the letter of the 12th of October, 1834, but only his own version of the case; and that statement had deceived Lord John Russell. Mr. Irwin had obtained copies of the letters from Mr. Vignolles, and Mr. Armstrong, a Protestant clergyman; but the Crown had not acknowledged their authenticity. Supported by the opinion of Mr. O'Connell, who gave it after much deliberation, and by the opinion of Chief Justice Pennefather, he was inclined to think that his right hon. and learned Friend had been misled by the documents which had so recently been placed in his hands. He hoped the Government would lay those documents on the table, for they should not refer to official documents unless they were laid on the table. He adhered to the opinion of Mr. O'Connell that Mr. O'Malley Irwin had suffered a grievous injustice, and that this petition of right should be fiated by the Crown.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, he wished to say one or two words with reference to the use which had been made by the hon. and learned Gentleman of the documents from which he had just quoted. From what had been stated by the hon. and learned Gentleman they appeared to be official documents, some of them confidential communications between the Private Secretary of Lord John Russell and the Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant. One of these documents bore the endorsement of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and they must have been abstracted from the office of the Secretary of State. He did not ask the hon. and learned Gentleman how he obtained possession of them, for no doubt they came to him through Mr. O'Malley Irwin. How Mr. O'Malley Irwin could come by them he did not understand; but he hoped the example set by the hon. and learned Gentleman of quoting from such private and confidential documents in that House would not be drawn into a precedent.

MR. HENNESSY read a letter signed "S. H. Walpole," which enclosed the documents when that right hon. Gentleman was Secretary of State for the Home Department, addressed to Mr. O'Malley Irwin.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, that he was quite sure his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Cambridge could not have placed documents of that kind at the disposal of any individual, except by mistake or accident.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at Nine o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, July 27, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Select Committee*—Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)* (No. 235).

Second Reading—Poor Relief (Metropolis) (No. 253); Cranbourne Street* (No. 252).

Committee—Limited Penalties* (No. 97).

Report—Weights and Measures (Metric System)* (No. 164); Limited Penalties* (No. 97).

Third Reading—Harwich Harbour Act Amendment* (No. 210), and *passed;* Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands)* (No. 215), and *passed;* Local Government Supplemental (No. 2)* (No. 190), and *passed;* Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension* (No. 231), and *passed;* Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues* (No. 232), and *passed;* Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), and *passed;* New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan)* (No. 233), and *passed;* Public Works (Manufacturing Districts)* (No. 237), and *passed;* Poor Removal* (No. 239), and *passed;* Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation* (No. 151), and *passed;* Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland)* (No. 216), and *passed;* Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental* (No. 221), and *passed;* West Indian Incumbered Estates Acts Amendment* (No. 225), and *passed;* Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* (No. 247), and *passed.*

POOR RELIEF (METROPOLIS) BILL—(No. 253).

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord WODEHOUSE, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said, that the object of the measure was to alleviate as much as possible the distress which existed in some districts of the metropolis. Their Lordships were aware of the distressing cases which had of late frequently appeared in the public journals, arising from the want of sufficient means to relieve the casual poor. Cases had occurred of persons being left without food or shelter during the inclement nights of winter, and in some instances the death of the unfortunate persons so exposed had been the result. It was the fact that in the several unions of London there were in the aggregate 500 destitute persons applying for casual relief daily; but from the want of the necessary accommodation, many cases of great hardship—almost of cruelty—were of constant occurrence. It was not too strong an expression to say that such a state of things was a disgrace to the capital of a civilized country like this. A Committee appointed to inquire into the subject had presented a Report to Parliament, recommending that the charge for the casual poor should be paid out of a rate levied on the rateable property of the whole metropolis, and that the Metropolitan Board of Works should be the machinery for collecting such rate, while the Poor Law Board prescribed the necessary arrangements. It was calculated that the required funds might be raised by a rate not exceeding one-sixth of a penny in the pound. Some complaint had been made that the Bill had been introduced so late in the Session; but it should be borne in mind that the Report of the Committee was only presented on the last day of May. On the 16th of June the President of the Poor Law Board sent out circulars to the Metropolitan Boards of Guardians, calling attention to the Report; and a great number of the Boards approved the scheme embodied in the present Bill, the operation of which was limited to a period ending on Lady Day next. It would be for Parliament next Session to adopt some well considered and permanent measure for effecting the object. In reference to the relief of casual poor it was reasonable to regard the whole metropolis as one district, and it was desirable to take precautions against the recurrence of such scenes of misery and distress as were witnessed last winter.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*Lord Wodehouse.*)

The Earl of POWIS said, that as the Bill was merely a temporary measure, he would not now argue whether the plan proposed was or was not the proper way for providing for the casual poor; but he could not see the slightest necessity for the Metropolitan Board of Works being employed merely for the purpose of discharging the functions of bankers. That was a duty which the Bank of England might more properly perform.

EARL FORTESCUE regarded the Bill as one of great importance, and the proposition to spread the charge over the whole metropolis appeared consistent with a sense of fairness; but he could not agree that the machinery by which the rate was proposed to be collected was the best. He feared, too, that as before there had been a tendency on the part of some Boards of Guardians unduly to restrict relief to the casual poor, there would now be, when the cost was to be defrayed out of a common fund, a rivalry in expenditure with the view of obtaining popular favour. He thought the Bill should have been introduced at an earlier period of the Session, and that the opinions of the Boards of Guardians should have been earlier obtained.

LORD REDESDALE had the same objection to this Bill which he had expressed with regard to the Poor Removal Bill—namely, that it had been brought up to their Lordships' House at too late a period of the Session to admit of any Amendments being proposed or the Bill being properly considered. It was a very serious subject of complaint, and had now become a systematic practice of the Poor Law Board, that important measures should be introduced at such an advanced period of the Session, that it was quite impossible to give them that consideration which their importance demanded. It was nonsense to talk of obtaining the opinions of the Poor Law Guardians before introducing the Bill. The proper course would have been for the Department to have framed a Bill and then submitted its provisions for the consideration of the Poor Law Guardians. The machinery of this Bill was defective in various particulars, and its effect would be to increase the number of vagrants, to draw the most abandoned from that part of the metropolis where they were known to those parts where they were not known, since no means were provided for testing in any way the character of the applicants for relief. The provision by which the money was to be raised by means of the Metropolitan Board of Works was also highly objectionable. Other provisions of the Bill were highly objectionable, but there was no time to propose any Amendments. For his own justification, therefore, and to enable other noble Lords to show their sense of the impropriety of introducing so important a Bill at the very end of the Session, he should move that the Bill be read a second time that day three months.

Amendment *moved* to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months.")—(*Lord Redesdale.*)

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY hoped his noble Friend would not press his Amendment. Any one who was conversant with the condition of the poor of London must see how urgent it was that something should be done. He was very much disposed to agree with the objection as to the lateness of the Session, and that would be a good ground for passing a severe censure on the Poor Law Board; but it would be but a bad justification for any sufferings to which the poor might be subjected next winter if their Lordships were to refuse on that account to pass the Bill.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE, while agreeing with his noble Friend in many of the objections which he had made to the provisions of the Bill, hoped he would not press his Amendment to a division.

On Question, That ("now") stand Part of the Motion? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative.*

Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow;* and Standing Orders Nos. 37 and 38 to be considered in order to their being dispensed with.

House adjourned at Three o'clock,
till To-morrow, half past
Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, July 27, 1864.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS— *Ordered* — Titles (Ireland) (No. 2)*; Courts of Conciliation*; Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment*.

First Reading — Courts of Conciliation* [Bill 242]; Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment* [Bill 243]; Titles (Ireland) (No. 2)* [Bill 244].

Considered as amended—Naval Discipline* [Bill 233].

Third Reading—Naval Discipline* [Bill 233].

Withdrawn — Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia)* [Bill 231].

STANDING ORDERS REVISION.

REPORT.

Standing Orders, Nos. 7, 8, and 9, and Report of the Select Committee, *further considered.*

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, that when this subject was last before the House, they were discussing the Amendments to the seventh Standing Order, and several hon. Members who had voted against the adoption of three as the number of Members to serve on Private Bill Committees, had since informed him that they had done so under the belief that the number ought to continue to be five, and that they did not wish that the number should be fixed at four—the number which was substituted. But he had introduced various changes in the Resolutions for the purpose of making the other Orders conformable to the recent decision of the House, and he was afraid that he would not have time, before the close of the Session, to re-alter the scheme with a view to have the number fixed at three. Under these circumstances he would suggest to hon. Members that the best course to pursue would be to allow four to stand, for the present, as the number of the Committee. It would then be open for any hon. Member to move any alteration of the Resolutions he might think proper at the commencement of next Session; and upon that subject he had to remind the House that there would be ample time for the adoption of such a course, inasmuch as no Committee would be appointed until three weeks after Parliament had re-assembled. In conclusion, he had to propose that Resolution 7 should be left as it then stood.

MR. WARNER said, he did not mean to oppose that proposal; but he wished to give notice that on the consideration of the Standing Orders at the commencement of next Session, he would move that the number of Members serving on Private Bill Committees should be reduced from four to three.

SIR MORTON PETO said, he should wish to make a few remarks upon the general way in which the Private Bill business of the House was conducted. He fully agreed that it was necessary that some alteration should be made, but he thought that the hon. and gallant Member was proceeding in a wrong direction. It had been proposed that Private Bills should, in the first instance, undergo an inquiry by a body of Referees, one of whom was to be an engineer. But he believed that it would be impossible to find a first-class engineer who would be disposed to undertake that duty; and if, on the other hand, it were intrusted to an inferior member of the profession, it was manifest that the decision of such a gentleman would carry with it no kind of authority. He would suggest that a Committee of the Officers of the House should be appointed for that purpose by the Speaker. A large number of Bills were brought forward by speculative parties, and the first thing that ought to be ascertained was whether these Bills were introduced by *bonâ fide* capitalists. [Mr. AYRTON: What is a capitalist?] A capitalist was a man who was capable of carrying out what he undertook to do. The Committee, he suggested, would inquire into this subject, and much time and trouble would be saved by such an inquiry. Then the schemes brought before Committees were often of a competing character, and it was very probable that after such a preliminary inquiry many of them would not be heard of any further. There was another point to which he wished to advert. It was at present necessary that Bills should be deposited by the 23rd of December; and he would propose that within a month of that time petitioners should deposit their objections to each scheme. The result of such an arrangement would probably be that parties would often settle their differences without coming at all before the House. There were some thousands of Local Boards throughout the country, and petitions emanating from those Boards occupied very largely the attention of Select Committees, but he believed that many of the petitions were got up to enable the solicitor and clerk to the Board to spend a few days in London. He believed that the Committee of Officers would have no difficulty in knocking off one-half at least of these petitions. It was said that in the case of these Private Bills they might separate the merits from the facts, but that he denied, because the merits were often entirely involved in the facts. It was proper that undertakings, for whose promotion it was sought to obtain the authority of the House, should be backed by persons having ample capital at their command; but if the House was too rigid in demanding that the whole capital should be subscribed at once, they might impede most useful undertakings. If this principle had been insisted on, what would have been the result in such a case, for instance, as that of the Great Northern Railway, which saved to the country annually £3,000,000. He would have the House remember that there was no class of enterprize which they clogged with such enormous penalties as railways, and he might mention a fact which occurred in his own experience to show how cheaply things of this sort might be effected. He had been a party to a contract in a foreign country, which involved an expenditure of £4,000,000, and the whole preliminary expenses to which they had been put scarcely exceeded £200. He wished to see existing interests properly protected, but they must avoid putting a damper upon fair enterprize legitimately represented by capital. He thought that if a Committee of the character which he had described was appointed, it would dispose of much of the surplus business of the House.

MR. MILNER GIBSON suggested that it would be convenient if Members would confine their remarks to the question before them, which was that the number of the Committee should remain for the present four.

MR. SPEAKER said, the best time to introduce the general discussion on the Question would be on the Order as to Referees.

Standing Order, No. 7, as amended, *agreed to.*

Several Standing Orders amended, and *agreed to,* as far as 86 B.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN moved the adoption of a new Standing Order (86 B),

> "The Chairman of Ways and Means, with not less than Three other persons, who shall be appointed by Mr. Speaker for such period as he shall think fit, shall be Referees of the House on Private Bills; such Referees to form one or more Courts; Two at least to be required to constitute each Court: provided that the Chairman of any second Court shall be a Member of this House."

MR. MASSEY said, that there was nothing in the Order to designate the character of the Referees. He thought it undesirable that they should be Members of the House, and would therefore propose to introduce the words "not being Members of this House."

Amendment proposed, after "persons," to insert "not being Members of this House."—(*Mr. Massey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN quite accorded with the suggestion, which he understood to be required by the rule of the House.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY said, he understood that his hon. and gallant Friend had, on a former occasion, expressed his opinion that one of the Referees should be an engineer; he did not, however, state whether he meant a civil or a military engineer. If the former, it was quite clear that the engineer should be one of the second or third class, for a first class engineer could scarcely afford to give up his time to the discharge of such duties. If, however, his hon. and gallant Friend meant that he should be a military engineer, the civil engineers would say that he was not practically conversant with the important questions that would be submitted to him.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, if his hon. Friend looked at the proposed Order he would find that it did not provide for the appointment of an engineer as one of the Referees. He (Colonel Wilson Patten) had alluded merely to the possibility of one of those Referees being an engineer. He recollected the case of a Committee sitting for nine days on the consideration of an engineering question, and at the end of that time they were obliged to ask the Government to lend them an engineer to help them in their difficulty. The request having been complied with, the Government engineer settled the matters at issue within forty-eight hours, to the satisfaction of all parties. The result was the construction of the celebrated tubular bridge over the Menai. There was no necessity to mention an engineer at all in the Orders, but he had no doubt the Speaker would exercise his discretion in the appointment of such an officer in whom they would all have confidence.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER said, a great complaint was made about the pressure of Private business, but he himself had not served on a Committee for three years, and he could not help thinking that if the labour was more fairly distributed among Members there would be less dissatisfaction. He believed it would greatly facilitate business if, at the close of an inquiry into the merits of each Bill that occupied any considerable time, one or two Members of the Committee were relieved by fresh Members. The proposed Referees would practically supersede the Select Committees altogether, for if they discharged the duties sought to be confided to them there would hardly be anything left for the Committees to do. He was opposed to the appointment of engineers as Referees. Even if an engineer of any eminence were found willing to act as a Referee, he would probably be interested professionally in many of the works upon which he was called to decide, and the decision of a man occupying a lower position in his profession would not give satisfaction to the parties. Perhaps the office of Referee would be intrusted to that fortunate class of men who were supposed to be capable of doing everything—barristers of seven years' standing. To designate a man as a Referee would not endow him with any special knowledge or fitness for the performance of these duties. When a Private Bill Committee first met the Members did not know what it was they were going to try. Then came counsel, with their long and rambling speeches, and perhaps after two or three hours the Committee began to see daylight as to the question which they would have to try. There was nothing placed before them for their guidance in the nature of pleadings, as was the case in any proceedings before an ordinary court. The parties who went before them ought at least to be required, in the first instance, to put in a written statement of facts, showing what their case was, what they proposed to prove, and what they asked for; and some officer of the House should be appointed to whom those statements of facts should be referred, and who should deal with them very much as a Judge in Chambers dealt with pleadings which were objected to for some reason or other. By that means he was of opinion that the inquiry before the Committee would be simplified and the Committee's labours considerably lightened.

Mr. AYRTON said, that the Chairman of Committee of Ways and Means had proposed an Amendment to prevent any other Member of that House except himself from being a Referee. It was difficult to understand how that hon. Gentleman should himself have proposed such an extraordinary Amendment. Let them look for a moment at what would be its effect. The Speaker was to appoint the Referees. It was not provided that they should be officers of that House, but it was intended that they should be divided into several courts; and, as the Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means could only be Chairman of one of those courts, the result would be that other courts would be set up in no way connected with that House, and in which no Member of that House would sit, so as to be able afterwards to afford it any information which might be required respecting the proceedings of one of those courts. It was provided that the decision of such a court, so disconnected from that House, was to be final, and binding upon the Committee as far as concerned the matters referred to it. Considerable embarrassment might ensue from such a state of things. If the proceedings of one of those courts, acting without the presence of a Member of the House, should be in any way impeached, there would be no one in Parliament to explain them, unless indeed the Referees were to be summoned to the Bar of the House. Thus, persons not responsible to the House would be made absolute masters of the proceedings of the House. It was said they could not have another Member of the House, besides the Chairman of Committee of Ways and Means as a Referee, because he must be paid; but there were many Members of the House who devoted their time and attention to carrying out its wishes without payment. The exclusion of Members from the office of Referees was a step in the wrong direction, and they ought to insist that where the Chairman of Committee of Ways and Means could not preside, some other Member of the House should preside in his stead, so that they might be satisfied that no error or injustice was committed in a finding which would bind the House as well as the parties interested. The House ought to take care how it allowed itself to be discredited in this matter, otherwise the country would regard the House of Lords as the only branch of the Legislature fit to conduct this important description of business. It appeared as if the House of Commons, having first abandoned the privilege of dealing with Private Bills as money Bills, was now going to abandon the privilege of dealing with them at all. Before depriving themselves of that power, hon. Members ought well to weigh the results which were likely to follow. If they conducted the proceedings of their Committees like any other tribunal in and out of this country, they would get rid of many of the difficulties which beset their private legislation. That House was almost the only tribunal which attempted to conduct litigious business without rules of procedure. Preliminary steps ought to be taken to clear the ground for the final inquiry before the Committee, and the parties should come before it with some precise issues to be tried. Instead of the vague preamble of a Bill which was now submitted to a Committee, they should have a detailed and specific pleading, such as was in use in the Law Courts at Westminster. A company approaching that House should be required several days beforehand to send in a tabulated estimate of the cost of their scheme and a succinct and accurate statement of its engineering features. If improvements like these were adopted it would be unnecessary to call in the aid of Referees at all. Moreover, the proposed system would frequently involve the necessity of double or triple references, and he was therefore afraid that the expenses to the suitor would only be increased.

Mr. H. BAILLIE said, no two Members appeared to be of the same opinion with regard to the description of persons who should be appointed Referees. One suggested engineers, another barristers of seven years' standing, and the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets that one of them should be a Member of that House. He (Mr. Baillie) thought there would be great difficulty in getting any hon. Member to undertake so onerous a duty. He was disposed to agree with the hon. Baronet the Member for Finsbury, that the vast amount of private business arose from the laxity with which the Standing Orders of the House were carried out. In practice they acted as a positive encouragement for bringing forward schemes for the sole purpose of being afterwards disposed of. He did not think the proposed change would be found to work successfully.

Mr. ARTHUR MILLS said, his experience of Private Bill Committees was that the time of the Committee and the money of the parties were frequently wasted in the process of proving matters which might be proved before the parties went before the Committee at all. Engineers were called to contradict engineers, and much needless expense was incurred in consequence. Great saving of time and money would be obtained by a preliminary inquiry before Referees, and there would be no necessity for having questions re-opened after the Referees had reported. It had been stated that an inquiry in the last Session had cost over £60,000—and he would venture to say that one half of the money was spent in proving facts that might have been previously established. There was not a strict analogy between these Committees and ordinary tribunals, and it would be impracticable to tie them down by the fixed rules adopted in the Law Courts. He contended that it was unfair to charge these Committees with arriving at random conclusions, without rules, for at present their practice was tolerably uniform, and they had rules which were now generally followed. He wished to see the existing machinery strengthened and made more efficient and economical in its working, and for that purpose he thought the Committees should be armed with additional powers. As to the Referees, whether they were or were not Members of that House he would have perfect confidence in them.

Captain JERVIS said, that besides saving the time of the House, hon. Members should see that they also saved the time and the pockets of the public. But he did not see how this was to be effected by the establishment of a third tribunal, which might have no effect in the other House, and would, in his judgment, both increase the expense, and waste the time of the public. Referees were to be appointed to go into the details now investigated by ten or a dozen Committees. Committees often neglected details for want of time; and no three men could do ten times the work so neglected by the Committees. It was out of the question. It was proposed further that three Referees should enter into traffic and engineering details, which sometimes took six weeks in one particular case. In his opinion, the only way of reforming the procedure in Private legislation was for the two Houses to concur in a mode of saving time and expense.

Mr ROEBUCK doubted, whether the mere fragment of the House of Commons which remained on that, the almost last day of the Session, was in a position safely to alter the whole Private legislation of the country. Was it decent? He would appeal to the noble Lord at the head of the Government, whether at so late a period so great a change should be made? It would be better to defer the subject to the early part of the next Session, in a full and fresh House. The hon. and learned Member moved that the Debate be adjourned for a month.

Sir JOHN SHELLEY seconded the Motion. As there was a probability of a general election early next year, and the greater portion of the metropolitan lines were now conceded, he thought it likely that the Notices for Private Bills next November would be comparatively few in number. They were quite at sea as to what the proposed Referees were to do, but they ought not to hurry the discussion of the subject.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Roebuck.*)

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH also thought it would be best to let the subject stand over until next Session. He was prepared to agree to a reduction in the number of the members of Select Committees, but the question of appointing Referees required further consideration. He thought that the appointment of Referees to sit simultaneously with Committees would add to the complexity of Private business, and would certainly not diminish the expense. At the same time he could not see why the parties should not be required to agree upon certain facts, such as the population of towns, distances, &c., the inquiry into which under the present system greatly lengthened the sittings of Committees.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN hoped the House would not adopt the Amendment of the hon. and learned Gentleman. Very many equally important measures were passed by more thinly attended Houses than the present. It was singular that the hon. Baronet the Member for Westminster should support a further postponement, because it was at his suggestion that the subject had been referred to a Committee. The hon. Baronet also nominated three Members to serve upon that Committee, but neither of those Members had suggested any objections, and even the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets allowed the report to be passed unanimously. He had no special affection for his own proposition, and had only brought it forward under the belief that it would tend to the public advantage. Reference had been made to the desirability of equalizing the labour thrown upon Members by serving upon the Select Committee, but he could assure the House that the Committee of selection endeavoured as much as possible to divide the labour. The hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets, who ought, perhaps, to have made his suggestion in the Select Committee, alleged that these propositions, if carried, would lower the authority of the House of Commons. It was difficult to understand how that could be, seeing that the House of Lords, as well as that House, now referred two branches of Private Bills to Commissioners out of Parliament. Having been for thirty years connected with the Standing Orders Committee, he had always found the same objections raised whenever attempts were made to alter the mode of dealing with Private business. Thus it was always urged that no fixed rules were laid down for the guidance of Committees, but whenever he appealed to lawyers to frame such rules he found that no two of them could agree. He thought the plan he proposed would be for the convenience of the Members and for the advantage of the public.

Mr. LOWE hoped the House would not hastily reject a carefully considered proposition, which was placed before them upon great authority, and which was called for by a serious emergency. The hon. and learned Member for Sheffield was in error in supposing that the House would resume this question with equal effect at the beginning of next Session. If Parliament meant to keep the Private business in its own hands, some material changes in the mode of managing it must be made, and, above all, the serious defect of having the same case tried twice over by two independent tribunals. The main objection urged against the plan of Joint Committees of the two Houses was, that it would be impossible for the other House to furnish its due proportion of working Members to sit upon these Committees. It was therefore obvious that the first thing to be done was to reduce within manageable limits the amount of business to be thrown upon the Committees, and the question then arose how could that reduction be brought about. It would be impossible to introduce anything in the nature of pleadings without increasing the existing confusion. The only way was to require that measurable and ascertainable facts, such as engineering works, traffic, &c., should be inquired into primarily and agreed upon, and that duty could best be performed by persons whom experience would render familiar with such details. The effect of such a plan would be to diminish the amount of labour now cast upon Members of the House, but if the House rejected this Referee proposal he did not see how the amount of business was to be reduced.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH feared that if the Motion for postponement was agreed to there would be nothing done in this matter for a couple of years, inasmuch as there was every probability of a general election next year. He, however, hoped that some further explanation would be given as to the character of the Referees whom it was proposed to appoint.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON said, he thought the House was much indebted to the hon. and gallant Gentleman for the pains he had taken with regard to this matter. There was a great deal to be said in favour of the scheme now under consideration, but at the same time he was fully alive to the fact that this was the last day but one of the Session, and that much might be said against as well as for the plan. There appeared to be doubts in the minds of many hon. Members who had expressed their opinions, as to whether this was the best scheme that could be desired, and whether it might not be possible to devise some other mode of management. The hon. and gallant Gentleman told them the Committee had been unanimous in their opinion upon these propositions, and if the hon. and gallant Gentleman should think it right to take the sense of the House upon them, the Members of the Government could not, in fairness, vote against them. He would, however, put it to the hon. and gallant Gentleman as a matter of discretion as well as of expediency, whether it would not be the better course to consent to postpone dealing with the subject until another Session? It would not be prejudicial to the plan to consent to such a postponement, for it must be borne in mind that there was always at the beginning of a Session a certain interval before Public business could be commenced, and that interval would afford a convenient opportunity of considering the best mode of dealing with the Private business.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, he was always desirous of yielding, if possible, to the noble Lord's opinion, but in this instance the noble Lord was mistaken as to the effect of a postponement. To defer dealing with this subject until next Session, meant putting it off until the year 1866. There would be Referees to be appointed and rules to be drawn up which would prevent any action being taken next Session upon the Resolutions, if agreed to. He should leave it to the House to decide whether this subject should be now dealt with, or be put off for another year.

Question put:—The House *divided*:—Ayes 14; Noes 51: Majority 37.

MR. MASSEY hoped that three Members would be appointed on the Committee of Referees who should not be Members of that House.

MR. MILNER GIBSON hoped that the Chairman of Ways and Means would not think it necessary to press his Amendment, as Members of the House might be found willing to act as Referees without payment, and it would be unadvisable to pass a Resolution precluding their appointment.

CAPTAIN JERVIS wished to know if the court would be open to the public. He believed that the public, whose interests were concerned, would not have the same confidence in a body of paid Commissioners as they would in a court formed of Members of that House, from whom they would be more apt to expect an impartial verdict.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, that the public would have access to the court as they now had to the Committees.

MR. ROEBUCK wished to know, whether the House was prepared to give power to any person to establish rules which they would not alter in the event of their being disapproved of by the House, because, if such rules should be made in the vacation, they would come into operation before the House met next Session?

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN suggested to the hon. Member for Sheffield the advisability of urging his objection when the clause to which he referred came on for discussion.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY did not know how the House was to acknowledge the proceedings of any of those courts which were not presided over by one of their own Members. He thought it better that that question should be left an open one.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, he was willing to let that question remain an open one.

MR. MASSEY said, he would withdraw his Amendment, as he found that the sense of the House was in favour of the matter being left open.

MR. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD wished to call the attention of the House to the fact that, at present, the suggestion was that the Chairman of Ways and Means and three Referees should form two courts, so that the casting vote in either court must necessarily be exercised by the chairman in case of any difference of opinion between himself and the other Referee. This was the more to be regretted as the subjects to be decided by these courts were such as to involve much litigation and expense, and the House would find the same scheme brought before them year after year in consequence of the dissatisfaction which the decision of one person must necessarily give. He would therefore suggest that each court should be composed of not less than three Members.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN would agree to the suggestion of the hon. Member.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH suggested the omission of the words "two at least to constitute each court."

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *negatived.*

Mr. ROEBUCK then moved in the place of the word "two" in line 4, to insert "three."

Mr. SPEAKER would point out to the House that such a Resolution would be tantamount to a direction to the Speaker to appoint five Referees instead of three as at present suggested.

Mr. ROEBUCK observed, that in order to constitute two courts there must be six persons appointed.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, the Order was to appoint not less than three persons.

Mr. MASSEY said, it would be necessary to divide the Referees into two courts, in case the business should be too heavy for one to dispose of. He thought it would be unwise for the House to put an absolute prohibition upon the action of Mr. Speaker. A second court was only to be opened when the business was too much for one.

Mr. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD said, that if only one court was to be opened it would be better for it to be composed of three Referees, because if the court were composed of four, the Chairman would have a casting vote. Mr. Speaker's power of appointment would be exhausted in the first instance, unless they inserted the words "from time to time."

Mr. MASSEY said, that the power of making further appointments was already provided for by the words "for such period as he shall think fit."

Mr. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD said, he would move a proviso in reference to the second court, that the Chairman should be a Member of the House.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN thought that his hon. Friend was raising difficulties which would never occur. If they provided for every little difficulty, the occurrence of which was only possible, there would be no end to the provisions which they would have to frame.

Mr. INGHAM was of opinion that there was no necessity for the Chairman of the second court being a Member of the House.

Sir MORTON PETO cited the example of the hon. Member for Ipswich (Mr. Adair), whom no amount of work appeared to frighten.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH would suggest that no such Referee, if a Member of the House, should receive a salary.

Sir JOHN SHELLEY said, that the Chairman of Ways and Means was empowered in his absence to appoint one of the Referees to supply his place, and he thought that the Referee so appointed ought also to be a Member of the House.

Mr. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD then moved, that the Chairman of the second court should be a Member of the House.

Mr. LOWE regarded this Amendment as equivalent to resisting the formation of any second court at all, because he did not believe they would find a Member willing to undertake the drudgery which the office involved.

Captain JERVIS said, that if Members could sit on Committees upstairs for four months there would be no difficulty in obtaining their services for a few weeks in the court below.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON agreed to the doctrine that the Chairman of the second court should be a Member of the House; the question was, Who was to appoint him?

Mr. SPEAKER would remind the House that he had no power to compel any Member to undertake the duty, and the possibility of putting such a provision into execution would entirely depend upon the willingness of any Member to fill the office. It would be compelling the Speaker to request, as a favour, some Member of the House to undertake the duty, and he thought that that was hardly the form in which the matter should be left.

Mr. INGHAM said, the duties would occupy from ten in the morning to five in the afternoon daily, and perhaps not excepting Saturday. That would prevent the hon. Member who undertook the office from attending to his public duties.

Mr. LYGON said, that if the duties did not deter the Chairman of Ways and Means from accepting the office in one court, he thought it ought not to deter any hon. Member from presiding over the second court.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY thought it would be much better to have only one court.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH moved a proviso—

> "And provided that no such Referee, if he be a Member of this House, shall receive any salary."

MR. LYGON pointed out that if such a Referee were appointed with a salary his seat would be vacated on that account.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, that the Chairman of Ways and Means was appointed with a salary, and did not vacate his seat. He was not an officer under the Crown.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, it was quite clear that the Act only referred to appointments held under the Crown.

Proviso *agreed to.*

MR. SPEAKER said, he had now to put the Question that this House do agree with the Resolution of the Committee as amended. He would venture to point out that there had been considerable alteration made in it. It was his business to take upon him any duty the House might choose to impose upon him, but he would have been glad if in the course of the debate some indication had been given by the House with regard to the persons whom they might desire to be appointed as Referees. He had only been able to gather the opinion that the House was averse to the appointment of one class—engineers. When he accepted the duty, he believed that his services would be confined to the appointment of three Referees; and now it was extended possibly to five, and with the class of persons undetermined he could not help feeling that the duty was somewhat difficult to perform.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, there were two officers appointed by the Speaker to examine Private Bills; their appointment had given the utmost satisfaction; and he had no doubt that like satisfaction would be felt with regard to any appointment that might be made by the Speaker under this Bill.

Standing Order 86 B *agreed to.*

Standing Order 86 C,

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN moved that the Chairman of Ways and Means should be Chairman of the Referees.

COLONEL FRENCH had heard nothing with reference to the amount of remuneration to be paid to the Referees. This was a mere experiment, and he wished to know whether the Referees appointed would be entitled to retiring pensions in case of failure?

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, the scheme was experimental. If unsuccessful it would be put an end to, and there would be no pension or compensation. The salaries would have to be determined by a vote of the House.

MR. MASSEY thought that the rule before the House might be omitted, as it was inappropriate after the decision at which the House had arrived in the course of its discussion of the previous rule.

MR. HARVEY LEWIS thought the question of remuneration ought to be fixed.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, that in other Departments no difficulty had occurred in this respect.

MR. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD asked, in the event of there being two courts, who was to be the Chairman of the second court?

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN moved the substitution of the words "first court" for "Referees" in the first part of the rule, which provided that the Chairman of Ways and Means should be the Chairman of the Referees.

CAPTAIN JERVIS thought it would be better to omit the whole Order.

The Order put, and *negatived.*

Order 86 D (Rules of Practice and Procedure to be made by Chairman of Ways and Means).

MR. ROEBUCK asked, whether these rules were to be acted on before the House had acceded to them? By such a course they would hand over to the Chairman of Ways and Means a power which should be retained in that House.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, the principle of framing these rules was taken from the system of the Courts of Law, and their only object was that the business should be carried on satisfactorily.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY moved after "may require" to insert "but only the Counsel shall appear before such Referees in support of a Private Bill, or in support of any petition in opposition thereto."

SIR MORTON PETO asked whether any counsel at all were necessary, as the solicitors and agents were quite competent to conduct the business. He believed that if counsel were let in, not one or two but half-a-dozen courts would be necessary.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, it was at the suggestion of the Parliamentary agents themselves that counsel were to be admitted. The Chairman of Ways and Means, however, would be empowered to regulate the proceedings before the Referees.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON thought that parties ought not to be deprived of the power of employing counsel as they pleased, especially as property to a large extent was involved in many cases that came before these Committees.

Mr. BRADY said, that the lawyers and agents who had recommended that counsel should be heard before the Board of Referees, were the very parties who were specially interested in increasing the cost of those inquiries.

Mr. LOCKE said, that perhaps the hon. Gentleman would like the parties to toss up to determine which side should win. The employment of counsel was for the interest of the parties, who naturally desired that their case should be stated in the best manner, and the right to retain counsel for the purpose of these proceedings ought not to be restricted.

Mr. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD supported the proposal of the hon. Baronet, that only one counsel should be allowed to appear. It would not be desirable to leave it to the Chairman of Ways and Means, who was himself a barrister, to adopt what might appear an invidious rule to his profession.

Mr. INGHAM thought the proposal of the hon. Baronet a reasonable one.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH, acknowledging the efforts of the President of the Board of Trade to regulate the fees of the Parliamentary Bar, asked, Whether the right hon. Gentleman could inform the House of any satisfactory result?

Mr. MILNER GIBSON said, he could not give much information on this subject beyond that which was already in the possession of the House. The doctrine which he held was simply this, that the fees of the Parliamentary Bar should be regulated as the fees in the ordinary Courts of Law and Equity were regulated. He was informed that the doors of the Committee-rooms were now thrown open, and that members of the Equity and Common Law Bars could now come in and practise there without incurring the displeasure of the Parliamentary Bar.

Mr. COX pointed out that, by allowing only one counsel to appear for each party, the promoters would have but a single counsel against perhaps half-a-dozen retained for different petitioners against the Bill.

Captain JERVIS thought the restriction a most salutary one, for the result would be the employment of one counsel, who would be present throughout the proceedings and attend exclusively to the case.

Motion *agreed to.*

Order 86 D, as amended, *agreed to.*

Order 86 E,

"The Referees shall inquire into all or any of the following matters as to which parties petitioning against any Bill desire to be heard in opposition, viz.—1. In the case of Bills of the Second Class for authorizing the construction of Works, the engineering details of the undertaking, the efficiency of the Works for the proposed object, and the sufficiency of the estimate for executing the same ; 2. In the case of Bills for authorizing a new line of railway, the statistics of the traffic proposed to be accommodated ; 3. In the case of Waterworks Bills, the nature and amount of the existing and the proposed source of supply, the quality of the water in each case, and the provisions as to storage reservoirs ; 4. In the case of Gas Bills, the quality of the gas, the existing supply and its price, the amount of pressure, the cost of production, and the modes of testing the purity and illuminating power of the gas,"

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, that after the length of time which had already been occupied in that discussion, he would propose that No. 2 in 86 C, which was the only debateable point he believed that still remained, should be left open for consideration in another Session, when he would move it as a special Resolution.

Sir MORTON PETO suggested, that Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 should be postponed till another Session.

Sir JOHN SHELLEY remarked that this regulation referred to railways, and would involve the whole question.

Mr. ROEBUCK said, that the inquiries contemplated in No. 1 would really place the whole Bill within the jurisdiction of the Referees, whose decision was to be practically without appeal. A noble Lord in the other House was said to be the House of Lords as far as Private Bills were concerned. He was not prepared to make these Referees in the same way the House of Commons.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, the sole effect of the provision would be, that where questions relating to engineering matters were concerned, they would go before the Referees instead of the Committee. He begged, as the discussion had taken this turn, to move "That Order 86 stand part of the Bill."

MR. MILNER GIBSON was disposed to agree in the objections of the hon. and learned Member. The efficiency of the works for the proposed object and the sufficiency of the estimate were really inferences from facts. It seemed to him, therefore, that the Referees ought to report the facts, as well as the inference which they drew from those facts.

SIR MORTON PETO moved the postponement of Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4, which, he thought, would be better inquired into next Session. This proposal would practically constitute two trials of the whole affair instead of one, whereas he had understood that the business of the Referees would be simply to denude the inquiry before the Committee of all unnecessary matter.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, that if these paragraphs were struck out the omission would make perfect nonsense of the whole scheme. The facts into which the Referees were to inquire had nothing to do with the merits; they were only the facts upon which the merits depend, and they could be as well ascertained by other parties as by Members of the House.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH thought the engineering details and the sufficiency of the estimate were matters which could properly be ascertained by the Referees.

MR. SPEAKER having put the Question that Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 be struck out,

MR. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD said, it appeared to him that such a proposition amounted to asking the House to reconsider their decision. They had decided to constitute Courts of Referees, and it was now necessary to decide what questions should be referred to them. If those four clauses were now to be postponed until next Session they would simply have wasted four hours in a discussion upon them. That would give to their proceedings the character of a farce.

SIR MORTON PETO said that, under the circumstances, he would not press the Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, he would have no objection to strike out No. 2 in order to save the time of the House, and he would undertake to bring it forward again next Session. With regard to the remaining clauses, they were mere matters of fact upon which he believed there would be no difference of opinion.

No. 2 *struck out.*

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN then moved the adoption of Standing Order, 86 F,

> "So soon as the inquiry into the matters referred to them upon any Bill has been completed, the Referees shall make their Report upon the same to the House, and the Report shall thereupon stand referred to the Select Committee on the Bill. No further evidence shall be taken by the Committee to prove or disprove any of the facts reported by the Referees."

MR. MILNER GIBSON moved the insertion, after the word "House," of the words "stating the facts on which their opinion is founded." He thought it but right that the Select Committee should be put in possession of that information.

MR. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD thought that if the opinion of the Referees was to be final, the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman would only open the door to useless criticism.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN concurred with the hon. Gentleman in thinking that such an Amendment would only provoke unnecessary discussions.

MR. MILNER GIBSON did not propose that it should be competent to the Committee to prove or disprove the facts into which the Referees had already inquired; but unless a report of the facts was before the Committee it could not arrive at a conclusion as to whether the inference drawn by the Referees was a correct one, and he was not prepared to deprive the Committees of the House of the power to judge of the inference which should be drawn from ascertained facts.

MR. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD reiterated his objections to the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment.

MR. INGHAM said, the Referees would have to state the result of certain facts, but the Committee would have no power to go into the details by which the Referees had arrived at them. The policy of the measure would remain in the discretion of the Committee.

MR. MASSEY said, the Amendment was no innovation on the existing practice. If the Referees were to report their conclusions without stating the facts upon which they were based, he did not think their Reports would have the confidence of that House. If the Committee had the power to refer the Report back for further consideration he thought it would be sufficient.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, the object of the Standing Order was to allow the details to be thoroughly investigated before the Referees.

Mr. CHILDERS said, the material facts were not, at present, the proper inquiry for a Select Committee. It would be the duty of the Referees to look into the details and see that they were sound.

Sir JOHN SHELLEY asked whether, if a Bill was unopposed, the details would be looked into and examined by the Referees?

Amendment *agreed to.*

Question put, that the Order, as amended, be *agreed to,*

Mr. ROEBUCK observed that, in the case of a Water Bill, if the Referees had taken evidence as to the sufficiency of a puddle wall, the Select Committee would be precluded from making any inquiry as to whether the wall was sufficient or not; but if after the construction of the work the wall should fall, the world would say it had been approved by a Select Committee, when, in fact, the catastrophe would be due to the neglect of the Referees.

Standing Order, as amended, *agreed to.*

Colonel WILSON PATTEN then proposed Standing Order 86 G—

"The Select Committee to which any Bill has been referred may, subject to the approval of the Chairman of Ways and Means, refer any question arising in the course of their inquiry which they may deem suitable to be so referred to the Referees for their decision; such question to be stated in writing, and signed by the Chairman of the Committee. The Referees, so soon as their inquiry has been completed, to return the question, with their decision certified thereon, to the Chairman."

Mr. SEYMOUR FITZGERALD moved an Amendment, limiting the questions to be so referred to questions of fact.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, the Standing Order was framed at the suggestion of several experienced members of the railway body. A point had arisen the other day between the Great Northern and Great Eastern Railways with regard to the connection of the lines, which it would have been desirable, if it could have been done, to refer to arbitration. It was to meet a similar case that the Standing Order had been introduced.

Mr. AYRTON said, he thought it would be putting an unlimited amount of labour upon the Chairman of Ways and Means, before the fact was ascertained that he would accept the duty. These Committees were to be permitted to make references to the Referees without the Referees being bound to undertake the duties.

Mr. LOWE was of opinion that the machinery of reference would break down under the additional work thus proposed to be put upon it.

Mr. MASSEY hoped the House would not overburden the Chairman of Ways and Means.

Amendment *negatived.*

Standing Order 86 G *agreed to.*

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, this was the last of these Resolutions. If the experiment should fail, he would be one of the first to vote for its repeal. He thought, however, that it would be beneficial.

On the Motion of Colonel Wilson Patten Orders 113 and 113 A *struck out.*

Standing Order in lieu of 113 A (Absence of Members by Death or otherwise to be reported)—

"If, at any time after the Committee on a Bill shall have been formed, a quorum of Members required by the Standing Orders cannot attend in consequence of any of the Members who shall have duly qualified to serve on such Committee having become incompetent to continue such service by having been placed on an Election Committee, or by death, or otherwise, the Chairman shall report the circumstances of the case to the House in order that such measures may be taken by the House as shall enable the Members still remaining on the Committee to proceed with the business referred to such Committee, or as the emergency of the case may require."

—put, and *agreed to.*

Standing Order 143,

Mr. SCOURFIELD moved to insert after the word "railway," in line 13 of 48, the following words:—

"The amounts subscribed and paid by the persons named and described in the Schedule to the Bill, the *bona fides* of such subscription, and the correctness of the names, residences, and description of the subscribers."

Sir MORTON PETO hoped the hon. Member would not press his Amendment, and the other Resolutions of which the hon. Member had given notice, as they would be fatal to many great undertakings already in progress. He would be quite ready to consider the whole subject in another Session.

Mr. MASSEY said, that the change which his hon. Friend proposed to make was one of a very extensive character, but it did not properly relate to the mere Standing Orders of the House. He would recommend his hon. Friend to withdraw the Amendment, and next Session to take the deliberate opinion of the House upon the subject.

Mr. SCOURFIELD intimated that he would not press the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Standing Order *agreed to*.

Mr. TORRENS moved that the following be a new Order:—

> "That on every Private Bill to be considered by a Committee all Petitions presented by the Promoters, Opponents, or other parties Petitioning on matters connected with such Bill be printed, and a Copy of every Petition be placed in the hands of the Members of the Committee on its assembling."

Mr. MASSEY said, that the proposal was one of a novel character, and would entail a considerable addition of expenditure on the parties. He did not say, however, that it ought on that account to be rejected. But he would ask the hon. Gentleman to withdraw his Motion for the present so as to allow him (Mr. Massey) to confer with those persons concerned in the conduct of private business, and next Session he would have an opportunity of conferring with the hon. Member himself, and the result might be a proposition which would be generally acceptable.

Mr. TORRENS intimated that after that assurance he would not press the Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Standing Orders relating to Private Bills *repealed*.

Ordered, That the several Orders, as reported by the Committee and amended by this House, be the Standing Orders of this House relating to Private Bills, and be *printed*. [No. 545.]

THAMES CONSERVANCY BILL.

[Bill 240.]—Lords Amendments.

Lords Amendments *considered*:

Amendments *agreed to*, as far as page 23, line 32.

Mr. AYRTON objected to a provision marked C, inserted by the other House, which conferred a privilege on coal vessels not enjoyed by vessels engaged in other branches of commerce—namely, to unload in the river and escape dock duties. It was better to leave the Thames as a free highway for the equal benefit of all descriptions of commerce, and he begged to move that the House should disagree with this Amendment of the Lords.

Page 23, line 32, the next Amendment, being read a second time; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with The Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Ayrton.*)

Mr. LINDSAY supported the clause, which he said would promote the general trade of the port of London.

Mr. Alderman SALOMONS said, that this provision had been inserted by the Lords in opposition to the opinion of the Select Committee. He could inform the House that a large portion of his constituents were opposed to the clause, and considered that their interests had been overlooked by its introduction at a period of the Session when it was almost impossible to discuss it properly.

Mr. LOCKE said, that this was an attempt to restrict everybody else connected with this matter for the benefit of a favoured class. He did not know why colliers should not go into dock the same as other vessels.

Mr. HUTT hoped that his hon. Friend would not press his Amendment, as by so doing it might imperil the Bill itself at that late period of the Session. He believed that the Bill would greatly increase the facilities of the navigation of the Thames. He proposed to add a few words to the clause restraining the exercise of any undue power by any individuals under the Act.

Mr. AYRTON said, he would withdraw his Amendment.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Other Amendments *agreed to*, as far as Clause 75.

Mr. LOCKE objected to an Amendment of the Lords which threw out a provision prohibiting any extension being made in the sewers or drains leading into the Thames outside the metropolitan districts. The Court of Chancery had granted an injunction against this drainage being carried out at Kingston, which would remain in force till Michaelmas term next; but the rejection of the clause would permit Kingston and also all other towns on the banks of the Thames to empty their sewage into the river. Seeing that the inhabitants of London were taxed to the extent of four millions to prevent this being done in the case of London, he thought it was inconsistent to allow other towns to drain into the Thames. He moved that the House should disagree with the Lords Amendment.

Clause 75, the last Amendment, being read a second time; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with The Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Locke.*)

MR. HUTT agreed in all the hon. and learned Gentleman had said on the importance of keeping the Thames free from pollution, but he appealed to the hon. and learned Gentleman not to press his Motion, as it might defeat the measure for the Session. He would undertake that the subject should be brought under the serious consideration of the Government during the recess.

MR. BRADY hoped the hon. and learned Gentleman would press his Motion.

MR. LOCKE said, he would, under the promise held out, withdraw his Amendment.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment *agreed to.*

TITLES (IRELAND) (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND, Bill for the Recording of Titles in Ireland, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND and Sir ROBERT PEEL.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 244.]

COURTS OF CONCILIATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. EDWARD PLEYDELL BOUVERIE, Bill to enable Persons between whom Disputes have arisen to settle their Differences without resorting to Litigation, *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. EDWARD PLEYDELL BOUVERIE and Mr. HARDCASTLE.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 242.]

SALMON FISHERY ACT (1861) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. BARING, Bill to amend "The Salmon Fishery Act, 1861," *ordered** to be brought in by Mr. BARING and Sir GEORGE GREY.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°.* [Bill 243.]

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, July 28, 1864.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Committee*—Poor Relief (Metropolis)* (No. 253).
Report—Poor Relief (Metropolis)* (No. 253).
Third Reading—Poor Relief (Metropolis)* (No. 253); Weights and Measures (Metric System)* (No. 164); Limited Penalties* (No. 97); Cranbourne Street* (No. 252).

Mr. Locke

THE PROROGATION.—QUESTION.

In reply to Lord CHELMSFORD,

THE LORD CHANCELLOR stated, that the Prorogation was fixed for to-morrow.

LORD REDESDALE said, he was sorry to hear that announcement, for two Bills had come up from the Commons with their Lordships' Amendments disagreed to, and it would be now impossible to consider the matter properly.

RAILWAY COMPANIES POWERS BILL.

Returned from the Commons, with some of the Amendments, *agreed to;* some *agreed to* with Amendments; and some *disagreed to,* for which Disagreement the Commons have assigned Reasons.

Moved, "That the Commons Reasons for disagreeing to certain of the Amendments made by the Lords, and Commons Amendments to Lords Amendments, be now considered."—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

LORD REDESDALE said, he could not understand why the Prorogation should take place to-morrow. He found that on the Minutes of the House a judgment was put down to be delivered on Saturday. There was no idea yesterday that the Prorogation would take place to-morrow. It was quite impossible to consider these Amendments. They had not even been printed. He protested against the haste that was being exhibited.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said, that with regard to the first Amendment, at all events, the noble Lord knew what it was.

LORD REDESDALE said, he had no objection to that Amendment, but their Lordships generally knew nothing whatever about the Amendments, and therefore it was most unreasonable to ask them to agree to them.

LORD CHELMSFORD also thought it most unreasonable that their Lordships should be asked to record their agreement with Amendments of which they knew nothing.

An Amendment *moved* to leave out from ("That") to the End of the Motion for the Purpose of inserting ("the Consideration of the Commons Reasons and Amendments be adjourned till To-morrow, and that the Reasons and Amendments be printed."—(*Lord Redesdale.*)

After short debate, on Question, Whether to agree to the said Amendment?

Their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 8; Not-Contents 18: Majority 10.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

CONTENTS.

Hawarden, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore*). [*Teller.*]
Melville, V.
Abinger, L.
Chelmsford, L.
Denman, L.
Redesdale, L. [*Teller.*]
Wensleydale, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Westbury, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Lansdowne, M.
De Grey, E.
Ducie, E.
Fortescue, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Stratford de Redcliffe, V.
Sydney, V.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Harris, L.
Methuen, L.
Monson, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*) [*Teller.*]
Rivers, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Seymour, L. (*E. St. Maur.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Wodehouse, L.

Commons Reasons for disagreeing to certain of the Amendments made by the Lords *considered*: *Moved* not to insist on the said Amendments; on Question, Whether to insist? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative:* Commons Amendments *considered;* some *agreed to,* the rest *disagreed to,* and a Committee appointed to prepare Reasons to be offered to the Commons for the Lords insisting on their Amendments, and disagreeing to certain of the Amendments made by the Commons to the said Bill; the Committee to meet *forthwith:* Report from Committee of a Reason prepared by them; read, and *agreed to;* and a Message sent to the Commons to return the said Bill, with the Reason.

RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTION FACILITIES BILL.

Commons Reasons for disagreeing to certain of the Amendments made by the Lords, and Commons Amendment to Lords Amendments, *considered* (on Motion): *Moved* not to insist on the said Amendments. On Question, Whether to insist? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative:* Commons Amendment *considered,* and *disagreed to,* and a Committee appointed to prepare Reasons to be offered to the Commons for the Lords insisting on their Amendments, and disagreeing to the Amendment made by the Commons to the said Bill; the Committee to meet *forthwith:* Report from Committee of a Reason prepared by them; read, and *agreed to;* and a Message sent to the Commons to return the said Bill, with the Reason.

RAILWAY COMPANIES POWERS BILL.

Returned from the Commons, with their Disagreement to the Amendments made by the Lords, *not insisted on,* and with the Amendments made by the Commons to the Amendments made by the Lords, to which the Lords have disagreed, *not insisted on.*

RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTION FACILITIES BILL.

Returned from the Commons, with their Disagreement to the Amendments made by the Lords *not insisted on,* and with the Amendment made by the Commons to the Amendments made by the Lords, to which the Lords have disagreed, *not insisted on.*

House adjourned at a quarter before Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, July 28, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Withdrawn*—Partnership Law Amendment * [Bill 68].

THE NEW CANON OF WESTMINSTER. QUESTION.

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If the newly appointed Canon of Westminster, who is *ex officio* Rector of St. Margaret's Westmister, is to receive a fixed stipend or a proportion of the gross income of the canonry; and, if so, what proportion?

Mr. T. G. BARING, in reply, said, he believed the stipend of the newly appointed Canon of Westminster would be fixed, and that it would amount to £1,000 a year. As, however, the question depended upon the construction of several Acts of Parliament, he could not give a positive answer.

INDIA—THE INDIAN ARMY. QUESTION.

Colonel SYKES said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whether, now that the Regiments of the Three Native Armies of India are termed Irregulars, it is intended to continue the exceptional practice of appointing Officers to Regiments to be Commandants and second in command of Regiments, irrespective of their rank, notwithstanding other Officers appointed to the same Regiments may have superior brevet or substantive rank; and on what grounds a Staff Officer serving with a Native Regiment is permitted to qualify himself for promotion to substantive rank and pay, while an Officer on the Cadre of a Regiment, and not on the Staff, is only qualifying himself for promotion to brevet rank without pay?

SIR CHARLES WOOD said, in reply, that in answer to the first Question of the hon. and gallant Member, he had to state that in the Irregular Regiments in India the rank of commandant was given to an officer quite irrespectively of his rank in the regular army. It was not proposed to abolish the power of making the appointment of commandants in the manner stated in the Question, and thus prevent the Government from putting the right man in the right place; but that course would only be adopted in very exceptional cases. In reply to the second Question, he had to state that the position of an officer under such circumstances in a Native Regiment had no connection with his regimental rank or pay.

AFFAIRS OF MEXICO.—QUESTION.

MR. KINGLAKE asked, Whether, on the part of the Government, the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs can convey an assurance that before the Government advises the Queen to recognize the Archduke Ferdinand Maximilian as Emperor of Mexico they will be prepared to satisfy the House that his authority is *de facto* established in the main portion of the States and Territories now held under the sway of President Juarez?

MR. LAYARD replied that there was some difficulty in ascertaining exactly what portion of Mexico was actually in the hands of the new Mexican Government, or rather of the French troops. According to the latest accounts he had been able to collect, the French troops were in possession of the capital, Vera Cruz, Tampico, Alvarado, Minatitlan, Laguna del Terminos, San Juan Baptista, Sisal, Campeachy, and Puebla. The French troops were also blockading Acapulco, Tuspan, Nantla, and Tabasco. On the 1st of May last Juarez was established at Monterey, and Matamoras was also then in the possession of the Mexicans. That was the only information he could give to his hon. Friend with regard to the places actually in possession of the new Mexican Government. As his hon. Friend was aware, in that unfortunate country for many years past it had been almost impossible to say that at any time any particular Government had been in possession of the whole of the Republic. Recent Presidents had rarely held more than the capital, Vera Cruz, and one or two of the ports of the country surrounding the capital. The rest of the Republic had generally been in a state of insurrection. It had hitherto been the custom, from necessity, to recognize the Government that was in possession of the capital, and the Archduke Maximilian was now in possession not only of the capital, but of a considerable portion of the country. Her Majesty's Government had informed the Emperor of the French confidentially that when the Archduke Maximilian was actually in Mexico, and had notified to the European Powers that he had taken possession of the Government, it was their intention to advise Her Majesty to recognize the Archduke as Emperor of Mexico. He could give his hon. Friend no assurance that before that acknowledgment of the Emperor *de facto* was made the Archduke would have to be able to show that the greater part of Mexico was actually in his hands. The peculiar state of the country was such that he did not believe it would be possible for the Archduke Maximilian to do that. There were always a number of chiefs in arms, who took possession of a district and held it against the Government, and a state of anarchy was the consequence. He hoped, however, that when the Government of the Archduke Maximilian was established in Mexico a better condition of things would ensue. At any rate, it was very desirable for the interests of British subjects that there should be at least some *de facto* Government in Mexico in possession of the capital and some of the ports of the country.

RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTION FACILITIES BILL—LORDS AMENDMENT.

Lords Amendments *considered;* several *agreed to;* several *disagreed to;* several amended, and *agreed to.*

Committee *appointed,*

"To draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to the Amendments to which this House hath disagreed:"—Mr. MILNER GIBSON, Mr. HUTT, Sir WILLIAM DUNBAR, Lord CLARENCE PAGET, and Mr. ADAIR:—To withdraw immediately:—Three to be the quorum.

EMIGRATION (AMERICA).

PAPERS MOVED FOR.

LORD EDWARD HOWARD said, he rose to call attention to the subject of Emigration to the United States of America in reference to the prolongation of the war now raging in that country, and to move an Address for Papers. He certainly should not have attempted to intrude on their attention at that late period of the Session had it not been that a case had presented itself which it appeared to him necessary he should bring before the House. In the course of his duty as a member of the Distress Relief Committee at Glossop, one of the towns most affected by the cotton distress, it became necessary to have a census made of the population of the district, and one of the elements of that census was the character of the emigration which prevailed. It appeared from that census that there had been a very large emigration from that district, and from the inquiry which supervened he found it was also large from the cotton districts in general. In twenty-two towns, taken promiscuously from the cotton districts—and he did not know that they were the largest towns—there had been within a few months, setting aside single men, no less than 1,460 married men who had left this country for the United States of America, of whom no fewer than 780 had deserted their wives and families, leaving 2,160 chargeable on the rates. He had also the names of fourteen persons who had emigrated within three months from one spot near Manchester, and of these no fewer than twelve had deserted their wives and children. In all probability the 780 married men who had deserted their families were young and able men not long married, and in the most active period of their lives. That emigration, attended by such calamitous results, must show that there were deep causes at work for the present state of things, which was to be lamented, not only for its anti-social results, but for the country generally. It would not meet the argument to say that these men had emigrated with a view afterwards to send for their families, because he knew that there had been instances in which the manufacturers of America had sent for manufacturing hands from England, had paid for the passage of those who went over including not only the working hands, but their families also, and the money thus advanced was afterwards repaid out of the men's wages on their arrival in America. He had further to say that great caution was exercised by the agents who were instrumental in taking these people out of the country, for they did not give written documents or money until the emigrants were safe on board the vessels which were to convey them to America. He would read a few extracts to show how some, at all events, of those who emigrated were disposed of when they got to the other side of the water, and in order to present the case in the most condensed form he should mainly confine himself to printed or written statements. Here was a well-authenticated case:—A young man who was a private in the Manchester Volunteers was decoyed over to New York, and he held in his hand a letter which was written by an officer of the corps relative to the case—

> "A companion of his had seen an advertisement in some newspaper requiring first-rate mechanics for a workshop in Canada. He searched out and found the advertiser, who assured him that work was plentiful in Canada, and that he would have permanent employment at 35*s.* a week. At the next interview with the advertiser (which took place on the steps of the Manchester Exchange) the man went with his friend, and they agreed to go. They were only told to provide for their voyage, because on their arrival in Canada they would obtain employment immediately, and could get cash on account of their wages. Six men were thus induced to go. When they arrived at Liverpool there was a conveyance waiting for them, and they were driven down to the pier head. On getting on board the steamer (called the *Virginia*), however, they found she was bound for New York, and in reply to their inquiries were told that they would be reshipped at New York for Canada. However, when they arrived at New York, the advertiser sent them to a place to get some refreshment, paid for it, and also intimated that he had paid their passage to Long Island. He then disappeared, and they never saw him afterwards. The poor fellows knew nothing about Long Island, and went. They were penniless and friendless. Two enlisted at once. Four escaped to New York, and then enlisted. One man concealed himself in the hold of a Cunard steamer and returned to England, sadly ashamed of himself, and a miserable victim of Yankee rascality."

Long Island, mentioned in this letter, was a place where recruits bound themselves for service in the Federal army. He could quote a case even more startling than that, but he did not wish to trespass too long on the time of the House. It was not a solitary case. He held in his hand the statement of a man named Macartney, whose case was before the Foreign Office, who was landed at New York with a letter of credit for £10. He was drugged, robbed, and while in a state of stupefaction enlisted in the Federal army. There was reason to believe that in all the passenger ships from the Mersey to America there were emissaries from the Federal Government on board with the view of enlisting young men as recruits. A case had been told to him two days ago by an hon. and gallant Member of that House. A man sailed from London in a ship for America. He did not like the provisions, but a very civil and kind person who was on board produced a quantity of potted meats, and induced the emigrant to partake of them. When about to land, this person asked the emigrant to come to his house in New York; the emigrant consented, was drugged with whisky, and found himself a Federal soldier. He deserted, and found himself in gaol. Here was another case:—A letter had been received by Mr. Whinham, of Hull, from his nephew, who stated that he left Liverpool in an American ship. On the voyage he was very much ill-used by the captain and crew, and he stated that immediately after he had landed he was seized by soldiers and taken by force to an island near New York, the name of which he did not give—though no doubt it was Long Island; here he met with several other Englishmen, all of whom had been impressed into the Federal service. This letter, which was dated June 23, stated that the recruits were being drilled daily, and that the writer almost hourly expected to receive orders to join the army. He complained loudly that the British Government did not interfere to prevent these scandalous outrages upon Englishmen, apparently forgetting that by going to America and on board an American ship he forfeited all reasonable claim upon the country he deserted. A case in the Irish Court of Bankruptcy a few days ago threw some light on the system of Federal recruiting in Ireland. In the case of a bankrupt named Ellis, an application was made for the assistance of the court on behalf of a poor woman named Comyns, whose son had enclosed her a cheque for £40, which he had received from the Federal Government for "emigrating" to that country. He was now a soldier in Grant's army on his way to Richmond. Similar cases were referred to by Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, in a charge he delivered the other day in Ireland. He had also in his possession a proclamation of the Lord Lieutenant on the subject, and the numerous cases cropping up everywhere showed that they ought to be inquired into. He was aware that some manufacturers were of opinion that when their mills were reopened many of the persons who had gone to America would return to this country. He could not indulge in such a hope. In the first place many of these men would never turn up again, being under the ground, having been food for powder. Others would have succeeded in obtaining better wages than they obtained at home; while others, again, would have found new friends and connections which would disincline them for returning. He, therefore, thought it was a great mistake for the manufacturers to look with equanimity upon the large emigration in the belief that the men would return, and he was informed by good authority that in some parts of the country labour was getting so scarce and dear that when happier times should arrive, and the mills be again employed, the manufacturing interest would be seriously embarrassed. He, therefore, hoped that the manufacturers would set their mills to work if even only to a limited extent, as it would be nothing but an act of wisdom and prudence to do so. It was known that all the passages on board the vessels from this country to America were engaged for months in advance, and he learnt from the newspapers that there were 10,000 men from Switzerland waiting for passages to join the Federal army. What was the condition of emigrants when they got to America? To show what folly it was to emigrate at present he had a letter from a young man who wrote from Lawrence, Massachusetts, in which he said—

"I am very much surprised that people keep coming to this country, knowing that paper money is at such a discount and provisions so very high—clothing the same. Tell Cousin —— from me, that 15*s*. per week in England is better than 8 dols. per week, which is as much as he would get. For board he would have to pay 4 dols. per week; that would leave 4 dols., which would be of the value of 6*s*. in English money. I am getting 9½ dols. per week, which is worth no more now than 16*s*. per week—so you see, that I am doing worse than I was in England. The war is ruining the country; flour, that used to sell for 7 dols., is now 15 dols. per barrel. Sugar is 35c. that was 12c. per lb. Coals are 14 dols. per ton, that sold for 7 dols. Wood is 11 dols. per cord that was 6 dols. Tea, that was 60c. per lb. when we were here before, is now 1 dol. 40c. per lb. Things are still advancing, and likely to do so. Prints and calicoes are selling at a monstrous price. Clothing of every description is enormous. We are trying to make the best of a bad job. Caution any one that thinks of taking on with ——. He is misleading scores, telling them what good wages they get here, but not telling them what they have got to pay for everything; 30c. in England will bring

> more than 1 dol. here, take things altogether. Things are very uncertain here. I should not be very much surprised if all the places of business are stopped up in three months from now. My wages are not worth half as much as when we came here first."

That was not a very encouraging prospect for those persons who left this country in the hope of improving their position in the United States. Within the last few days some papers had been presented to the other House and had also been issued to the House of Commons which were well worthy of the consideration of hon. Members, and he thought that few would rise from their perusal without deep feelings of sorrow. The scene opened, as it were, upon a melodrama, only in this case, unhappily, the more jocose portions of a melodrama were wanting. The melodrama opened with two rascals—the one pretending to have the means of giving employment upon railways in America, and sending forth the other rascal — whom, he hoped, he was not uncharitable nor indecorous in styling an imp of the devil. That other man went to Ireland. There he plotted and made his bargain so well that, upon the plea of railway employment, he induced many persons — even some who were receiving good wages — to take up with him and to accompany him to America. He got 120 men to go with him in a steamer. It seemed as if one of these men was a match for him, for that man, wearing his hat in a peculiar manner over his forehead, it was not until they arrived in the middle of the Atlantic that it was discovered that he had only one eye. The man was, therefore, not fit for a soldier, although he would have been qualified as a navigator or railway labourer. The agent Feeny, however, complained that he had been deceived, thus showing that he wanted the men for soldiers and not for railway works. He need not enter into the sad history of that transaction, which hon. Members might have read in the papers. He would only briefly state that when they arrived in America these men were supplied with abundance of whisky even before landing. When they did land they were again dosed with whisky, made drunk, and got into the police cells, when, through the collusion, it was said, of the police with the recruiting agents, many of them were induced to become soldiers in the Federal army. It appeared that they did not like their position, for they applied to the British Minister and Consuls, the result of which was the correspondence which had been laid before Parliament, from which he would read one or two extracts. Consul Lousada, at Boston, on March 15, 1864, wrote:—

> "The bounties both of the United States and of the several States, added to local premiums, amount to 700 dols., and even 820 dols., besides 15 dols. to 25 dols. to the bringer in of a recruit, and as the poor Irish are generally made drunk and given at the outside 25 dols., the sharks who prey on them collect the balance, and thus a cargo of 120, as in this instance, would net a very large profit to the speculators. There are some features in these transactions which involuntarily recall to my mind my experiences in Cuba. I trust, however, that the publication of what those who hire themselves as labourers may expect on this side will check the traffic."

It was also stated that the recruiting agents cleared 500 dols. by each man. It must also be stated, in order to show how plausibly these things were carried on, that this man Feeny, who took out a cargo of what might be called slaves, had been arrested in Ireland upon a charge of inducing men to enlist in the United States army, but he was released because it was thought he showed sufficient proof that his enterprise was legitimate, and that his object was simply to obtain men to work upon railways. With regard to many of the men who were thus taken out, they could not help enlisting. As soon as they arrived in America they were surrounded by enlistment brokers, were threatened with sixty days' imprisonment for being drunk and disorderly, and, by the collusion to which he had referred between the police and the recruiting agents, they finally became soldiers in the United States army. Consul Murray, in a letter to Lord Lyons dated April 7, 1864, wrote—

> "There can be no doubt that there was a systematic attempt made to get these emigrants drunk for the purpose of enlistment. Policeman Berrick's evidence on this subject is most important. He states, 'While in Mr. Bradley's (liquor store) there were two or three well-dressed men, I do not know their names, but have seen them in this city, who appeared to be liberal with their money. These men were not drinking themselves, but the emigrants were. I saw a man who said he was from Augusta, who appeared to be talking with the men out on the railroad track. This man said to me he was a recruiting officer, and wanted some of my help to get some of the men. I told him the police had nothing to do with business of that kind. He insinuated to me that if the men wanted liquor to aid them in getting it. I told him no, that I did not drink myself, and would not assist in procuring any for the men."

Consul Murray further said—

> "The evidence given by the police officers and the recruiting officers proves that there was a very good understanding between these functionaries, and that the latter were even called and admitted to the cells with the object of inducing the men to enlist."

That statement showed that persons might, without secondary or improper views, be taken out to America, and there, finding themselves in difficulties, might be compelled to enlist. There was the case of a man named Ainsworth, who left Blackburn for Canada with the praiseworthy motive of finding the means of employment for his distressed fellow townsmen. Two bodies of thirty each went out, but the enterprize appeared not to have been successful, and Ainsworth was last heard of at Portland, while it was unknown what had become of his companions. He did not desire to raise any charge against the American Government, but he only wished to warn his fellow-countrymen of the dangers they might incur. He had brought the case before the House of Commons because he believed that the circulation of these facts throughout the country might, at all events, enable some who might otherwise be deluded and inveigled, to steer clear of the dangers which lay in their path. He would now read an extract from a despatch of Lord Lyons, dated Washington, May 3, 1864, and in doing so he would state that all his information had been obtained from this side of the water, and that he had had no correspondence whatever upon the subject with any person in America. Lord Lyons, writing to Earl Russell, said—

> "Washington, May 3, 1864.
>
> "My Lord, — The number of British subjects who are serving in the United States' army and navy is very considerable; and complaints are constantly made to me of the practices by which the enlistment of many of them has been effected. I may say, indeed, that the most laborious and most painful and unsatisfactory part of the duties which have devolved upon this Legation, since the breaking out of the civil war, is connected with these complaints. No pains have been spared by Her Majesty's Consuls and myself in investigating them, and every effort has been made by us to obtain redress for those which have appeared to be well founded. In few cases, however, have our efforts produced any satisfactory results."

Lord Lyons then went on to give the following extracts from a Report by Major General Dix, the military commandant of New York, to the Secretary of War:—

> "Almost every imaginable form of outrage and deception has been developed in the cases in which Mr. Clapp was agent for the payment of bounties. . . . In some cases boys have been seduced from their homes to secure their enlistment. In others men have been drugged, and enlisted while unconscious. . . . In short, there is no artifice or fraud which has not been resorted to in carrying out this system of pillage. . . Old men and boys, and persons labouring under incurable diseases, were in numerous instances thrust into the service under this system of public plunder, alike fraudulent to the recruits and the Government. . . . The enormous sum of 400,000 dols. has been plundered by the brokers. . . . The outrages practised on recruits are too unjust to be borne, and, in some cases, too loathsome to be detailed. Boys have been seduced from their families, drugged, and then enlisted. Two were so sadly drugged that they died—one on his arrival at Rikers Island, and the other the following day."

He wished to be fair to all parties, and would fully admit that this system was discountenanced by many honourable men in the United States, and even in the ranks of the Federal army. General Dix, in writing to General Wistar, said—

> "There seems to be little doubt that many—in fact, I think I am justified in saying the most—of these unfortunate men were either deceived or kidnapped, or both, in the most scandalous and inhuman manner in New York city, where they were drugged and carried off to New Hampshire and Connecticut, mustered in, and uniformed before their consciousness was fully restored. . . Nearly all are foreigners, mostly sailors, both ignorant of, and indifferent to, the objects of the war in which they thus suddenly find themselves involved. . . . Two men were shot here this morning for desertion, and over thirty more are now awaiting trial or execution."

He would particularly call the attention of intending emigrants to the concluding sentence of the extract which he had just read. He saw that General Dix had expressed his determination to do his best to prevent the recurrence of those outrages; but when they remembered the enormous profit which accrued to the kidnappers of those poor wretches, they would at once perceive the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of putting an end to the system. The system itself was contrary to the express regulations issued by the Government to recruiting officers—

> "They will not allow any man to be deceived or inveigled into the service by false representations, but will in person explain the nature of the service, the length of the term, the pay, clothing, rations, and other allowances to which a soldier is entitled by law, to every man before he signs the enlistment."

It was, however, evident that people, after being drugged, had been admitted into the army even before their return to consciousness. He did not wish to be unfair to the United States Government, but he must say that he feared that evasions were oftentimes practised, and justice impeded. Lord Lyons had asked the Government to keep seven or eight men from going into battle until their cases had been decided, but the result of his efforts was recorded in the following despatch:—

> "Washington, May 23, 1864.
>
> "My Lord,—Since I first became acquainted two months ago with the circumstances under which some of the Irish passengers on board the *Nova Scotian* had been enlisted in the United States army at Portland, I have never ceased to urge the United States Government to take measures to prevent their being brought into collision with the enemy pending the investigation of the lawfulness of their enlistment. The copies of notes to Mr. Seward, which have been inclosed in my despatches to your Lordship, will have shown your Lordship how often I have insisted upon this in writing. I have pressed it still oftener and still more urgently in verbal communications. My endeavours have, however, been of no avail. One of the men called at the Legation the day before yesterday. He had been badly wounded in the head, and sent back from the army to a hospital here. Another of the men had, he said, been wounded; a third was reported to be killed; three others, when he last saw them, were advancing against the enemy under a heavy musketry fire."

From another statement elsewhere it appeared that two of these men were killed, and possibly the third might have met with the same fate. For his own part he must say that he deplored the fate of the poor wretches who met with such treatment. It appeared to him that a war of defence was a just war, and that it became the duty of men to assist in the defence of their country. But a war of aggression was undoubtedly very wicked, and when persons who had nothing to do with the dispute took part in the warfare, such conduct was in reality nothing better than murder. It was true that there was a class of filibusters and buccaneers whose conduct was frequently viewed with a certain amount of approbation by some portions of mankind. They knew what an evil effect the adventurous deeds of such highwaymen as Dick Turpin and Claude Duval had had upon the minds of large numbers of youths, and even older people; and the same feeling of approbation would, to a certain extent, be accorded by many to those who distinguished themselves by bravery, although they might have been engaged in a quarrel in which international law and justice were alike opposed to them. He did not, however, believe that such a feeling would be entertained when hordes of people went from this country and mingled in the distressing conflict now going on in the United States; and when their participation in that warfare was the result of treachery and deceit everybody would exclaim against it, and demand that every exertion should be made to put an end to such a system. He had no desire to say anything against either the Government or the army of the United States. He cared not what form of Government regulated the affairs of a country, so that it protected industry and international right, so that it took means fairly to administer justice and find employment for the energies of mankind, and so that it were a Government under which the people could live and enjoy a fair amount of happiness; and, as long as that was the case, he cared not whether the Government were monarchical, constitutional, or republican. Still less did he desire to say anything against the brave army of the United States, which, as well as its opponents, had exhibited powers of endurance and fighting rarely paralleled in history. The character of the United States army for bravery would never in future be disputed, but he thought it would be but justice to the brave soldiers who composed it that the slaughter, if it could not cease, should not at all events be maintained by supplies from other countries. Their bravery entitled them to something better than being reduced to dust and being made food for gunpowder, and it was high time that we should cease to contribute to such a result, by sending forth such hosts of emigrants from this country. The widows, orphans, and mourning relatives of these brave men were entitled to some consideration. He believed that many on both sides were now praying most fervently, though from motives of prudence, the prayer might not be readily expressed, for the cessation of this conflict. It was due to them as well, that we should do all we could to prevent any fuel being supplied to this devouring flame. What was the opinion of the man in this country who, from his position, was most competent to decide upon this question, who held in his hand the various webs of negotiation within the last few years, and who, he hoped, when the proper time came, would have the discretion to exercise his power in the interests of peace? The wishes of the Government must, of course, be to give peace to an afflicted continent, and to take away so great a stain from the human race. Meanwhile, Earl Russell had expressed the following opinion in a despatch to Lord Lyons, dated May 27, 1864:

> "Her Majesty's Government have considered, in communication with the Law Advisers of the Crown, your Lordship's despatches of the 14th of March and 19th of April, relative to the case of the Irishmen recently enlisted at Portland and Boston for service in the United States army; and I have to state to you that it appears to Her Majesty's Government to be clear from these papers, and from the reports on the same subject which have been received from Her Majesty's Consuls at those ports, that no doubt can be entertained that the enlistment of these Irishmen was the result of a fraudulent scheme, contrived and executed in disregard of the laws and neutral rights of Great Britain. Her Majesty's Government consider that the men enlisted at Portland were induced, in evident bad faith and under false pretences, to leave their own country for the purpose of obtaining employment, which was not really ready for them on their arrival in the United States; that on landing at Portland they were designedly plied with drink, and that they were then dealt with in a manner which (although it might be the legal consequence of their disordered condition) made it natural and almost inevitable that they should easily yield to the persuasions of the recruiting officers, who were on the look-out for them, and who obtained access to them while in confinement, by the aid of the police authorities."

These facts having come to his (Lord Edward Howard's) knowledge, he felt it to be only his duty to bring the Question before the House with the view of warning those who might still be seduced into these ruinous engagements. He had also communicated with the Secretary for the Colonies, thinking that he might be better able to warn the public generally through the many emigration agents against this abominable system. The right hon. Gentleman, he believed, had applied to the agents at Liverpool on the subject, but they said that they could not aid him in his object. He had, however, since seen a ticket which was delivered to emigrants, advising them to beware of persons whom they met, and giving them other suggestions which were, no doubt, very good and unobjectionable. All he objected to in the ticket was this statement,—"Remember the American dollar is equal to 4*s.* 2*d.* English money, and the cent is equal to one farthing." Now, he had shown that the dollar was worth nothing like that sum, and he hoped that upon this point some better information would be supplied to emigrants. He had made this plain statement in the interests of humanity, and hoped that it might do some little good by keeping, if possible, some few of these poor wretches away from the war, and by so doing assist in preventing that unnecessary effusion of blood which was a disgrace to humanity. He did not wish to embarrass the Foreign Office or the Government, or to give rise to any bad feeling, but he appealed to the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Layard) and the House of Commons for some expression of feeling on this subject, if it were possible. No doubt the Foreign Office would do all it could to get redress for these poor wretches, who, though they might be foolish and misguided enough to "seek the bubble reputation in the cannon's mouth," were still, so long as they remained British subjects, entitled to the protection of the British Government, and should be looked on as the erring children of this country. He wished to use no threats towards any other nation. But the House had lately been told that our ships of five guns were now as efficient as our ships of 130 guns used to be; our resources were ample; our wealth never was greater; we were in a position to be the arbiters of the world; and at all events our voice should have the weight which had always attached to the voice of England. He trusted that the Government, conscious of the national strength, conscious of the goodness of the cause, and conscious moreover of the truth of what he had stated—for he had not stated one hundredth part of the evil—would lose no opportunity of remedying and relieving the sufferings of these poor people, and of distributing such information throughout the country as would serve for a warning to others from being in a similar manner led astray. He trusted also that they would take every means in their power, if the opportunity presented itself, by a kind and charitable mediation, of bringing to a close this disastrous internecine war, so that peace might once more resume her sway over the American continent. He begged to move an Address for

> "Copy of Papers on the subject of Emigration to the United States of America, in reference to the prolongation of the war now raging in that country."

MR. LAYARD thought his noble Friend had done good service by the able and impartial address which he had just delivered. This was a most difficult Question for the Government to deal with, and he really did not know how the undoubted grievances which existed were to be avoided more effectually than by the publication of the important statement which the noble Lord had addressed to the House. He hoped that what his noble Friend had said would go throughout the length and breadth of the land, and that those individuals who were being induced to cross the Atlantic might be placed on their guard, and warned of the dangers to which they would be exposed on arriving in America. It was impossible for the Government to deal with this question in any other way than by reiterating the warnings of his noble Friend, and by doing all that lay in their power to instruct those who went to the United States as to the dangers which awaited them there. For this purpose the caution on the cards read by his noble Friend had been addressed to emigrants. But although a great many of these persons were seduced on their arrival in the United States and were treated in the way described, being forced against their will to become soldiers of the United States, a large number of them were not exposed to this risk. They were induced to go to America upon the representations—many very just representations—that on their arrival they would receive immediate employment and much higher wages than they would receive in this country. It was therefore not wonderful that large numbers of persons, especially in Ireland, should wish to cross the water. As to the persons who had been guilty of seducing these unfortunate victims, they so carried on their business in this country that it was impossible for the Government to touch them. It was exceedingly difficult to bring home the offence to these persons, because they took care, while under the laws of this country, not to infringe them openly. The description which his noble Friend had given as to what awaited these unfortunate persons on the other side of the ocean was too true. Almost daily communications on the subject were received at the Foreign Office. He had rarely come down to the House that Session without having a letter placed in his hand, giving some heartrending accounts of the sufferings of poor creatures who had been entrapped into the ranks of the American army. It was only the other day that an hon. and gallant Friend gave him a letter which disclosed a most melancholy case. A man went to the States in search of employment, intending as soon as he obtained it to send for his wife and family. He fell in with an agent on board the ship who gained his confidence, and invited him to his house on their arrival at New York. There the poor man was made drunk, and found himself next day engaged, without his knowledge or consent, as a soldier in the Federal army. In a fit of desperation he deserted; and his wife had lately received from him the last letter probably he would ever write, announcing that he had been arrested, convicted by a court-martial, and sentenced to be shot. Now such cases as that occurred over and over again. Her Majesty's Government had done all in their power to counteract this nefarious system. Lord Lyons had been quite indefatigable in his efforts for the protection of British interests in the States. A Return was moved for in the other House of the number of cases in which representations had been made as to the lives and property of British subjects in America. It took a gentleman in the Foreign Office three months to prepare that Return, and in doing so he had to consult many thousand documents. In fact, an incredible amount of work had been undertaken by the Ministry in regard to these matters. He did not say that the American Government had not, in most cases, expressed themselves willing to do justice; but as his noble Friend stated, the references from one office to another, and he was afraid the evasions of officers in command of regiments, who were unwilling to surrender any of their men, defeated the ends of justice. Mr. Seward exhibited every desire to do justice, but it sometimes happened that when they had traced a man, he was killed or removed out of reach, before measures could be taken for his release. Every endeavour would be made to give protection to these unfortunate emigrants; but nothing would be of greater practical utility than the able speech of his noble Friend. He trusted that that speech would go throughout the country, and serve as a warning to intending emigrants of the tricks and seductions to which they would be exposed on the other side of the Atlantic. It was the duty of all persons connected in any way with emigration, as, for instance, persons residing in districts from which emigration was taking place, to circulate the warning as much as possible. His noble Friend's remark as to the change in the value of the dollar and the cent was perfectly true, and he would take care to bring the matter under the notice of the Colonial Office in order that the circular might be corrected. Having been under the impression, until he arrived in the House, that the Motion of his noble Friend would be answered by his right hon. Friend the Colonial Secretary, he was not prepared, as he otherwise would have been, to supply any further information on the subject. All the facts stated by his noble Friend were, he believed, strictly accurate, and had been brought forward, not in any spirit of hostility to the American Government, which all must deprecate, but in a way that could give offence to none. He could not but hope that the American Government would do what they could to prevent those great abuses from taking place in the seaport towns. If the Federal authorities desired, they might do a good deal in that direction, and he hoped the speech of his noble Friend would produce an impression on the other, as well as on this side of the ocean. If such a state of things existed in this country, he was sure every honourable man would desire to put a stop to it, and no Government would hesitate to punish those who attempted to infringe the laws. His noble Friend was right in saying that the laws of the United States were opposed to any proceedings. Of course nothing could be done to check emigration, but emigrants might be put on their guard as to the reception they had to expect in New York. A despatch had been received within the last few days from Lord Lyons, stating that five or six men had recently been released from the army, and that Mr. Seward had promised to institute a stringent inquiry, and to set free any others who had been improperly enlisted. He would endeavour, during the recess, to collect the information which his noble Friend desired.

Mr. FERRAND said, the working classes of this country, as well as of Ireland, must feel greatly indebted to the noble Lord for his able and important speech. He concurred in the opinion that that speech ought to be circulated throughout the country. The expense of doing so might be great, nevertheless he would ask the Government whether they had not some funds in hand—secret-service money for example—which could be usefully employed for that purpose.

Mr. HENNESSY said, he would be glad to ascertain from the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether since the debate on Irish emigration he had received information that the departure of men, evidently for the American army, was still going on. By the most recent communications from Ireland it appeared that the number of vessels and emigrants leaving Cork was as great now as at any time during the early part of last year. In his opinion, the noble Lord had performed an important public service in directing attention to this subject, and his speech contrasted favourably with that of the noble Lord at the head of the Government on the occasion referred to, who had attributed that emigration to the action of the law of level in Ireland, and declined te take any measures with the view of arresting it. They were then told that as employment and high wages were to be found in America, emigrants must go there, and the Government would not consent at that time even to the Resolution he moved, that the decline of population in Ireland was to be regretted. So far from his poor countrymen being well off in America, the papers since laid on the table disclosed a very different picture. One writer said—

> "The condition of the men the morning after their arrival in Charlestown was anything but gratifying. Their number had already been diminished by those left behind at Portland, and of these the recruiting agents had snapped up eight. Without money, without friends, with scanty clothing, with no means to procure sustenance, they would have suffered greatly, had not kindhearted country-women supplied their wants. Recruiting agents hovered round them, and in the course of the day gobbled up several. On the evening of Thursday they had another interview with Mr. Kidder, when they were told the hall must be cleared, and they would not have had a place to lay their heads had not Captain John Warren, who keeps an establishment on that street, near by, bestirred himself and procured billets for them upon the neighbours round. Yesterday morning they were still in Bunker-hill-street, subsisting upon charity, and still pestered with recruiting agents."

Again, this was the sort of food they got—

> "Their supper, when they arrived in Bunker-hill-street, after fasting all day, consisted of a barrel of crackers and a cheese, with a knife on it, and the question was, 'Who shall?' and there was a scramble, some getting enough for five, others getting nothing. For breakfast they had buckets of whisky. That night, without beds, or even straw, enlisting agents were among them all the time."

Such was the condition of the unfortunate Irish emigrants, who were tempted to leave their country by representations of the high bounties to be obtained in America, which were made, not merely by American agents, but by Members of Her Majesty's Government. He trusted that the Government would, in future, look to the real facts of the case as stated in authentic papers, and not to theoretical doctrines of the law of level. He hoped, also, that they would afford to the suffering agricultural population of Ireland the same assistance, in the shape of advances for public works, which had been furnished to the manufacturing districts of Lancashire.

MR. LINDSAY said, he also hoped that the very able and excellent speech of the noble Lord would obtain wide publicity, although he hardly knew how its circulaton could be undertaken by the House. These poor emigrants might not be aware of the fact, that the American dollar at the present rate of exchange was worth only about 1*s.* 6*d.* of English money; consequently, a man in this country earning four shillings was as well off as the man earning three dollars in the United States. The House was perhaps not aware of the enormous number of men drafted into the United States army. The Report of Mr. Wilson, the Chairman of the Military Committee of the Senate, showed that, between the 30th of May, 1863, and the 30th of May, 1864, no less than 700,000 men were drafted into the service of the United States, and he believed were drilled and marched into the field. Altogether, from the first outbreak of that dreadful and vain war, down to the 30th of June last, there had been drafted into the Federal service and placed upon its pay-roll no less than 2,300,000 men. He presumed that there were now close upon 1,000,000 men upon the pay-roll of the Federal Government, although there could hardly now be more than 500,000 of them in active service. But even supposing the whole million to be available, what had become of the other 1,300,000? That was a matter which the young men of Ireland and Germany who thought of emigrating to the United States would do well to ponder over. Half a million, and more, of those men were either in their graves or disabled for life. England was directly interested in preventing the recruiting which was going on in this country on behalf of the United States. We had subscribed and voted in that House about £3,000,000 for the relief of the distress in Lancashire caused by that lamentable war. Again, the cost of manufactured cotton goods to the people of this country in 1860, before the outbreak of the war, was about £25,000,000 per annum, and the value of those same goods now was close upon £60,000,000, so that the actual direct loss upon cotton goods alone to the people of this country was about £35,000,000, besides the money voted and subscribed. If the people of this country thought the war would result in the restoration of the Union or in the accomplishment of the objects of the Federal Government, perhaps they would be willing to bear these evils; but nine-tenths of them believed that it was a vain war, in which the North could never attain its end of subjugating the South. He was glad to hear the answer given that day by the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs. An opinion prevailed in and out of that House, that if Her Majesty's Government had used the same diligence to find out these enlistments for the Federal service as they had used to find out whether certain vessels were being built for the Confederates, these enlistments would have been stopped. But the matter was no doubt attended with difficulty; and he believed that the authorities of the Foreign Office had more than once said, "Only give us proof that a man has been enlisted in this country, only give us something to go upon, and we will act with promptitude."

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, he should have come to the House prepared with details which he thought would have refuted the hon. and learned Member's assertion, that emigration and enlistment were still going on in Ireland in the same degree as was the case some time ago, if he had expected that the question would have been raised again that day. That question, it would be recollected, had already been fully discussed in the House, when the views of the Government in this matter were fully stated. Since then the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland had issued a proclamation on the subject, which had been circulated throughout the country; and he hoped, and indeed believed, that it had had a salutary effect in checking emigration for the purpose of enlistment. The Government could not stop the emigration, but they warned the people as much as possible against the traps and snares that were likely to beset them on their arrival on the American continent. He had listened with great attention to the interesting speech of the noble Lord, and thought it was a most admirable demonstration of humane and charitable feeling, which would certainly be productive of great good. It was only by such kindly and temperate expressions of opinion as the noble Lord had uttered that these poor people who were contemplating emigration could be induced to open their eyes and give ear to the advice which had already been given to them by the Government. He could only say that so far as the Executive in Ireland was concerned they had taken all the steps in their power to place before the people the gross fraud which was practised on them, as shown in the documents which had been quoted. The individual who had been referred to had not been lost sight of as long as he was in Ireland. In fact, one of the detectives in the Irish force had slept in the same bed with him, and he could assure the House that the most vigilant attention of the authorities was directed to the whole movement. The measures ordered by the Lord Lieutenant would, he felt confident, tend to diminish very materially the evil which had hitherto been so justly complained of.

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR said, he thought it unfortunate that the noble Lord's excellent speech should have been supported by the hon. Member for Sunderland. The noble Lord's Motion was couched in the calm and impartial spirit which was most likely to produce an effect in that House. He advocated the rights of his countrymen without regard to political parties in America, and in this impartiality lay the strength of the argument of the noble Lord. But the name of the hon. Member for Sunderland was most unmistakably connected with the idea of his being a warm partisan of the Southern Confederacy. He, however, disagreed with one or two of the points in the noble Lord's speech. The noble Lord spoke of the hardships which emigrants experienced on landing in America, owing to the enormous price they had to pay for provisions—twice as much as before; but his Lordship seemed hardly to bear in mind that this was the effect of the change of the value of money. Another point in which he disagreed with the noble Lord was this: he said that what this country was desirous of was simply peace. He (Mr. Taylor) denied this. Large masses in this country desired peace, but they desired peace that should be honourable to the United States of North America, and that such peace should not come till the hideous curse of slavery that had blighted America and was the real cause of the war should be swept away. He was aware that these sentiments were not popular with the upper ten thousand or the upper twenty thousand of this country; but he believed that out of 200 public meetings on the subject, only six or eight had been decided adversely to the Northern States. When the interference of British subjects in the American struggle was so much deprecated, it should not be forgotten that our countrymen were pursuing an exactly similar course in China and in Japan. Some people even thought we were censurable for not interfering in the quarrel between Denmark and Germany. The noble Lord said that, although he desired that the Government should hold out no threats against the United States, still England was in a condition to use such threats. However that might be, he thought it a most injudicious supplement to the speech of the noble Lord, that after saying the Government should not interfere against the United States, he should add that the country was in a position to do so. The sympathy of the hon. Member for Sunderland crept out in every word he uttered about America. What but intense sympathy for the South, and a strong desire for the defeat of the North, should induce him to repeat so astounding an assertion as that 2,300,000 men had been drafted into the army of the United States, of which 1,300,000 had been killed or wounded. He must have obtained his statistics from Mr. Spence's treatise, and his principles from the letters of "Manhattan." He (Mr. Taylor) thought this was simply a question of the determined will of the North to put down the rebellion, and with it slavery, and he believed the North would succeed. The hon. Member for Sunderland thought there should be mediation. Mediation meant favouring one party in the struggle. But the North would neither desire mediation nor submit to it. Mediation, therefore, meant giving a moral support to the South. It would be intervention with a vengeance, since no one who had read the recent despatches could fail to perceive that the reign of the South was rapidly approaching its close. Why, there was hardly a State in the South that was not more or less occupied by Federal troops. Their capital, if not taken, was closely beleaguered. It was Richmond, not Washington, that was in danger. He trusted that the speech of the noble Lord would have its effect in warning those who emigrated of the danger they would run of being seduced into a war in which they had no interest on either side. But when the practice of the Americans with regard to enlistment was so much reprobated, he could not help reminding the House of the old English pressgang and the enlistment shilling placed in the hands of a drunken man.

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, the speech

of the hon. Member for Leicester appeared to have been directed, not against the very temperate and practical speech of the hon. Member for Sunderland, but against such a speech as the hon. Member (Mr. Taylor) might have supposed his hon. Friend (Mr. Lindsay) intended to make, had he brought on his Motion about mediation. The noble Lord thought that the hon. Gentleman with his appeal in favour of the North was the last man to bring accusations against his hon. Friend for entertaining views in favour of the independence of the South. He wished to thank the noble Lord for his excellent speech, and he concurred in the desire which had been expressed, that means could be devised for its circulation, as a warning in the places where such warning was most required. It seemed from the speech of the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs that it was not only by the enlisted party that such a warning was required, but that the *bonâ fide* emigrant needed quite as much a warning as to the traps awaiting him on his arrival in the land of his adoption. He trusted, then, that the Emigration Commissioners, in their next circular of advice to emigrants, of whatever character, would warn them of the peril which in one direction awaited them, and that till the war was at an end it was not well for our fellow subjects to select America as their future home. The hon. Member for Leicester said the great masses of the people of this country were in favour of the war being prosecuted by the North. The hon. Member, though not a Leicestershire man, represented the chief town of his (Lord John Manners's) native county. Did the hon. Member, when he made his statement, carry in his mind a great meeting that took place not long since at Leicester? He (Lord John Manners) did not believe that the statement of the hon. Gentleman represented fairly the feelings of the great mass of that thriving and important manufacturing town. He did not believe in the existence of that feeling; but were that feeling existent or not, there was no man in the House who would not concur in the recommendations of the noble Lord that the Emigration Commissioners would do well to issue a warning to emigrants, whether their intentions were military or otherwise, of what was likely to occur on landing at New York. The noble Lord believed that none would regret, not even the hon. Member for Leicester, if the result should be largely to diminish those armies which were now devastating the American States.

LORD EDWARD HOWARD, in reply, said, that if he were to consult his own feelings only, he could not but be deeply gratified by the kind approval of his speech that had been expressed by hon. Members on both sides of the House, but he could not avoid knowing that that approval was due to the goodness of his cause and the aptness of the materials he had employed. He hoped that some means would be found of putting the public upon their guard against unconsciously venturing upon a step which might involve them in disaster and ruin. While thanking the hon. Member for Leicester for his approval of part of his speech, he must say that he thought the hon. Member had mistaken the purport of those remarks of his which he supposed to militate against his impartiality. Had he desired to embitter the discussion, he could have mentioned a case in which the great power of this country had been used and with immediate effect. He referred to the case of the Trent. He had, however, rather appealed to the propriety of international law and to the justice of international feeling, with a view that the present state of things might cease. The hon. Member for Leicester seemed to think that he had overstated the enhancement of prices in America, but he had quoted the letter of one who was on the spot, and there could be no doubt that since that letter was written prices had still further advanced proportionately with the increase in the price of gold. He thanked the Under Secretary of State for his offer to grant all the information in his power to give, and he trusted that some means of making public that information would be found. It was, after all, by the usual means of public information that the greatest amount of good might be done in this matter, as, if the information was published, not only in the London newspapers, but also in the local and Irish newspapers, it would be brought effectually within the reach of all classes. He should be grateful to think he had a share in any good result which this discussion might produce.

Motion *agreed to.*

Address for "Copy of Papers on the subject of Emigration to the United States of America, in reference to the prolongation of the war now raging in that country."

House adjourned at a quarter before Seven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, July 29, 1864.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—*Report*—On Library; on Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod.

Public Bills — *Royal Assents* — Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 73]

Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 74]

Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 109]

Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 94]

Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 75]

Registration of Deeds (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 76]

Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 77]

Turnpike Trusts Arrangements [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 79]

Bank Notes, &c., Signature [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 78]

Defence Act Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 89]

Accidents Compensation Act Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 95]

Burials Registration [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 97]

Bleaching and Dyeing Works Act Extension [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 98]

Sale of Gas (Scotland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 96]

Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 100]

Expiring Laws Continuance [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 84]

Bank Post Bills (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 86]

Corn Accounts and Returns [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 87]

Westminster Bridge Traffic [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 88]

Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 56]

Naval and Victualling Stores [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 91]

Public Schools [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 92]

Civil Bill Courts (Ireland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 99]

Harwich Harbour Act Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 102]

Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 103]

Local Government Supplemental (No. 2) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 83]

Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 80]

Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 81]

New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 82]

Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 104]

Poor Removal [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 105]

Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 106]

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 72]

West Indian Incumbered Estates Acts Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 108]

Poor Relief (Metropolis) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 116]

Weights and Measures (Metric System) [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 117]

Limited Penalties [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 110]

Cranbourne Street [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 111]

Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 118]

Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, &c. [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 115]

Naval Discipline [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 119]

Judgments, &c., Law Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 112]

Highways Act Amendment [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 101]

Railway Companies Powers [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 120]

Railways Construction Facilities [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 121]

Contagious Diseases [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 85]

Thames Conservancy [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 113]

Improvement of Land Act, 1864 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 114]

Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 93].

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT. SPEECH OF THE LORDS COMMISSIONERS.

The PARLIAMENT was this day prorogued by Commission.

The Lords Commissioners — namely, The Lord Chancellor (Lord Westbury); The Lord Steward of the Household (The Earl of St. Germans); The Earl de Grey and Ripon (One of the Principal Secretaries of State); The Lord Chamberlain of the Household (The Viscount Sydney) and The Lord Wensleydale—being in their robes, and seated on a Form placed between the Throne and the Woolsack; and the Commons being come with their Speaker, the Royal Assent was given to several Bills.

Then The LORD CHANCELLOR *delivered* the Speech of the Lords Commissioners as follows:—

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"We are commanded by Her Majesty to release you from further Attendance in Parliament, and at the same Time to convey to you Her Majesty's Acknowledgments for the Zeal and Assiduity with which you have applied yourselves to the Discharge of your Duties during the Session of Parliament now brought to a Close.

"Her Majesty commands us to inform you that She greatly regrets that the Endeavours which She made, in concert with The Emperor of the

French, The Emperor of *Russia*, and The King of *Sweden*, to bring about a Reconciliation between the *German* Powers and The King of *Denmark*, were not successful, and that the Hostilities which had been suspended (during the Negotiations) were again resumed. Her Majesty trusts, however, that the Negotiations which have been opened between the Belligerents may restore Peace to the North of *Europe*.

"HER Majesty, having addressed Herself to the Powers who were contracting Parties to the Treaty by which the *Ionian* Republic was placed under the Protectorate of *Great Britain*, and having obtained their Consent to the Annexation of that Republic to the Kingdom of *Greece*, and the States of the *Ionian* Republic having agreed thereto, the Republic of the Seven Islands has been formally united to the Kingdom of *Greece*, and Her Majesty trusts that the Union so made will conduce to the Welfare and Prosperity of all the Subjects of His Majesty The King of the *Hellenes*.

"HER Majesty's Relations with The Emperor of *China* continue to be friendly, and the Commerce of Her Subjects with the *Chinese* Empire is increasing.

"HER Majesty has been engaged, in concert with The Emperor of *Austria*, The Emperor of the *French*, The King of *Prussia*, and The Emperor of *Russia*, in an Endeavour to bring to Effect an amicable Arrangement of Differences which had arisen between the Hospodar of *Moldo-Wallachia* and his Suzerain The Sultan. Her Majesty has the Satisfaction to inform you that this Endeavour has been successful.

"HER Majesty deeply laments that the Civil War in *North America* has not been brought to a Close. Her Majesty will continue to observe a strict Neutrality between the Belligerents, and would rejoice at a friendly Reconciliation between the Contending Parties.

"*Gentlemen of the House of Commons*,

"HER Majesty commands us to convey to you Her warm Acknowledgments for the liberal Supplies which you have granted for the Service of the present Year, and towards the permanent Defence of Her Majesty's Dockyards and Arsenals.

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

"HER Majesty has observed with Satisfaction that the Distress which the Civil War in *North America* has created in some of the Manufacturing Districts has to a great Extent abated, and Her Majesty trusts that increased Supplies of the raw Material of Industry may be expected from Countries by which it has hitherto been scantily furnished.

"THE Revolt of certain Tribes in *New Zealand* has not yet been quelled, but it is satisfactory to Her Majesty to know that a large Portion of the Native Population of those Islands have taken no Part in this Revolt.

"IT has been a Source of much Gratification to Her Majesty to observe the rapid Development of the Revenues of Her *East Indian* Possessions, and the general Contentment of the People inhabiting those extensive Regions.

"HER Majesty has given Her cordial Assent to many Measures of public Usefulness, the Result of your Labours during the Session now brought to a Close.

"The Act for extending to Women and Children employed in various Trades the Regulations applicable to Factories in general, will tend materially to preserve the Health and improve the Education of those on whose Behalf it was framed.

"The Act for authorizing the Grant of Government Annuities will encourage Habits of Prudence among the Working Classes, and will afford them the Means of securely investing the Results of their Industry.

"The Act for authorizing a further Advance for Public Works in some of the Manufacturing Districts will contribute to alleviate the Distress in these Districts, and will afford the Means of completing many Works of much Importance for the Health of the Population.

"The Act for giving increased Facilities for the Construction of Railways will diminish the Expenses attendant upon the Extension of those important Channels of Communication.

"It has afforded to Her Majesty the most heartfelt Satisfaction to observe the general Well-being and Contentment which prevail throughout Her Dominions, and to remark the progressive Increase and Development of the National Resources, and to find that, after sufficiently providing for the Public Service, you have been able to make a material Diminution in the Taxation of the Country.

"On returning to your respective Counties you will still have important Duties to perform, essentially connected with the linking together of the several Classes of the Community; and Her Majesty fervently prays that the Blessing of Almighty God may attend your Exertions, and guide them to the Object of Her Majesty's constant Solicitude, the Welfare and Happiness of Her People."

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which

The LORD CHANCELLOR said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to *Thursday* the *Thirteenth* Day of *October* next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to *Thursday* the *Thirteenth* Day of *October* next.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, July 29, 1864.

MINUTES.]—New Writ Issued — For Exeter *v.* Edward Divett, esquire, deceased.

DENMARK AND GERMANY. SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN.—QUESTION.

Sir HARRY VERNEY said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether (France and England having placed on record that in their opinion no satisfactory settlement of the Schleswig-Holstein Question can be arrived at otherwise than with the consent of the populations of those countries, either through their constitutional organs or in some other way, and Prussia having made proposals during the Conference which implied that she shared that opinion) Her Majesty's Government have, in conjunction with that of His Majesty the Emperor of the French, taken steps to urge on the

Government of Prussia the propriety of not departing from that principle, and the importance, in the interests of European peace, of acting upon it as speedily as possible?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: No, Sir; as long as the British Government were acting in Conference in conjunction with the other Neutral Powers, of course proposals and suggestions were made; but the Conference being over, negotiations have terminated; and the negotiations being now conducted between the belligerent parties, it is not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to interfere further in the matter.

TURKEY.
PRINCE COUZA AND THE PORTE.
QUESTION.

MR. P. A. TAYLOR said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether it is a fact that Prince Couza has issued a Proclamation dated 2nd (14th) July to the Roumanian people, wherein it is stated that—

> "His Majesty the Sultan, our Illustrious Sovereign, and the Guaranteeing Powers, have recognized the New Institutions of Roumania created by the Plebiscite of the 10th (22nd) to the 14th (26th) May?"

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Sir, Prince Couza, of his own authority, issued edicts entirely altering the constitution of the Principalities. The Porte objected to that, and so did the Powers who at the Treaty of Paris had to a certain degree undertaken to secure to the Principalities certain constitutional institutions. The Prince was summoned to Constantinople, where he communicated with the Porte and with the Representatives of the Powers who were parties to the Treaty of Paris, and the result of the deliberations of these parties was an agreement between the Porte and Prince Couza as to certain modifications in the constitution which had been given, certain portions of that constitution being maintained and other portions being altered. The result was considered satisfactory, both by the Porte and by the other European Powers.

THE VOLUNTEER SERVICE.
QUESTION.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN said, he would beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether the 20th section of the Volunteer Act of 1863 will apply to the case of a private (William Lodge, 146, Cannon Street Road, St. George's-in-the-East) of the Third London Rifle Volunteer Regiment, who was disabled while under official inspection, and therefore in actual Military Service—namely, on the 16th of May, 1864, at West End Park, Kilburn? the section referred to being as follows:—

> "A Volunteer, or Non-Commissioned Officer of the Volunteer Permanent Staff, disabled on actual Military Service, shall, according to his rank, be entitled to the like pension and other benefits, if any, as a Soldier of Her Majesty's Army."

MR. HUTT said, in the absence of his noble Friend (the Marquess of Hartington), he would endeavour to answer the Question of the hon. Member. He regretted to say that the Volunteer who was the subject of the unfortunate accident was not, under the provisions of the Volunteer Act of 1863, entitled to a pension. He was not, within the meaning of that Act, engaged on actual military service. Such actual military service would only occur to a Volunteer in the event of an invasion of the country, or the immediate apprehension of such an event.

CASE OF FLOGGING AT SUNDERLAND.
QUESTION.

COLONEL SYKES said, in the absence of his hon. Friend (Mr. Buxton), he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the case of John Croudace and Thomas Allison, who were flogged on Saturday last in the County Prison at Sunderland; and what the names were of the magistrates by whom the same was ordered and superintended?

SIR GEORGE GREY replied, that his attention had been called to this case by a Question which had been put to him the other evening. He assumed then that this punishment had been inflicted by virtue of a sentence passed in conformity with the provisions of an Act passed last Session, which, for the first time, authorized corporal punishment to be inflicted in certain cases, in addition to penal servitude. Since then he had seen the calendar and the list of the convictions, and he found that these two prisoners were convicted of robbery with violence, and were sentenced by Mr. Baron Pigott to terms of penal servitude, and to receive twenty lashes with the cat within one week of the date of their conviction. He had no doubt that the sentence was carried into effect in strict conformity with the Act of last Session. Very few sentences had been passed under the provisions of that Act, but this was one of them. The magistrates were in no way responsible for the sentence; the only persons bound to be present at the infliction of the punishment being the governor of the gaol and the surgeon.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he wished to know whether the cat was made of leather, and not of whipcord?

Sir GEORGE GREY said, he did not know the difference, or whether the cat of leather or of whipcord was the heavier instrument. The Judge who passed the sentence directed that the punishment should be inflicted with a cat instead of a birch-rod, according to the provisions of the statute.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS.—QUESTION.

Mr. GRANT DUFF said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether a Royal Commission is about to be issued to inquire into all those Endowed Schools which were not inquired into by the last two Education Commissions?

Sir GEORGE GREY, in reply, said, an application was recently made to his noble Friend at the head of the Government for issuing a Commission with a view of inquiry into the state of those schools in which the children of the middle classes were principally educated, which were not included within the scope of the Commission for inquiry into the higher-class schools, nor within that of the Commission to inquire into the state of the ordinary schools for the lower class, which were supported by Parliamentary Grants. The Government thought it would be very useful that such an inquiry should take place, and a Commission would shortly be issued.

INDIA—FINANCE ACCOUNTS.
QUESTION.

Mr. TORRENS said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whether he proposes to direct the attention of the Government of India to the necessity of closing the Finance and Revenue Accounts on a much earlier date than at present, in order that the Indian Financial Statement may be made soon after the meeting of Parliament; whether he has any objection to have the Finance and

Revenue Accounts to be submitted to the House of Commons so arranged as to exhibit the Military and Naval (if any) Charges and Estimates for the maintenance of our Forces, European and Native, separately in the Presidency of Bengal, the North Western Provinces, the Oude Territory, the Punjaub Territories, the Presidency of Bombay, the Province of Sind, the Nagpore Territory, the Districts of East and West Berar, the Presidency of Madras with Coorg, the Eastern Settlements, and the Pegu and Tenasserim Provinces; and whether he has any objection to insert in the future annual Finance Accounts the total number of British troops, of Native troops, and of Military police, for whom the charges entered in the Accounts have been incurred?

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, in reply, that the investigation of the Indian Finance Accounts was submitted to the charge of two gentleman, upon whom devolved the duty of arranging them; and in the majority of cases it was found impossible to submit the financial statement to that House at an earlier period of the Session. He apprehended that the best course he could pursue would be to communicate with Sir Charles Trevelyan, with a view to ascertain what could be done in order to get the accounts at an earlier period than at present. In reply to the second Question of the hon. Gentleman, he thought it would be of no advantage, but that it would be, on the other hand, an evil to attempt to distribute the accounts of each Presidency—as that for instance of Bengal—within its own limits—inasmuch as the accounts of each district would furnish no guide to the general revenue and expenditure of the country. In answer to the third Question, he had only to say he should have not the least objection to state at any time the number of troops for whom the charges in the accounts had been incurred.

Mr. TORRENS said, he wished to explain that his inquiry merely extended to the expenses, and not to the number of the troops employed.

IRELAND—INAUGURATION OF THE O'CONNELL STATUE.
QUESTION.

Major STUART KNOX said, he would beg to ask the noble Lord at the head of the Government a Question of which he had given him private notice, it was

Whether the noble Lord is aware that a great party demonstration is to take place in Dublin on the occasion of the inauguration of the O'Connell Statue; and whether the Government will allow the provisions of the Processions and Party Emblems Acts to be set at nought on that occasion, as was the case at the funeral of Mr. M'Manus?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Really, Sir, I have no information on the subject. I take it for granted that whenever the event to which the hon. and gallant Member has referred may be expected to take place, the Government will take all the measures which it will be their duty to take in order to preserve public order.

THE MOUNT ST. BERNARD REFORMATORY.—QUESTION.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, in consequence of his unavoidable absence, he was unable to submit to the House the Motion which stood in his name in reference to the Correspondence on the subject of the Reformatory of Mount St. Bernard. He begged now to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department as he can not allude to that correspondence, whether the certificate of the Inspector as regarded the Reformatory has not been practically withdrawn?

SIR GEORGE GREY replied that the papers for which the hon. Gentleman gave notice of his intention to move did not relate, as he (Sir George Grey) understood, to recent circumstances, but only to the alleged mismanagement and disorder which prevailed at the Reformatory in 1863. A great deal of correspondence had taken place on the subject, but as the management of the institution had since passed into other hands, it was not considered expedient to produce it. He had certainly determined upon withdrawing the certificate; but subsequently he allowed it to remain in consequence of a representation having been made by the Inspector (Mr. Sidney Turner), that much inconvenience would arise if it were withdrawn. The certificate was then allowed to stand subject to the condition that the management of the Reformatory would be taken out of the hands of the monks and placed in other hands, which was agreed to.

SCOTCH AND IRISH MARRIAGE LAW. QUESTION.

CAPTAIN ARCHDALL said, he rose to ask, Whether the Government intend to introduce any measure early next Session to alter the Law of Marriage in Scotland, so as to make it in accordance with that of civilized nations?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON was understood to say that the Question was a large one, and that he could not undertake to promise off-hand that the law on the subject would be considered by the Government.

MR. HENNESSY said, he should like to know what Her Majesty's Government intend to do in regard to the Marriage Law in Ireland. At that moment there was the verdict of an Irish jury which had been upheld by the decision of the full Court of Common Pleas in Ireland, declaring Miss Longworth to be the lawful wife of Major Yelverton; and now they had further the decision of the final Court of Appeal that, according to the law of Scotland, she is not the wife of that gentleman.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, the question in the case alluded to was one of fact, not of law. Surely the hon. Gentleman could not mean to say that a marriage performed by a Roman Catholic Priest between a Protestant and Roman Catholic was legal?

MR. HENNESSY: The jury found it to be legal.

SIR GEORGE GREY: The jury only determined a question of fact.

DENMARK AND GERMANY — THE ARMISTICE.—QUESTION.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he would beg to ask the noble Lord at the head of the Government, Whether any information has reached him in regard to the nine months' armistice agreed upon between the Danish and the German Powers? As this armistice has been agreed to before the arrival of the Danish Representative at the Conference, it must have been effected through foreign mediation. He wished to know, Whether the noble Lord is aware of any such foreign mediation?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON, in reply, said, he believed that no such mediation had been employed. He believed that the French Government had recommended moderation to the German Powers, but the negotiations had been carried on entirely between the Representative of Denmark on the one side, and those of Austria and Prussia on the other.

PRISON MINISTERS ACT.

PAPERS MOVED FOR.

Mr. HENNESSY, pursuant to notice, rose to call attention to the proceedings of the Middlesex magistrates with reference to the Prison Ministers Act; and to move an address for papers. The hon. Gentleman said, a few days ago, he had presented a petition, signed by upwards of 10,000 Roman Catholics residing in the county of Middlesex, complaining that the provisions of the Prison Ministers Act had not been carried into effect by the Middlesex magistrates. It appeared that during the year ending Michaelmas, 1863, no less than forty-six Roman Catholics were received into the three prisons of Middlesex, and that at one time, in February last, those three prisons contained Roman Catholic prisoners. The petitioners stated that, owing to the conduct of the Middlesex magistrates, those unfortunate prisoners were deprived of that spiritual consolation and religious instruction which by the Prison Ministers Act the Legislature intended to give them. The Middlesex magistrates not only refused to appoint a Roman Catholic priest to attend upon those prisoners, but they had subsequently taken a particular step which indicated that they had been animated by motives which he did not think that House would approve. After refusing to carry out the provisions of the Prison Ministers Act, they proceeded a few days afterwards to pass the following resolution—

> "That a Scripture Reader be appointed, at a salary of £80 per annum, whose duty shall be—first, to see every prisoner about to be discharged a sufficient length of time beforehand to enable him to make himself acquainted, as far as may be, with his position and character, with a view to ascertaining whether he is a fit object for relief by the Visiting Justices, through the agency of the Discharged Prisoners Aid Committee; secondly, to devote whatever time remains at his disposal to the religious instruction of the prisoners generally, in the two new buildings of the prison, and that in this part of his duties he be placed under the supervision and control of the prison chaplain."

It was obvious that the appointment of such a person, under such circumstances, was but an indirect attempt to proselytise the Roman Catholic prisoners. Hon. Members knew that the Scripture readers were generally of a controversial turn of mind, and the Scripture reader in question would have a clear field for the exercise of his powers when armed with the power of reporting upon the prisoners who were most deserving of relief from the Prisoners Aid Fund. He (Mr. Hennessy) wished to ask the Home Secretary, whether Her Majesty's Government approved of those proceedings, and whether they were aware of all the circumstances connected with them. It appeared, further, that the Chairman of the Middlesex magistrates was Mr. Pownall, who (he perceived from an advertisement in *The Times*) was an active member of the Committee of the Protestant Alliance. He thought it very unfortunate that a gentleman who was acting in such a semi-judicial capacity should be also closely connected with that body, which boasted, in the very advertisement to which he had referred, of the opposition it had given from time to time to the proceedings of the House of Commons. He considered that the conduct pursued by the Middlesex magistrates was highly unjust to the Roman Catholic prisoners themselves, unjust to millions of the Queen's subjects of the Roman Catholic Faith, and unjust also to the great mass of the people of this country, who believed that religious freedom and equal laws for all existed throughout the kingdom.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copies of any Papers concerning the Proceedings of the Middlesex Magistrates, with reference to the Prison Ministers Act."—(*Mr. Hennessy.*)

Mr. NEWDEGATE, having had the honour of presenting a petition from the Middlesex magistrates, might state that he was present at the discussion which resulted in the passing of the resolution alluded to by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the King's County. He thought it right to call the attention of the House to a former resolution of the Middlesex magistrates, the last words of which were—

> "And no prisoner belonging to any church or religious persuasion shall be compelled to attend any religious service, held or performed by any chaplain, minister, or religious instructor of a church or religious persuasion to which the said prisoner does not belong."

He could assure the House that the terms of that resolution had been strictly observed by the Middlesex magistrates. He had heard Mr. Serjeant Bellasis propose that the Roman Catholic prisoners should be placed under the exclusive supervision of the Roman Catholic priests. In consequence of that declaration the Middlesex magistrates, acting in conformity with the spirit of the Act, refused to make any appointment which would entail such compulsory supervision. He had voted for that resolution of the Middlesex magistrates, and that was the ground upon which he did so. In reference to what the hon. Gentleman had said, respecting Mr. Pownall having appointed a Scripture reader for the performance of certain duties in the prisons, he could only state that Mr. Pownall was incapable of adopting any such means for the purpose of proselytism. But having a person as Scripture reader whom they could trust, that person was employed to make the inquiries with reference to the distribution of the Prisoners Aid Fund. It was his conviction that the Middlesex magistrates would continue to act to the best of their ability in the spirit of the Prison Ministers Act. When the hon. and learned Member for the King's County expressed uneasiness at the idea of proselytism by means of the Scripture reader, he could assure him that he was doing a great injustice to a body of gentlemen, of which he (Mr. Newdegate) had the honour of being a member, and especially to Mr. Pownall, their honoured and trustworthy chairman.

SIR GEORGE GREY, in answer to the hon. and learned Member for the King's County, begged to say that the papers recently laid upon the table contained the correspondence asked for. He had done all that he felt he could do, in pointing out to the visiting justices of Middlesex the power which the law placed in their hands in this matter, and in urging upon them their responsibility in the exercise of that power. The Prison Ministers Act did three things. It gave power in England to the magistrates in quarter sessions to appoint a Roman Catholic priest to visit the Roman Catholic prisoners, where there was a certain number of prisoners of that persuasion, and it also empowered them to award such remuneration as they deemed just to the Roman Catholic priest who performed those services. In a subsequent part of the Act, the visiting justices, as distinguished from the Court of Quarter Session, were expressly authorized to dispense with the necessity of exacting a request from the Roman Catholic prisoner as a condition to his seeing a priest, and were likewise enabled to permit a priest, if they saw fit, to visit the prisoners of his own church, subject to certain arrangements, for the prevention of improper intercourse. In the early part of the year the visiting justices had had that question brought before them, and they had declined to exercise the power which the law gave them. He could make no complaint against them for exercising that discretion, but he thought the magistrates in quarter sessions went beyond the power and the spirit of the act in passing the resolution that had been referred to. He pointed out to the visiting magistrates that the law vested the appointment in them, and that they were not bound by the resolution of the Court of Quarter Sessions. The visiting justices of Coldbath Fields Prison had before intimated to him their views in almost the same terms he addressed to the quarter sessions, and that they were willing to exercise their power, but that in deference to the resolution of the Court of Quarter Sessions, they thought they had better not do so. In the case of the other two prisons they said they did not consider themselves actually precluded from the resolution from doing so, but that in consequence of that resolution, they thought they ought not to make the appointment. He regretted they had taken that view of the duty imposed on them by Parliament, because he thought it was contrary to the intention of the Act, and the Court of Quarter Sessions ought not to have endeavoured to control the visiting justices. He had no power to make them take a different view of their duty. He had, however, stated his own opinion upon the subject, and he had some hopes that it would be reconsidered. The hon. Gentleman the Member for North Warwickshire had represented Mr. Serjeant Bellasis' letter as a proposition to place the Roman Catholic prisoners under the absolute supervision of the Roman Catholic priests; but the fact was that he simply called upon the visiting justices to carry out strictly the provisions of the Act. He regretted very much that occasion had been given by the magistrates in quarter session to our fellow Roman Catholic subjects to complain in this matter of injustice done to them. Parliament had enacted that it was expedient that Roman Catholic prisoners should receive religious instruction from ministers of that religion. Though the number of Roman Catholic prisoners confined in these prisons was very large, it should be borne in mind that 115 only, out of 391 Roman Catholic prisoners in one prison, and in another not one out of 97, had requested the attendance of a priest in the quarter ending January, 1864. The number of Roman Catholics in these prisons was very great, and he, therefore, felt it to be unfortunate that the magistrates in quarter sessions had not shown a greater disposition to carry into effect the intention of the Legislature in this matter.

Mr. NEWDEGATE, in explanation, read the resolution agreed to by the Middlesex Sessions—

> "That it appears to this Court that, by the laws now in force, all prisoners who belong to churches or persuasions differing from the Church of England, in addition to the instruction they may be willing to receive from the chaplain of the prison, are entitled, at their own request, to be visited by a minister of the religious persuasion to which they belong; but no prisoners are compellable to receive such visits against their will; that comparatively few prisoners of the various religious denominations have made such requests, and those who have have been duly visited; this Court is, therefore, of opinion that the present arrangements for the moral and religious instruction of the prisoners are sufficient, and that any appointments by this Court, or permission by the visiting justices, for Roman Catholic priests to attend at the prisons on all occasions, whether their ministrations are required or not, would be unnecessary and improper."

Mr. WYLD desired to defend Mr. Pownall from the imputation of any religious bias in this matter. That gentleman had for a number of years discharged the duties of his office with honour to himself and to the satisfaction of the public.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

RELATIONS WITH MEXICO—PAPERS MOVED FOR.

Mr. KINGLAKE, in rising to submit the Motion of which he had given notice relative to Mexico, observed that the papers for which he should move were necessary, in justification of the very important decision which had been come to by Government. He thought this country could not sufficiently congratulate itself on the fact that, thanks to the spirit and sagacity of Sir Charles Wyke, it was happily disentangled from the invasion the French were carrying on in Mexico. He was glad to find that the information of Her Majesty's Government with regard to the extent of that invasion was even more favourable to the views which he entertained on this question, than was the information which had come to himself. They now knew the extent of territory into which that invasion had penetrated. The Archduke's Government, it was stated, was occupying Tampico; but, in order to free that statement from deception, it must be also stated that there was no land communication between Mexico and Tampico, and the latter had only been occupied because the French had a naval communication with that port, and the result was that the French invasion occupied a wedge-like piece of territory only one-tenth of the extent of Mexico, hemmed in by 39,000 regular troops, and by an amount of guerilla troops which it was not easily to compute. It was quite clear, therefore, that there was no justification, in point of fact, for the proposed recognition of the Archduke's Government; but it must rest upon policy. It was quite possible there might be a policy to justify us in recognizing a ruler notwithstanding that he had not succeeded in possessing himself of the country. The way in which matters stood was this. If, in point of fact, the ruler was in possession of the country, there could be nothing offensive in acknowledging a fact so established; but if the fact did not correspond with the claims—if he who professed to be Emperor of all Mexico occupied only a small portion of it, the acknowledgment of his pretensions was an expression of preference—an intimation that he would be warranted in proceeding by fire and sword to subjugate an independent people. That seemed a very strong proposition to maintain. No doubt wherever the French army had penetrated it would be easy to find persons called "Notables" to offer a crown to an Archduke, but he believed he was warranted in saying that beyond the reach of the French armies no one had expressed the slightest inclination for the introduction of the monarchical system into that part of the world. He held in his hand the copy of a very interesting letter from General Prim to the Emperor Napoleon, which he would have read to the House, but from the very uncertain term of the present sitting. General Prim stated in that letter that the experiment of a Mexican Monarchy had been tried, and persons had been made to understand that they should express their opinions. That state of things had continued for two months, but notwithstanding every intrigue and every opportunity given to encourage the expression of opinion in favour of the monarchical system, nothing of the kind had occurred. The General, therefore, counselled the Emperor to withdraw from the experiment, which was altogether inapplicable to the state of the country. How did it, then, consist with the principle which this country had always held, to be siding with the invader against the invaded? He had always thought that one of the great objects which England aimed at was the independence of nations, and yet we were here showing a preference for invaders, who came without a Mexican in their camp, except some priests who had made themselves hateful to their country, and who would not venture to remain there but for the support of the French. True, General Marquez was amongst the exiled faction, but he was a man whom he would not say had robbed, but had removed by force the sum of £132,000 from the British Legation. That man was now the foremost soldier in the service of the Archduke Maximilian, and had received the decoration of the Legion of Honour. That was the man who was engaged with the Archduke Maximilian in his attempt to subdue the country; an attempt to which we had given our sanction, he was going to say recognition, but it could hardly be termed recognition, because we had not yet recognized the Archduke as Sovereign of that country, though for some reason hitherto unexplained it seemed that we had entered into an engagement to do so at some future period. There might, possibly, be some reason for such a course which the papers for which he asked would disclose, but he could not but regard the course which we had pursued as one which differed from the ordinary practice of English statesmen. Over and over again English statesmen had been asked to say what they would do in the case of some future contingency, and their answer had always been that it did not become them to say, because the Government of this country was a Parliamentary Government, and their duty, therefore, was to avoid as much as possible doing anything which would tend to fetter the hands of their successors. But Her Majesty's Government seemed to have departed from that wholesome principle, and to have promised the French Government that they would recognize this invasion. As far as he was able to gather from the official papers of the French themselves, he believed that the invasion of the French by fire and sword was not only directed against the people of the country who were in arms, but also against peaceful villagers. A colonel in the French army had threatened a village with destruction, not because the inhabitants had resisted the French, but because they had fled to the mountains on their approach, and their only alternative was to furnish supplies to the enemies of their country. That was the kind of cause with which we were associated. If the invasion were in itself politic and just, then he freely admitted that the fact of the recognition being gratifying to a neighbouring potentate would only be an extra inducement for us to adopt that course; and if the Archduke were really in the occupation of these territories, he would recommend our following the policy of Mr. Canning, or even going still further, and saying that notwithstanding the invasion might be an iniquitous one, we were content, since the Archduke had succeeded in making himself Emperor, to acknowledge himself as such. That argument however could not apply when the Archduke Maximilian was only in possession of one-tenth of those vast territories. Under these circumstances, he trusted that the papers would be produced, so that they might have the means of examining fully into the grounds upon which the Government had proceeded in holding out a promise of support to the Archduke's Government.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copies of any Papers relating to the state of our relations with Mexico."—(*Mr. Kinglake.*)

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON said, the course which Her Majesty's Government intend to pursue in this case does not differ in principle from the course which the Government has invariably pursued in similar cases. It has been our practice to acknowledge established Governments. Without going into minute questions as to the origin of the Government—whether it be a republic or a monarchy—when we find a Government established we enter into friendly relations with that Government. My hon. Friend says that we have promised prematurely to acknowledge the Emperor of Mexico before that empire has practically and really been established. I do not think our engagements have gone to that extent. Before the Archduke left Europe we were asked to acknowledge him as the future Emperor of Mexico.

We were not inclined to do that, and we said it would be entirely at variance with our practice and our principles; but that if on his arrival in Mexico he should be well received by the people and his Government regularly established, our wish was that Mexico should have a stable Government. The great cause of the dissatisfaction which we have had for a long time in respect to that country is that Mexico has been governed successively by a number of military chiefs, who one after another obtained power, and one after another availed themselves of that power to plunder and murder English subjects, for they treated them no better than the people of any other country, but rather worse. It was, therefore, a great object with us to see established in Mexico a Government with which friendly relations could be maintained; and from which we might expect justice for British subjects resident in or engaged in commerce with Mexico. My hon. Friend says that as far as his information goes the portion of Mexico occupied by French troops is very limited. That may be so; but it does not follow that in other parts of the country not occupied by French troops the people may not be inclined to support the Government of the Emperor. And we have information — we may be misled, but our information is to the effect that the Indian population, who form a large portion of the total number of the people, are very well disposed to the establishment of an empire. It is said that they have historical traditions which dispose them to this course, as they have no particular regard or fancy for the mixed Spanish race, by whom they have never been over-well treated. For these reasons it is thought that they would be glad to see the Government of the Emperor established in Mexico, and that they would willingly submit to the rule of that Government. No doubt, there is still a number of troops commanded by Native leaders in opposition to the French army, but we are told that the French Government are employing transports to bring back a number of their soldiers, which fact implies that the disposition on the part of the people of Mexico to acquiesce in the rule of the Emperor is considerably greater than my hon. Friend has been informed it is. All I can say is that our course will depend on what we hear as to the manner in which the authority of the Emperor is established. If we find there is a prospect of a permanent Government being established, we shall be very glad to acknowledge it, because we think that would be a very great good not only to the people of Mexico but also to all Europe. If, on the other hand, we find matters still uncertain, and a war still going on, which may result one way or the other, we shall say the Government is not of a kind that would justify us in acknowledging the Archduke as Emperor of Mexico—

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT.

Message to attend the LORDS COMMISSIONERS.

The House went, and the ROYAL ASSENT was given to several Bills; And afterwards a Speech of The LORDS COMMISSIONERS was delivered to both Houses of Parliament by The LORD CHANCELLOR.

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to *Thursday* the *Thirteenth* day of *October* next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to *Thursday* the *Thirteenth* day of *October* next.

A

TABLE OF ALL THE STATUTES

PASSED IN THE SIXTH SESSION OF

THE NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

27° & 28° *VICT.*

PUBLIC GENERAL ACTS.

I. AN Act to authorize the Inclosure of certain Lands in pursuance of a Report of the Inclosure Commissioners for *England* and *Wales.*

II. An Act to enable the Right Honourable Sir *John Laird Mair Lawrence* to receive the full Benefit of the Salary of Governor General of *India,* notwithstanding his being in receipt of an Annuity granted to him by the *East India* Company.

III. An Act for punishing Mutiny and Desertion, and for the better Payment of the Army and their Quarters.

IV. An Act for the Regulation of Her Majesty's Royal Marine Forces while on shore.

V. An Act to apply the Sum of Five hundred and eighty-four thousand six hundred and fifty Pounds out of the Consolidated Fund to the Service of the Year ending the Thirty-first Day of *March* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-four.

VI. An Act to apply the Sum of Four Million five hundred thousand Pounds out of the Consolidated Fund to the Service of the Year One thousand eight hundred and sixty-four.

VII. An Act to amend the Law relating to Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes in *Ireland.*

VIII. An Act to amend the Laws relating to Conveyancers, Special Pleaders, and Draughtsmen in Equity practising in *Ireland.*

IX. An Act to allow the Making of Malt Duty-free to be used in feeding Animals.

X. An Act to continue for a further Period certain Provisions of the Union Relief Aid Acts.

XI. An Act to apply the Sum of Fifteen Millions out of the Consolidated Fund to the Service of the Year One thousand eight hundred and sixty-four.

XII. An Act to amend the Laws relating to the warehousing of *British* Spirits.

XIII. An Act to further extend the time for making Enrolments under the Act passed in the Twenty-fourth Year of the Reign of Her present Majesty, intituled *An Act to amend the Law relating to the Conveyance of Lands for Charitable Uses,* and otherwise to amend the said Law.

XIV. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Land Drainage Act, 1861."

XV. An Act for making better and further Provision for the more efficient Despatch of Business in the High Court of Chancery.

XVI. An Act to confirm the Appointment of *Henry Pendock St. George Tucker* Esquire as One of the Judges of Her Majesty's High Court at *Bombay,* and to establish the Validity of certain Proceedings therein.

XVII. An Act for the Abolition of Vestry Cess in *Ireland,* and for other Purposes relating thereto.

XVIII. An Act to grant certain Duties of Customs and Inland Revenue.

XIX. An Act to enable Joint Stock Companies carrying on Business in Foreign Countries to have Official Seals to be used in such Countries.

XX. An Act to remove certain Restrictions on the Negotiation of Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange under a limited Sum in *Ireland.*

XXI. An Act to indemnify certain Persons from any penal Consequences which they may have incurred by sitting and voting as Members of the House of Commons while holding the Office of Under Secretary of State.

XXII. An Act to amend the Laws which regulate the Registration of Parliamentary Voters in Counties in *Ireland.*

XXIII. An Act to repeal Enactments relating to Naval Prize of War and Matters connected therewith, or with the Discipline or Management of the Navy.

XXIV. An Act to provide for the Appointment, Duties, and Remuneration of Agents for Ships of War, and for the Distribution of Salvage, Bounty, Prize, and other Money among the Officers and Crews thereof.

XXV. An Act for regulating Naval Prize of War.

XXVI. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the Districts of *Southampton, Brighton, Hexham, Oswaldtwistle, Bolton, Ashford, Oswestry, Fareham, West Cowes,* and *Wilton.*

XXVII. An Act for regulating the Proving and Sale of Chain Cables and Anchors.

XXVIII. An Act to amend "The Common Law Procedure (*Ireland*) Act, 1853," in relation to Jurors and Juries in the County of *Cork.*

XXIX. An Act to amend the Act Third and Fourth *Victoria* Chapter Fifty-four, for making further Provision for the Confinement and Maintenance of Insane Prisoners.

XXX. An Act to provide for the Alteration of the Circuits of the Court of Justiciary in *Scotland,* and for holding additional Circuit Courts.

XXXI. An Act to settle an Annuity on *Mary Louisa* Countess of *Elgin and Kincardine,* in consideration of the distinguished Services performed by the late *James* Earl of *Elgin and Kincardine.*

XXXII. An Act to enable certain Banking Copartnerships which shall discontinue the Issue of their own Bank Notes to sue and be sued by their public Officer.

XXXIII. An Act to facilitate the Commutation and Sale of certain Vicarage Teinds in *Scotland.*

XXXIV. An Act for amending the Law relating to Seats in the House of Commons of Persons holding certain Public Offices.

XXXV. An Act for more effectually regulating the Sale of Beer in *Ireland.*

XXXVI. An Act to amend the Law relative to the Payment of the Shares of Prize and other Money belonging to deceased Officers and Soldiers of Her Majesty's Land Forces.

XXXVII. An Act to amend and extend the Act for the Regulation of Chimney Sweepers.

XXXVIII. An Act to facilitate the Redemption of Chief Rents in *Ireland.*

XXXIX. An Act to amend the Union Assessment Committee Act (1862).

XL. An Act for authorizing the Relinquishment in favour of the King of the *Hellenes* of certain Money payable in respect of the *Greek* Loan.

XLI. An Act for confirming a Scheme of the Charity Commissioners for the Charity called "The Free Grammar School" in the City of *Coventry.*

XLII. An Act to provide for Superannuation Allowances to Officers of Unions and Parishes.

XLIII. An Act to grant additional Facilities for the Purchase of small Government Annuities, and for assuring Payments of Money on Death.

XLIV. An Act to amend the Act relating to Divorce and Matrimonial Causes in *England,* Twentieth and Twenty-first *Victoria,* Chapter Eight-five.

XLV. An Act to further amend The Settled Estates Act of 1856.

XLVI. An Act to provide for the Investment and Appropriation of all Monies received by the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt on account of Deferred Life Annuities and Payments to be made on Death.

XLVII. An Act to amend the Penal Servitude Acts.

XLVIII. An Act for the Extension of the Factory Acts.

XLIX. An Act to indemnify such Persons in the United Kingdom as have omitted to qualify themselves for Offices and Employments, and to extend the Time limited for those Purposes respectively.

L. An Act to amend an Act of the Twenty-fifth Year of the Reign of Her present Majesty, to provide for the Registration and Transfer of *Indian* Stocks at the Bank of *Ireland,* and for the mutual Transfer of such Stocks from and to the Banks of *England* and *Ireland* respectively.

LI. An Act to vest the Site of the *India* Office in Her Majesty for the Service of the Government of *India.*

LII. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Valuation of Rateable Property in *Ireland.*

LIII. An Act to make Provision for Uniformity of Process in summary Criminal Prosecutions and Prosecutions for Penalties in the Inferior Courts in *Scotland.*

LIV. An Act for the Union of the Diocesan Courts and Registries in *Ireland;* for the Regulation of the Mode of Procedure therein, and also in the Provincial Courts of *Armagh* and *Dublin;* and for Appeals therefrom.

LV. An Act for the better Regulation of Street Music within the Metropolitan Police District.

LVI. An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain Stamp Duties; and to amend the Laws relating to the Inland Revenue.

LVII. An Act to make Provision respecting the Acquisition of Lands required by the Admiralty for the Public Service, and respecting the Use and Disposition thereof, and the Execution of Works thereon.

LVIII. An Act for confirming a Provisional Order concerning Pilotage made by the Board of Trade under The Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act, 1862, relating to *Hartlepool.*

LIX. An Act to continue the Deputy Commissioners in Lunacy in *Scotland,* and to make further Provision for the Salaries of the Deputy Commissioners, Secretary, and Clerk of the General Board of Lunacy in *Scotland.*

LX. An Act to enable Her Majesty to grant a Lease for Nine hundred and ninety-nine Years of the Building known as the College of Physicians in *Pall Mall East.*

LXI. An Act for empowering the Commissioners of the Treasury to guarantee, and the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt to advance, the Sums authorized to be borrowed for the Embankment of the *Thames* and Improvement of the Metropolis; and for other Purposes connected therewith.

LXII. An Act for amending the *Isle of Man* Harbours Act, 1863.

LXIII. An Act to suspend the making of Lists and the Ballots for the Militia of the United Kingdom.

LXIV. An Act for further regulating the Closing of Public Houses Refreshment Houses and within the Metropolitan Police District, the City of *London*, certain Corporate Boroughs, and other Places.

LXV. An Act for amending the Law relating to the Removal of Clerks of the Peace.

LXVI. An Act to authorize the Inclosure of certain Lands in pursuance of a Special Report of the Inclosure Commissioners.

LXVII. An Act to amend the Law in certain Cases relating to Trespasses in Pursuit of Game.

LXVIII. An Act to amend the Local Government Act of 1858, so far as it applies to *Oxford*.

LXIX. An Act to defray the Charge of the Pay, Clothing, and contingent and other Expenses of the Disembodied Militia in *Great Britain* and *Ireland;* to grant Allowances in certain Cases to Subaltern Officers, Adjutants, Paymasters, Quartermasters, Surgeons, Assistant Surgeons, and Surgeons Mates of the Militia; and to authorize the Employment of the Non-commissioned Officers.

LXX. An Act to substitute fixed instead of fluctuating Incomes for the Members of certain minor Corporations in certain of the Cathedral Churches in *England*.

LXXI. An Act for amending and extending the Railways, *Ireland*, Act, 1851, and the Railways, *Ireland*, Act, 1860.

LXXII. An Act to explain certain Provisions contained in the Drainage and Improvement of Lands (*Ireland*) Act, 1863.

LXXIII. An Act to apply a Sum out of the Consolidated Fund and the Surplus of Ways and Means to the Service of the Year One thousand eight hundred and sixty-four, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament.

LXXIV. An Act for raising the Sum of One million six hundred thousand Pounds by Exchequer Bonds for the Service of the Year One thousand eight hundred and sixty-four.

LXXV. An Act to amend the Law relating to certain Nuisances on Turnpike Roads, and to continue certain Turnpike Acts in *Great Britain*.

LXXVI. An Act to make valid defective Registration of Deeds in certain Cases, and to substitute Stamps in lieu of the Fees now payable on Proceedings in the Registrar of Deeds Office in *Ireland*.

LXXVII. An Act to repeal and in part to re-enact certain Acts of Parliament relating to the *Ionian* States, and to establish the Validity of certain Things done in the said States.

LXXVIII. An Act for impressing by Machinery Signatures of Names on Bank Notes and certain Bills of the Bank of *Ireland*.

LXXIX. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made under an Act of the Fifteenth Year of Her present Majesty, to facilitate Arrangements for the Relief of Turnpike Trusts.

LXXX. An Act to extend the Provisions of "The Criminal Justice Act, 1855," to the Liberties of the Cinque Ports and to the District of *Romney Marsh* in the County of *Kent*.

LXXXI. An Act for amending the Act 11th & 12th *George* the Third, Cap. 17. (I.), in respect of the Charges on the Revenues of the Archbishopric of *Armagh*.

LXXXII. An Act to guarantee the Liquidation of a Loan for the Service of the Colony of *New Zealand*.

LXXXIII. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the Districts of *Kingston-upon-Hull*, *Stockport*, *Penzance*, *Shanklin*, *Portsmouth*, *Tunbridge Wells*, *Woolwich*, and *Tormoham*.

LXXXIV. An Act for continuing various expiring Acts.

LXXXV. An Act for the Prevention of Contagious Diseases at certain Naval and Military Stations.

LXXXVI. An Act to permit for a limited Period Compositions for Stamp Duty on Bank Post Bills of Five Pounds and upwards in *Ireland*.

LXXXVII. An Act to amend the Law relating to Publication of Accounts of Corn imported, and to Returns of Purchases and Sales of Corn.

LXXXVIII. An Act for the better Regulation of the Traffic on *Westminster Bridge*, and for the Prevention of Obstructions thereon.

LXXXIX An Act to amend The Defence Act, 1842.

XC. An Act to amend an Act of the present Session, Chapter Eighteen, as to the Stamp Duties on certain Letters or Powers of Attorney.

XCI. An Act for the more effectual Protection of Her Majesty's Naval and Victualling Stores.

XCII. An Act for annexing Conditions to the Appointment of Persons to Offices in the Governing Bodies of certain Public Schools and Colleges.

XCIII. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to *Brighton*, *Eastbourne*, *Sandown*, *Walton-on-the-Naze*, *Clevedon*, *Rhyl*, *Bray*, *Kircubbin*, *Walton* (*Suffolk*), *Holywood*, *Exe Bight*, *Lytham*, *Ardglass*, *Filey*, *Greenock*, *Carlingford Lough*, *Wexford*, *Torquay*, and *Oban*.

XCIV. An Act to remove Disabilities affecting the Bishops and Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in *Scotland*.

XCV. An Act to amend the Act Ninth and Tenth *Victoria*, Chapter Ninety-three, for compensating the Families of Persons killed by Accident.

XCVI. An Act to enable certain Royal and Parliamentary Burghs in *Scotland* to avail themselves of the Provisions of the Acts Twenty-second and Twenty-third *Victoria*, Chapter Sixty-six, and Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth *Victoria*, Chapter One hundred and forty-six, for regulating the Sale of Gas.

XCVII. An Act to make further Provision for the Registration of Burials in *England*.

XCVIII. An Act for extending the Provisions of "The Bleaching and Dyeing Works Act, 1860."

XCIX. An Act to amend the Procedure of the Civil Bill Courts in *Ireland*.

C. An Act to confirm certain Proceedings of the Justices for the County of *Sussex*.

CI. An Act to amend the Act for the better Management of Highways in *England*.

CII. An Act for amending the *Harwich* Harbour Act, 1863.

CIII. An Act to authorize the Acquisition of Lands by the Admiralty with a view to the Extension of *Portsmouth* Dockyard, and for other Purposes connected therewith.

CIV. An Act to extend the Powers of the Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) Act, 1863.

CV. An Act to explain the Statutes of Her present Majesty for amending the Laws relating to the Removal of the Poor.

CVI. An Act to authorize the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury to make Provision in regard to the Salaries of certain Sheriffs Substitute in *Scotland.*

CVII. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (*Ireland*) Act, 1863."

CVIII. An Act to amend "The *West Indian* Incumbered Estates Acts."

CIX. An Act for providing a further Sum towards defraying the Expenses of constructing Fortifications for the Protection of the Royal Arsenals and Dockyards and the Ports of *Dover* and *Portland,* and of creating a Central Arsenal.

CX. An Act for the Amendment of the Law relating to the Mitigation of Penalties.

CXI. An Act to transfer certain Houses in and near *Cranbourne Street* in the City of *Westminster* from the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Works to Her Majesty, for the Considerations therein mentioned.

CXII. An Act to amend the Law relating to future Judgments, Statutes, and Recognizances.

CXIII. An Act to amend the Laws relating to the Conservancy of the River *Thames;* and for other Purposes relating thereto.

CXIV. The Improvement of Land Act, 1864.

CXV. An Act to prohibit the placing of poisoned Flesh and poisonous Matters in Plantations, Fields, and open Places, and to extend "The poisoned Grain Prohibition Act, 1863."

CXVI. An Act to make Provision for distributing the Charge of Relief of certain Classes of poor Persons over the whole of the Metropolis.

CXVII. An Act to render permissive the Use of the Metric System of Weights and Measures.

CXVIII. An Act to amend the Acts relating to Salmon Fisheries in *Scotland.*

CXIX. An Act to make Provision for the Discipline of the Navy.

CXX. An Act to facilitate in certain Cases the obtaining of further Powers by Railway Companies.

CXXI. An Act to facilitate in certain Cases the obtaining of Powers for the Construction of Railways.

LOCAL AND PERSONAL ACTS,

DECLARED PUBLIC,

AND TO BE JUDICIALLY NOTICED.

i. An Act to confer certain Powers on the *Llanelly* Railway and Dock Company with respect to their Capital.

ii. An Act to enable the Dock Company at *Kingston-upon-Hull* to raise a further Sum of Money.

iii. An Act for granting further Powers to "The *Newry and Greenore* Railway Company."

iv. An Act to enable the Metropolitan Board of Works to provide a public Park for the South-eastern Districts of the Metropolis, to be called *Southwark Park*.

v. An Act to amend the existing Acts of the *Folkestone* Waterworks Company, and to confer further Powers upon the Company.

vi. An Act for better supplying *Matlock Bath* in the County of *Derby* with Water.

vii. An Act for altering the *Marple New Mills and Hayfield Junction* Railway; extending the time for Completion of Portions thereof; and for other Purposes.

viii. An Act to empower the *Southwark and Vauxhall* Water Company to raise further Money; and for other Purposes.

ix. An Act for granting certain Powers to "The *Chertsey* Gas Consumers Company (Limited)."

x. An Act for granting further Powers to the *Kingston-upon-Thames* Gas Company.

xi. An Act to incorporate "The *Tunbridge Wells* Gas Company;" to extend their Limits for supplying Gas; to repeal the Deeds of Settlement under which the Company is established; to authorize the raising of further Capital; and for other Purposes.

xii. An Act to alter and regulate the Capital and Borrowing Powers of the *Dublin and Belfast Junction* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

xiii. An Act to enable the *Carmarthen and Cardigan* Railway Company to make a Branch Railway near *Kidwelly* in *Carmarthenshire*.

xiv. An Act to authorize the *Dover* Gaslight Company to purchase certain Land; to raise more Money; and for other Purposes.

xv. An Act to amend the Metropolitan Meat and Poultry Market Act, 1860, and other Acts, with respect to the borrowing of Money; and for other Purposes.

xvi. An Act for granting further Powers to "The *Calne* Railway Company."

xvii. An Act to enable the *Ipswich* Gaslight Company to increase their Capital.

xviii. An Act to enable the *Swansea Vale* Railway Company to raise a further Sum of Money.

xix. An Act to enable the *South Yorkshire* Railway and River *Dun* Company to extend their Railway to the *Midland* Railway at *Barnsley*.

xx. An Act to enable the *North-eastern* Railway Company to construct a Branch Railway and Works between *Church Fenton* and *Micklefield*, in the County of *York;* to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

xxi. An Act to amend "The *Salisbury* Railway and Market House Act, 1856; and to enable the Company thereby incorporated to increase their Capital; and for other Purposes.

xxii. An Act to extend the Time limited for the Purchase of certain Lands by Acts relating to the *Llanidloes and Newtown* Railway Company; and to authorize that Company to raise and apply Money to the General Purposes of their Undertaking; and for other Purposes.

xxiii. An Act for incorporating and granting other Powers to "The *Salisbury* Gaslight and Coke Company."

xxiv. An Act for repairing and maintaining the *Sudden Bridge and Bury* Roads in the County Palatine of *Lancaster;* and for other Purposes.

xxv. An Act to enable the *Haslingden and Rawtenstall* Waterworks Company to raise a further Sum of Money, and to construct Works; and for other Purposes.

xxvi. An Act to enable the *Great North of Scotland* Railway Company to contribute further Monies to certain Undertakings.

xxvii. An Act for enabling the *Huntingdon and Godmanchester* Gas and Coke Company (Limited) to acquire additional Land.

xxviii. An Act to enable the *Dublin and Meath* Railway Company to raise a further Sum of Money; and for other Purposes.

xxix. An Act to authorize the *Edgware, Highgate and London* Railway Company to extend their Railway to the *Alexandra Park;* and for other Purposes.

xxx. An Act for lighting with Gas the Townships of *Clayton*, *Allerton*, and *Thornton*, and certain neighbouring Townships or Parts thereof in the West Riding of the County of *York*.

xxxi. An Act for amalgamating the Undertakings of the *Commercial* Dock Company and of the *Grand Surrey* Docks and Canal Company; for consolidating and amending their Acts; and for other Purposes.

xxxii. An Act to confer Powers on the *Lancashire and Yorkshire* Railway Company for the Execution of new Works and the Acquisition of additional Lands, and otherwise in relation to their Undertaking; and for other Purposes.

xxxiii. An Act to make Provision for equalizing the Revenue and Expenditure of the *Aberbrothwick* Harbour Trust; to enable the Trustees to borrow a further sum of Money; and for other Purposes relating to the said Harbour,

xxxiv. An Act to enable the *Anglesey Central* Railway Company to make a Deviation of a Portion of their authorized Line.

xxxv. An Act to enable the *London, Brighton, and South Coast* Railway Company to provide Station Accommodation at *Kemp Town, Brighton,* and to construct a new Railway in connexion therewith; and for other Purposes.

xxxvi. An Act to incorporate the *Pontypridd* Waterworks Company (Limited), and to make further Provision for the Supply of Water to the Town of *Pontypridd* and the Neighbourhood thereof.

xxxvii. An Act to extend the Term and amend the Provisions of the Act relating to the *Thornset* Turnpike Roads.

xxxviii. An Act to re-incorporate the *Bedford* Gaslight Company, and make further Provision for Lighting the Borough of *Bedford* in the County of *Bedford* and certain neighbouring Parishes with Gas.

xxxix. An Act for authorizing the Governor and Company of *Chelsea* Waterworks to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

xl. An Act to incorporate the *Stroud* Gaslight and Coke Company, and make further Provision for Lighting the Borough of *Stroud* and Parish of *Eastington* with Gas; and for other Purposes.

xli. An Act to enable the *Swansea* Harbour Trustees to construct additional Works, and to raise a further Sum of Money for the Purposes of their Undertaking; and for other Purposes.

xlii. An Act for better supplying the Town of *Drogheda* and Neighbourhood thereof with Water; and for other Purposes.

xliii. An Act to repeal *An Act for repairing the Road from the present Turnpike Road in the Parish of* Hursley *in the County of* Southampton *to* Andover, *and from thence to* Newbury, *and from* Newbury *to* Chilton Pond *in the County of* Berks, and for granting more effectual Powers in lieu thereof.

xliv. An Act for the making and maintaining a Bridge over the River *Thames* or *Isis*, near the Ferry at *Clifton Hampden* in the County of *Oxford,* with Approaches thereto; and for other Purposes.

xlv. An Act to incorporate the *Deal and Walmer* Gaslight and Coke Company (Limited), and to make further Provision for lighting the Town of *Deal* and Parish of *Walmer* and certain neighbouring Places with Gas.

xlvi. An Act for extending the Powers of "The *Chichester* Harbour Embankment Act, 1859."

xlvii. An Act to enable the Corporations of the Boroughs of *Ashton-under-Lyne* and *Stalybridge* to provide a further Supply of Water for those Boroughs and the Neighbourhood thereof respectively; and for other Purposes.

xlviii. An Act for authorizing the Improvement of the Harbour of *Porth Cawl,* to confirm Arrangements relative thereto between the *Llynvi Valley* Railway Company and the *Ogmore Valley* Railways Company; and for other Purposes.

xlix. An Act to enable the *North-eastern* Railway Company to construct Railways between their Main Line near *York* and the *Great Northern* Railway near *Doncaster;* to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

l. An Act for continuing the Term of and otherwise amending the Act relating to "The *Pucklechurch* or Lower District of Roads," in the Counties of *Gloucester* and *Wilts.*

li. An Act for extending the Time for the Purchase of Lands and the Completion of the Works authorized by "The *Greenwich and South-eastern* Docks Act, 1859."

lii. An Act to continue the *Hedon and Patrington* Turnpike Trust in the East Riding of the County of *York;* and for other Purposes.

liii. An Act to repeal the Acts relating to the *Newport* (*Monmouthshire*) Turnpike Trust, and the *Caerleon* Turnpike Trust, and to amalgamate those Trusts; and for other Purposes.

liv. An Act for the *Portmadock and Beaver Pool Bridge* Turnpike Roads in the Counties of *Merioneth and Carnarvon.*

lv. An Act to give Effect to the Provisions of "The *West Yorkshire* Railway Act, 1863," with reference to the Admission of the *North-eastern* and *Lancashire and Yorkshire* Railway Companies to become Joint Owners with the *West Yorkshire* Railway Company of the *Methley* Railway; and for other Purposes.

lvi. An Act for incorporating the *Hertford* Gaslight Company, for extending their Limits for supplying Gas, for the Increase and Regulation of their Capital; and for other Purposes.

lvii. An Act to amend the "*London* Necropolis and National Mausoleum Amendment Act, 1855," and for other Purposes.

lviii. An Act for authorizing the *Cowes and Newport* Railway Company to make and maintain Extension and Branch Railways in the *Isle of Wight,* and to raise Funds for the Purpose; and for other Purposes.

lix. An Act to extend the Term and amend the Provisions of the Act relating to the Turnpike Road from *Brough Ferry* to *South Newbald Holmes,* and from *Brough* to *Welton,* in the East Riding of the County of *York.*

lx. An Act to enable the *Caledonian* Railway Company to make a Branch Railway from their *Rutherglen and Coatbridge* Branch to *Tennockside* in the County of *Lanark;* and for other Purposes.

lxi. An Act to authorize the Corporation of the City of *London* to form a Viaduct or raised Way across the *Holborn Valley,* and new Streets and Improvements connected therewith; and for other Purposes.

lxii. An Act to authorize Arrangements between the *Bedford and Cambridge* and *London and North-western* Railway Companies; and for other Purposes.

lxiii. An Act to authorize the *Stirling* Waterworks Commissioners to make and maintain additional Reservoirs and other Works, and to extend the Supply of Water; and for other Purposes.

lxiv. An Act for incorporating the *Salop* Fire Office, and for other Purposes relating thereto.

lxv. An Act to enable the *Trent, Ancholme, and Grimsby* Railway Company to raise further Money.

lxvi. An Act to confer upon the *Westminster Palace* Hotel Company, Limited, further Powers with respect to Arrangements between them and Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State in Council of *India,* and for other Purposes connected with their Undertaking.

lxvii. An Act to enable the *North-eastern* Railway Company to make Branch Railways and other Works in the Counties of *Durham* and

Cumberland; to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

lxviii. An Act to incorporate the *Scarborough Valley* Bridge Company; to authorize the construction of a Bridge over the *Ramsdale Valley* in *Scarborough,* with Approaches; and for other Purposes.

lxix. An Act for making further Provision with respect to the Investment of Monies of the *Rock* Life Assurance Company; and for other Purposes.

lxx. An Act for more effectually repairing certain Roads from *Scaddow Gate* in the Parish of *Ticknall* to the *Burton-upon-Trent and Ashby* Road, and other Roads connected therewith, and for making new Branches of Road, in the Counties of *Derby* and *Leicester;* and for other Purposes.

lxxi. An Act to authorize Arrangements of the Capital of the *North-western* Railway Company.

lxxii. An Act to authorize the Construction of new and widening and altering of existing Streets and other Improvements in the Borough of *Liverpool;* and for other Purposes.

lxxiii. An Act for making further Provision with respect to the Sanitary Condition of the Borough of *Liverpool;* and for other Purposes.

lxxiv. An Act for continuing the Term of the Turnpike Road from *Chesterfield* to *Hernstone Lane Head,* with its Branches, all in the County of *Derby;* and for other Purposes.

lxxv. An Act to incorporate a Company for making "The *Chichester and Midhurst* Railway."

lxxvi. An Act for making a Railway from the *Northampton and Banbury Junction* Railway to the *Great Western* Railway at *Stratford-on-Avon.*

lxxvii. An Act to authorize the Transfer of the Undertaking of the *South Yorkshire* Railway and River *Dun* Company to the *Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire* Railway Company.

lxxviii. An Act to grant to the *Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire* Railway Company certain Powers with respect to the *Stockport and Woodley Junction, Cheshire Midland, Stockport, Timperley, and Altrinchham Junction,* and *West Cheshire* Railways, and to empower the Company to enlarge its Canal Premises in *Manchester;* and for other Purposes.

lxxix. An Act to enable the *Tendring Hundred* Railway Company to alter their Line to *Walton* in *Essex;* and for other Purposes.

lxxx. An Act for making a Railway from the *Lancashire and Yorkshire* Railway at *Chatburn* to the *North-western* Railway at *Settle,* to be called "The *Ribblesdale* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

lxxxi. An Act to amalgamate the *Alva* Railway Company with the *Edinburgh and Glasgow* Railway Company.

lxxxii. An Act for vesting the *Alyth* Railway, by way of Lease, in the *Scottish North-eastern* Railway Company; to enable the *Alyth* Railway Company to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

lxxxiii. An Act to enable the *Perth, Almond Valley and Methven* Railway Company to raise additional Capital, and to sell their Undertaking to the *Scottish North-eastern* Railway Company, and to enable that Company to purchase the same; and for other Purposes.

lxxxiv. An Act to authorize the *North British* Railway Company to make a Railway from the *Carlisle and Silloth Bay* Railway in the Parish of *Holme Cultram* to the *Maryport and Carlisle* Railway in the Parish of *Wigton,* all in the County of *Cumberland;* and for other Purposes.

lxxxv. An Act for better supplying the Borough of *Wrexham* and Neighbourhood thereof with Water; and for other Purposes.

lxxxvi. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway from *Ely,* through *Haddenham,* to *Sutton,* in *Cambridgeshire.*

lxxxvii. An Act for authorizing the *London and South-western* Railway Company to make and maintain a Railway from the *London and South-western* Railway at *Chertsey* to the *Staines and Wokingham* Railway at *Egham;* and for other Purposes.

lxxxviii. An Act to empower the *Salisbury and Yeovil* Railway Company to acquire additional Lands, and to raise more Money; and for other Purposes.

lxxxix. An Act to enable the *South Staffordshire* Waterworks Company to construct additional Works, and obtain a further Supply of Water, and to extend their Supply of Water into other Districts; and for other Purposes.

xc. An Act for making a Railway from the *Lynn and Hunstanton* Railway at *Heacham* to the *Great Eastern* Railway at *Wells,* to be called "The *West Norfolk Junction* Railway," all in the County of *Norfolk.*

xci. An Act to enable the *West Riding and Grimsby* Railway Company to make a Station at *Wakefield,* and for other Purposes with relation to that Company.

xcii. An Act for incorporating the *Ulverston* Gaslight and Coke Company, and for conferring upon them further Powers for the Supply of Gas to the Township of *Ulverston,* and certain neighbouring Townships and Parishes, in the County of *Lancaster.*

xciii. An Act to empower the *Kent Coast* Railway Company to acquire additional Lands, and to raise more Money, and to make further Provision for the Lease of their Undertaking to the *London, Chatham, and Dover* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

xciv. An Act to empower the *Crystal Palace and South London Junction* Railway Company to make a Railway to connect their authorized Railway with the *Greenwich* Line of the *London, Chatham, and Dover* Railway Company, and to let or transfer their Undertaking to the *London, Chatham, and Dover* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

xcv. An Act to authorize the *Great Eastern* Railway Company to make a Railway from their *Loughton* Line to near *Highbeech Green* in *Epping Forest.*

xcvi. An Act to authorize the *London, Chatham, and Dover* Railway Company to run Steam Vessels between *Ramsgate* and certain Foreign Ports, and to provide Accommodation for Steam Boat Traffic at *Ramsgate* and *Dover,* and for incidental Purposes.

xcvii. An Act for authorizing the *Oswestry, Ellesmere, and Whitchurch* Railway Company to raise a further Sum of Money.

xcviii. An Act for authorizing the *South-eastern* Railway Company to make and maintain an Extension of their Railway to *Westerham,* and to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

xcix. An Act for authorizing the *South-eastern* Railway Company to make and maintain Extensions of their Railway to *Cranbrook*, *Hythe*, and *Sandgate* respectively, and to raise further Monies ; and for other Purposes.

c. An Act to sanction an Agreement between the *North British* Railway Company and the *Scottish Central* Railway Company with respect to the General Station at *Perth ;* and for other Purposes.

ci. An Act to enable the *Witney* Railway Company to raise a further Sum of Money ; and for other Purposes.

cii. An Act for repairing the Road from *North Shields* in the County of *Northumberland* to the Town of *Newcastle-upon-Tyne ;* and for other Purposes.

ciii. An Act to incorporate a Company for holding Markets and Fairs in the Town and Parish of *Wellington* in the County of *Salop ;* and for other Purposes.

civ. An Act to grant a further Term in the Road from or near *Mytholm Royd Bridge* in the West Riding of the County of *York* communicating with the Road at or near to the Sixth Milestone from *Rochdale* in the County of *Lancaster*, and further Powers for the Management thereof; to alter the Rights of the existing Creditors of the Trust, and to repeal the existing Act ; and for other Purposes.

cv. An Act to amend the Act 3 *Victoria*, Chapter 44. for regulating and preserving the Harbour of *Workington* in the County of *Cumberland*, in relation to the Securities to be granted for borrowed Money ; and for other Purposes.

cvi. An Act to enable the *Belfast and Northern Counties* Railway Company to make a Railway or Tramway at *Portrush ;* and to purchase additional Lands ; and to extend the Period at present limited for the Sale of certain superfluous Lands of the said Company ; and for other Purposes.

cvii. An Act to incorporate the Proprietors of the *North Cheshire* Waterworks Company, Limited, and to confer on them further Powers for the Supply of Water ; and for other Purposes.

cviii. An Act for enabling the Local Board of Health for the Borough of *Lancaster* to construct and maintain an improved System of Waterworks for the Supply of the Borough and of adjacent Places with Water ; to authorize certain Street Improvements in the Borough of *Lancaster ;* and to give Powers of Sale or Mortgage over *Lancaster Marsh ;* and for other Purposes.

cix. An Act to grant further Powers to the *Nottingham* Gaslight and Coke Company.

cx. An Act to enable the *Stockton and Middlesbrough* Waterworks Company to extend their Limits for the Supply of Water ; to construct additional Works ; to raise additional Capital ; to alter and amend their existing Act ; and for other Purposes.

cxi. An Act to authorize the *Scottish North-eastern* Railway Company to construct a Railway to connect their Railway with the *Great North of Scotland* Railway at *Aberdeen ;* to confer Powers and Obligations on them, and on the *Great North of Scotland* Railway Company ; and for other Purposes.

cxii. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Dock, Piers, a Railway, and other Works at or near *Deal*, and a navigable Channel therefrom to *Sandwich*, all in the County of *Kent ;* and for other Purposes.

cxiii. An Act for authorizing the *North and South Western Junction* Railway Company to acquire additional Lands for the Purposes of their Undertaking ; and to raise further Monies ; and for other Purposes.

cxiv. An Act for authorizing the *Okehampton* Railway Company to make certain Deviations from their authorized Lines ; and for other Purposes.

cxv. An Act to enable the *Scottish North-eastern* Railway Company to make a new Railway from *Newtyle* to the *Meigle* Station on the *Scottish North-eastern* Railway ; and for other Purposes.

cxvi. An Act to confirm an Agreement for the Amalgamation of the *Globe* Insurance Company with the *Liverpool and London* Fire and Life Insurance Company, and to alter the Name of the last-mentioned Company ; and for other Purposes.

cxvii. An Act to confer further Powers on the *Wallasey* Local Board ; and for other Purposes.

cxviii. An Act for vesting, by way of Lease in perpetuity, the *Newcastle-under-Lyme* Canal, and the Canal Extension Railway belonging thereto, in the *North Staffordshire* Railway Company ; and for other Purposes.

cxix. An Act for erecting and maintaining Bridges over the river *Severn* near *Shrewsbury*, and for making convenient Approaches thereto.

cxx. An Act for incorporating "The *Lymington* Harbour and Docks Company," and authorizing them to make and maintain the *Lymington* Harbour and Docks, and a Railway and other Works in connexion therewith ; and for other Purposes.

cxxi. An Act for better supplying with Water the Town of *Whitehaven* and its Neighbourhood ; and for other Purposes.

cxxii. An Act to authorize the making of a Railway from the *Great Eastern* Railway to *North Walsham* in the County of *Norfolk ;* and for other Purposes.

cxxiii. An Act to enable the *London, Brighton, and South Coast* Railway Company to make new Railways from the *Ouse* Viaduct on their Main Line to *Uckfield* and *Hailsham ;* and for other Purposes.

cxxiv. An Act to enable the *Great Northern* Railway Company to use certain Portions of the *Great Eastern* Railway, and to make Arrangements with the *Great Eastern* Railway Company.

cxxv. An Act to amend the Railway Passengers Assurance Company's Act, 1852, and to confer additional Powers upon the said Company.

cxxvi. An Act for authorizing a Deviation and Extensions of the *Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford* Railway ; and for other Purposes.

cxxvii. An Act for authorizing the *Falmouth* Docks Company to make and maintain additional Works, and to raise further Monies ; and for other Purposes.

cxxviii. An Act to enable the *West Shropshire Mineral* Railway Company to make certain New Lines of Railway, and to use a Portion of the *Oswestry and Newtown* Railway and the *Llanymynech* Station of that Railway ; and for other Purposes.

cxxix. An Act to authorize the Consolidation of the separate Capitals of the *Sevenoaks, Maidstone, and Tunbridge* Railway Company; to extend the existing Arrangements between them and the *London, Chatham, and Dover* Railway Company; to authorize the Sale or Lease of their Undertaking to that Company; and for other Purposes.

cxxx. An Act for enabling the Pneumatic Despatch Company (Limited) to purchase Lands and extend their Works.

cxxxi. An Act for empowering the Commissioners of the Harbour of *Tralee* to raise Money, and for other Purposes.

cxxxii. An Act to enable the *Glasgow and South-western* and the *Caledonian* Railway Companies to make certain Branches and other Works, and to acquire additional Lands in connexion with their Joint Line of Railway between *Glasgow* and *Paisley;* and for other Purposes.

cxxxiii. An Act for maintaining the public Roads and Bridges in the Stewartry of *Kirkcudbright.*

cxxxiv. An Act to extend the Time for completing the *Henley-in-Arden* Railway, and to raise additional Capital.

cxxxv. An Act to enable the Metropolitan Board of Works to purchase additional Lands and to make further Improvements in the Parish of *Saint Mary, Lambeth,* in the County of *Surrey,* for the Purposes of "The *Thames* Embankment Act, 1863."

cxxxvi. An Act to extend the Time for the Purchase of Land and completing the Extension Line to the River *Avon* of the *Bristol and South Wales Union* Railway; to authorize the Purchase of additional Lands; and for other Purposes.

cxxxvii. An Act for extending the Limits of the *Bolton* Gas Company's Act, 1854, and for other Purposes.

cxxxviii. An Act for the Amendment of the *Bolton and Saint Helen's* Turnpike Roads Act, 1860.

cxxxix. An Act to make Provision for the Maintenance and Management of public Roads in *Zetland.*

cxl. An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Harbour of Port *Glasgow.*

cxli. An Act for making and maintaining a Market in the Parish of *St. George the Martyr, Southwark,* in the County of *Surrey.*

cxlii. An Act to enable the *Mid Wales* Railway Company to make a Railway to join the *Central Wales Extension* Railway in the Parish of *Llanelwedd* in the County of *Radnor;* and to confer upon the said Company further Powers with respect to Roads crossed by their Railway, and with respect to the Purchase of Lands; and to enable the said Company to let their Railway on Lease; and to raise further Sums; and for other Purposes.

cxliii. An Act for authorizing the Construction of a Railway, to be called "The *Halifax and Ovenden Junction* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

cxliv. An Act to authorize the *Mistley, Thorpe, and Walton* Railway Company to make a Railway to connect their Line with an authorized Extension of the *Tendring Hundred* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

cxlv. An Act for making further Provision with respect to the *Liverpool Exchange* Buildings and the *Exchange* Area, and for authorizing the *Liverpool Exchange* Company to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

cxlvi. An Act for the Amalgamation of the *North Kent* Waterworks Company and their Undertaking and Property with the *Kent* Waterworks Company and their Undertaking and Property, and for the Dissolution of the *North Kent* Waterworks Company; and for authorizing the *Kent* Waterworks Company to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

cxlvii. An Act for authorizing the *Aberystwith and Welsh Coast* Railway Company to acquire additional Lands, and to raise further Monies; and for authorizing the *Oswestry and Newtown* Railway Company to contribute further Monies towards the Funds of that Company; and for other purposes.

cxlviii. An Act to re-incorporate the *Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Gateshead Union* Gaslight Company, and to make better Provision for lighting with Gas the Boroughs of *Newcastle-upon-Tyne* and *Gateshead,* and several neighbouring Parishes and Townships in the Counties of *Northumberland* and *Durham;* and for other Purposes.

cxlix. An Act for incorporating a Company for making a Railway in the County of *Lancaster,* to be called "The *Garstang and Knot End* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

cl. An Act to authorize the *Globe* Telegraph Company (Limited) to construct and maintain Telegraphs; to acquire and work Letters Patent relating to Electro-magnetic Telegraphs and Apparatus; and for other Purposes.

cli. An Act to authorize the *Severn Valley* Railway Company to raise further Sums of Money, and to make certain Works in connexion with their Railway; and for other Purposes.

clii. An Act to enable the *Nantwich and Market Drayton* Railway Company to increase their Capital; and for other Purposes.

cliii. An Act for the Purification of the Water of *Leith,* by Interception and Conveyance into the Sea of the Sewage falling into the same, and otherwise; and for other Purposes.

cliv. An Act to authorize the *London, Brighton, and South Coast* Railway Company to run Steam Vessels between *Littlehampton,* Places on the Coast of *France,* and in the *Channel Islands.*

clv. An Act for enlarging the Powers of "The *Weston-super-Mare* Pier Act, 1862;" and for other Purposes.

clvi. An Act to change the Name of the *West Shropshire Mineral* Railway Company, and to enable them to make Branch Railways and a Deviation, and to alter the Line and Levels of their Railway; and to confer upon the said Company further Powers for making, crossing, and altering public Roads, and for the Purchase of additional Lands; and for other Purposes.

clvii. An Act to amend the Acts relating to the *East Indian* Railway Company, and to authorize the Company to raise further Capital; and for other Purposes connected with their Undertaking.

clviii. An Act for making a Railway from the *Caledonian* Railway, near *Kirtlebridge* Station, to the *Maryport and Carlisle* Railway, near *Brayton* Station, with Branch Railways in connexion therewith, in the Counties of *Dumfries* and *Cumberland;* and for other Purposes.

clix. An Act to amend the Act relating to the

Phœnix Gas Company, and to authorize such Company to raise more Capital, and purchase a certain Piece of Land; and for other Purposes.

clx. An Act to make further Provision for the Maintenance and Repair of the *Wallasey* Embankment; and for other Purposes.

clxi. An Act to authorize the *Oswestry and Newtown* Railway Company to subscribe to the *Bishop's Castle* Railway; and for other Purposes.

clxii. An Act to enable the *Independent* Gaslight and Coke Company to raise additional Capital; to define their Limits for supplying Gas; to repeal, amend, and extend the Act relating to the Company; and for other Purposes.

clxiii. An Act for making a Railway from the *Cornwall* Railway, near *Burngullow*, to the *Saint Dennis* Branch of the *Newquay* Railway, near *Hendra*, in the County of *Cornwall;* and for other Purposes.

clxiv. An Act for the Construction by the *Midland* Railway Company of new Railways from their *Bristol and Birmingham* Line to the City of *Bath* and to *Thornbury;* and for other Purposes.

clxv. An Act for enabling the *Leeds, Bradford, and Halifax Junction* Railway Company to construct new Works and acquire additional Lands in the West Riding of the County of *York;* and for other Purposes.

clxvi. An Act for authorizing the *London and South-western* Railway Company to make and maintain a Line of Railway from *Kensington* to *Richmond*, and Junction lines communicating with the *Hammersmith and City* Railway and the *North and South Western Junction* Railway respectively; and to raise further Monies; and for authorizing Arrangements with divers Railway Companies; and for other Purposes.

clxvii. An Act for rendering valid Letters Patent granted to *Thomas Webster Rammell* for "Improvements in Pneumatic Railways and Tubes."

clxviii. An Act to provide for the Discharge by Deputy in certain Cases of the Functions of Warden in the University of *Durham;* and to authorize the Abolition of certain Fellowships in the said University; and to provide a further Endowment for the School of Theology, and a proposed School of Physical Science, in the said University; and for other Purposes.

clxix. An Act for supplying and lighting with Gas and supplying with Water the Town of *Barrow-in-Furness*, and the Townships of *Above Town, Ireleth, Lindal,* and *Martin, Dalton, Dalton Proper, Yarlside, Hawcoat,* and *Saint George's Barrow*, in the Parish of *Dalton-in-Furness* in the County Palatine of *Lancaster;* and for other Purposes.

clxx. An Act for making a Railway from the *Cornwall* Railway to *Bodmin.*

clxxi. An Act to authorize the *Worcester, Bromyard, and Leominster* Railway Company to purchase additional Lands; to extend the Time limited for the Purchase of Lands and for completing the Railway; and for other Purposes.

clxxii. An Act to enable the *London, Brighton, and South Coast* Railway Company to provide improved Railway Communication between *Tunbridge Wells* and *Eastbourne;* and for other Purposes.

clxxiii. An Act to enable the *Scottish North-eastern* Railway Company to construct a new Line between *Dundee* and *Forfar;* to levy Tolls; to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

clxxiv. An Act for authorizing an Alteration of the *Southampton and Netley* Railway, and the Amalgamation of the *Southampton and Netley* Railway with the *London and South-western* Railway; and for other Purposes.

clxxv. An Act to incorporate a Company for the making of Railways in the Counties of *Carmarthen* and *Cardigan*, to be called "The *Swansea and Aberystwith Junction* Railway."

clxxvi. An Act to enable the *Wellington and Drayton* Railway Company to divert a Portion of their authorized Railway, and to transfer their Undertaking to the *Great Western* Railway Company.

clxxvii. An Act for enabling the *Hayling* Railways Company to make and maintain Railways in Extension of their authorized Railways, and to make and maintain Docks, and to raise Monies for the Purpose, and to make Arrangements with other Companies; and for other Purposes.

clxxviii. An Act for the Amalgamation of the *London* Dock Company and the *Saint Katharine* Dock Company into One Company by the Name "The *London and St. Katharine* Docks Company," and for the Transfer to that Company and the Amalgamation with their Undertaking and Docks of the Undertaking and Docks of the *Victoria* (*London*) Dock Company; and for other Purposes.

clxxix. An Act for the *Stockport* and *Ashton* Turnpike Roads in the Counties Palatine of *Chester* and *Lancaster*, and the County of *York.*

clxxx. An Act for better supplying with Water the Borough of *Wisbech*, and certain Parishes and Places in the Counties of *Cambridge* and *Norfolk;* and for other Purposes.

clxxxi. An Act for authorizing the making of Railways from the Railway of the *Somerset and Dorset* Railway Company at *Wells* to the Railway of the *Bristol and Exeter* Railway Company at *Yatton*, and Arrangements between those Companies in relation thereto; and for other Purposes.

clxxxii. An Act for making Railways from the *Great Eastern* Railway at *East Dereham* to *Norwich*, to be called "The *Wensum Valley* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

clxxxiii. An Act to enable the *Pembroke and Tenby* Railway Company to construct new Lines of Railway; and for other Purposes.

clxxxiv. An Act for the Sale to the *Bristol and Exeter* Railway Company of the Undertaking of the Company of Proprietors of the *Grand Western* Canal, and for the Abandonment of a Portion of the Canal; and for other Purposes.

clxxxv. An Act to enable the *Newry and Armagh* Railway Company to raise further Capital, and for other Purposes.

clxxxvi. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway from *Carnarvon* to *Llanberis* in the County of *Carnarvon.*

clxxxvii. An Act for the Construction of an Embankment, Docks, and other Works, and the Reclamation and Acquisition of Lands near *Fleetwood* in the County Palatine of *Lancaster;* and for other Purposes.

clxxxviii. An Act for making a Railway from the *Merthyr, Tredegar, and Abergavenny* Railway to *Crickhowell;* and for other Purposes.

clxxxix. An Act for making a Railway from the Town of *Crieff* to the *Perth, Almond Valley, and Methven* Railway near *Methven;* and for other Purposes.

cxc. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway in *Middlesex,* to be called "The *Midland and South-western Junction* Railway."

cxci. An Act for the Extension of the Municipal Limits of the City of *Londonderry,* and for the Increase of the Jurisdiction of the Court of Conscience there; and for the further Improvement of the City; and for raising further Monies; and for other Purposes.

cxcii. An Act for authorizing the *Charing Cross* Railway Company to acquire additional Lands at or near to their *Cannon Street* Station in the City of *London,* and to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

cxciii. An Act for more effectually maintaining, keeping in repair, and improving the Roads, Highways, and Bridges within the County of *Peebles;* and for other Purposes.

cxciv. An Act for affording increased Facilities for the Transmission of Traffic between the Railways of the *London and North-western* Railway Company and Railways in *Ireland;* and for other Purposes.

cxcv. An Act to authorize the *London, Chatham, and Dover* Railway Company to construct additional Works and acquire additional Lands; to alter the Works and Powers (connected with or affecting their Undertaking) of other Companies, Bodies, and Persons; and to Amend the Acts relating to the above-named Company, to *Dover* and to *Margate;* and for other Purposes.

cxcvi. An Act to authorize the *Shrewsbury and Welchpool* Railway Company to transfer or lease their Undertaking to the *London and North-western* Railway Company, or to the *London and North-western* and *Great Western* Railway Companies.

cxcvii. An Act for making a Railway from *Helston* to *Penryn* in the County of *Cornwall;* and for other Purposes.

cxcviii. An Act for giving Effect to an Award relating to the Borough of *Belfast,* and for confirming Things done with a view to the Execution of the Acts for the Improvement of the Borough; and for other Purposes.

cxcix. An Act to enable the *Kington and Eardisley* Railway Company to extend their authorized Line of Railway to *Presteign,* and to use a Portion of the *Leominster and Kington* Railway, and make Agreements with other Companies; and for other Purposes.

cc. An Act for making a Railway from the *Great Western* Railway, near *Harbury,* to the *London and North-western* Railway, near *Birdingbury,* in the County of *Warwick.*

cci. An Act to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of *Bolton* to construct additional Waterworks; to acquire the *Turton and Entwistle* Reservoir; to provide a public Park and Town Hall; and for other Purposes.

ccii. An Act to enable the *Great Northern* Railway Company to extend their Railway to the Town of *Barnet;* to improve their Station at *Kings Cross;* and for other Purposes.

cciii. An Act to further amend and extend the Acts for the Improvement of the Navigation of the Rivers *Burry, Loughor,* and *Lliedi* in the Counties of *Carmarthen* and *Glamorgan,* and for the Improvement of the Harbour of *Llanelly* in the said County of *Carmarthen;* and to grant certain Powers to the *Llannelly* Railway and Dock Company and the *South Wales* Railway Company in relation to the Improvement of the said Harbour; and for other Purposes.

cciv. An Act for incorporating a Company, and for making and maintaining the *Macclesfield, Bollington, and Marple* Railway; and for other Purposes.

ccv. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway from the *Watford and Rickmansworth* Railway at *Watford* to the *Edgware, Highgate, and London* Railway at *Edgware.*

ccvi. An Act for making and maintaining Highways, Bridges, Quays, and Ferries; and for regulating Ferries in the Shire of *Argyll.*

ccvii. An Act for making a Railway from the *Staines, Wokingham, and Woking* Railway to *Cambridge Town* in the County of *Surrey;* and for other Purposes.

ccviii. An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Harbour of *Ardrossan,* and to provide for the Improvement of the said Harbour.

ccix. An Act to enable "The *Whitby* Waterworks Company (Limited)" to supply with Water the Town and Borough of *Whitby,* and the Neighbourhood thereof, in the Parish of *Whitby* in the North Riding of the County of *York;* and for other Purposes.

ccx. An Act to extend the *Bourton-on-the-Water* Railway towards *Cheltenham;* to amend the Act relating to the *Bourton-on-the-Water* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

ccxi. An Act for enabling the *Isle of Wight* Ferry Company to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

ccxii. An Act to form into a separate Undertaking Part of the City Lines of the *London, Chatham, and Dover* Railway Company, and to provide for a Contribution thereto by the *Great Northern* Railway Company, and to consolidate some of the Stocks and Shares of the first-named Company; and for other Purposes.

ccxiii. An Act to enable the *Mersey* Docks and Harbour Board to raise a further Sum of Money for the Purpose of increasing the Accommodation of the Dock Estate on the *Liverpool* side of the River *Mersey,* and to make a Diversion of *Derby* and *Victoria* Roads; and for altering certain Rates; and for other Purposes.

ccxiv. An Act to improve and extend the *Dundee and Newtyle* Railway; and for other Purposes.

ccxv. And Act for authorizing the Extension and Maintenance of Tramways in the parish of *Erith* in the County of *Kent;* and for other Purposes.

ccxvi. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway and Branch Railway, to be called "The *Waterford and Wexford* Railway," and of a Harbour in *Greenore Bay;* and for other Purposes.

ccxvii. An Act to enable the *Aylesbury and Buckingham* Railway Company to raise a further Sum of Money; and for other Purposes.

ccxviii. An Act to extend the Powers of the *Llanelly* Railway and Dock Company.

ccxix. An Act to authorize the *London and Blackwall* Railway Company to enlarge certain of their Stations and Works; and for other Purposes.

ccxx. An Act to authorize the *Stamford and Essendine* Railway Company to make a Railway from their Railway to join the *Northampton and Peterborough* Branch of the *London and North-western* Railway; and for other Purposes.

ccxxi An Act for authorizing the *Tottenham and Hampstead Junction* Railway Company to make a Railway to join the *Midland* Railway; and for other Purposes.

ccxxii. An Act for making a Railway from *Christian Malford* in the County of *Wilts* to *Nailsworth* in the County of *Gloucester;* and for other Purposes.

ccxxiii. An Act for authorizing the *Somerset and Dorset* Railway Company to acquire additional Lands for the Purposes of their Undertaking; and to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

ccxxiv. An Act to incorporate a Company for making the *Carmarthenshire* Railway, and to confer other Powers with reference thereto.

ccxxv. An Act to authorize the *Corris, Machynlleth, and River Dovey* Tramroad Company to make a new Railway; to abandon part of their existing Undertaking; to amend their Act; and for other Purposes.

ccxxvi. An Act for conferring additional Powers on the *London and North-western* Railway Company for the Construction of Works, and otherwise in relation to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies; for authorizing the Abandonment of certain Railways; and for other Purposes.

ccxxvii. An Act for the Amalgamation of divers Railway Companies with the *London and South-western* Railway Company; for authorizing that Company to make and maintain additional Lines of Railway, and to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

ccxxviii. An Act to enable the *Londonderry and Lough Swilly* Railway Company to extend their Railway towards the City of *Londonderry;* to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

ccxxix. An Act to regulate the use by the *Lynn and Sutton Bridge* Railway Company of the *Cross Keys Bridge* over the River *Nene.*

ccxxx. An Act for enabling the *Midland* Railway Company to construct a Railway from *Chesterfield* to *Sheffield;* and for other Purposes.

ccxxxi. An Act for enabling the *Midland* Railway Company to construct a Branch Railway in the Parish of *Saint Pancras;* for authorizing Arrangements with the *Metropolitan* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

ccxxxii. An Act for making a Railway from the *Potteries* Line of the *North Staffordshire* Railway to near *Tunstall* in the Parish of *Wolstanton* in the County of *Stafford;* and for other Purposes.

ccxxxiii. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway from *Hartley* and *Cranbrook* to *Tenterden* in the County of *Kent;* and for other Purposes.

ccxxxiv. An Act for the Extension of the *Wrexham, Mold, and Connah's Quay* Railway to *Whitchurch* and *Brymbo;* and for other Purposes.

ccxxxv. An Act to incorporate a Company for making a new Bridge from *Chelsea* to *Battersea,* with Approaches thereto.

ccxxxvi. An Act for authorizing the *Waterford and Limerick* Railway Company to work the Undertaking of the *Rathkeale and Newcastle Junction* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

ccxxxvii. An Act for authorizing the *West London* Docks and Warehouses Company to execute further Works, and to make Arrangements with other Companies; to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

ccxxxviii. An Act for incorporating the *Wandsworth* Bridge Company, and for authorizing them to make and maintain the *Wandsworth* Bridge, and to make Roads leading thereto; and for other Purposes.

ccxxxix. An Act to enlarge the Powers of the *Birmingham and Staffordshire* Gaslight Company; and for other Purposes.

ccxl. An Act for authorizing the *Peterborough, Wisbeach, and Sutton* Railway Company to extend their Line of Railway; and for other Purposes.

ccxli. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Dock and other Works near the Mouth of the River *Avon,* to be called "The *Bristol* Port and Channel Dock;" and for other Purposes.

ccxlii. An Act to enable the *Great Northern* Railway Company to extend their Railway from *Lincoln* to *Sleaford;* and to authorize the Amalgamation of the *Boston, Sleaford, and Midland Counties* Railway and the *Bourn and Essendine* Railway with the *Great Northern* Railway.

ccxliii. An Act to enable the *Great Northern* Railway Company to complete their Loop Line between *Doncaster* and *Gainsborough;* and to improve the Gradients of their Railway South of *Gainsborough.*

ccxliv. An Act to enable the *Blyth and Tyne* Railway Company to raise further Sums of Money; to extend the Time limited in respect of certain of their authorized Branches; and for other Purposes.

ccxlv. An Act for enabling the *Midland* Railway Company to construct new Railways and Works, and to acquire additional Lands; and for other Purposes.

ccxlvi. An Act to empower the *North London* Railway Company to construct additional Works at *Poplar;* and for other Purposes.

ccxlvii. An Act for making a Railway from the *Dartmouth and Torbay* Railway at *Brixham Road* Station to *Brixham* in the County of *Devon,* and a Tramway in connexion therewith; and for other Purposes.

ccxlviii. An Act to enable the Trustees of the *Clyde* Navigation to lay down Lines of Rails or Tramways upon and in connexion with the Quays at the Harbour of *Glasgow,* and to borrow additional Money; to alter certain of the Rates leviable by them; and for other Purposes.

ccxlix. An Act for better supplying with Water *Exmouth, Budleigh Salterton,* and the adjoining Districts within the Parishes of *Littleham* and *Exmouth, Withycombe Raleigh,* and *East Budleigh,* in the County of *Devon.*

ccl. An Act to authorize the Amalgamation of the *Hamilton and Strathaven* Railway Company with the *Caledonian* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

ccli. An Act for the Incorporation of "The *West Grinstead, Cuckfield, and Hayward's Heath*

Junction Railway Company," and the making and maintaining of "The *West Grinstead, Cuckfield, and Hayward's Heath Junction* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

cclii. An Act to enable the *Great Northern and Western* (of *Ireland*) Railway Company to raise a further Sum of Money.

ccliii. An Act for the Discharge of Debts of the *Irish North-western* Railway Company; and for authorizing divers Arrangements between that Company and other Railway Companies; and for other Purposes.

ccliv. An Act to incorporate a Company for making Railways to connect the several Railways in the Town of *Belfast*, and to construct a Central Station in *Belfast;* and for other Purposes.

cclv. An Act for incorporating "The *Millwall* Canal Company," and for authorizing them to make and maintain Canals and other Works in the *Isle of Dogs*, and thereby, and by the Appropriation of Works and Lands there, to provide Accommodation for Shipping and Waterside Accommodation for Shipbuilding and other Businesses requiring Water Frontage; and for other Purposes.

cclvi. An Act for authorizing the Construction of Docks and other Works upon or near *Hubberston Pill* at *Milford Haven* in the County of *Pembroke;* and for other Purposes.

cclvii. An Act for making Extension or Connecting Lines of Railway in the City of *Bristol;* and for other Purposes.

cclviii. An Act for incorporating a Company for making a Railway in the County of *Devon*, to be called "The *Buckfastleigh, Totnes, and South Devon* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

cclix. An Act for better lighting with Gas Parts of the Parishes of *Walthamstow* and *Leyton* in the County of *Essex*, and for conferring further Powers in relation thereto on the County and General Gas Consumers Company (Limited); and for other Purposes.

cclx. An Act for enabling the *Metropolitan* Railway Company to make additional Works; for extending the Time limited for the compulsory Purchase of Lands and Completion of certain Works; for authorizing the raising of additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

cclxi. An Act for better lighting with Gas Parts of the Parishes of *Northfleet*, *Stone*, and *Swanscombe*, in the County of *Kent*, and for conferring further Powers in relation thereto on the County and General Gas Consumers Company (Limited); and for other Purposes.

cclxii. An Act to amalgamate the *Oswestry and Newtown*, *Llanidloes and Newtown*, *Newtown and Machynlleth*, and *Oswestry, Ellesmere, and Whitchurch* Railway Companies, and to confer Powers upon the amalgamated and other Companies.

cclxiii. An Act to authorize Agreements between the *Oswestry and Newtown*, the *Llanidloes and Newtown*, the *Oswestry, Ellesmere, and Whitchurch*, the *Newtown and Machynlleth*, the *Hereford, Hay, and Brecon*, the *Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil*, and the *London and North-western* Railway Companies; and for other Purposes.

cclxiv. An Act for authorizing the *Rhymney* Railway Company to make and maintain their *Cardiff* and *Caerphilly* and other Railways; and for other Purposes.

cclxv. An Act to authorize certain Deviations from the existing and authorized Lines of the *Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction* Railway Company, and to empower that Company to form a Junction with the Limestone Railway of the *Rhymney* Iron Company, and (instead of the *Vale of Neath* Railway Company) to exercise the Powers of "The *Vale of Neath* Railway Act, 1863," for constructing the *Merthyr Curve;* and to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

cclxvi. An Act for making a Railway from the *Great Western* Railway to *Watlington* in the County of *Oxford.*

cclxvii. An Act for constructing a Pier at *New Brighton* in the County of *Chester.*

cclxviii. An Act for the Commutation of Tithes in certain Parishes in the City of *London;* and for other Purposes.

cclxix. An Act for making a Railway from the *Cornwall* Railway to *Redruth* in the County of *Cornwall;* and for other Purposes.

cclxx. An Act to enable the *Lancashire and Yorkshire* Railway Company to construct Railways between *Blackburn, Chorley, Horwich,* and *Wigan.*

cclxxi. An Act for sanctioning an Agreement between the *Caledonian* and *Edinburgh and Glasgow* Railway Companies with respect to the Construction of Branch Railways to connect their Undertakings with *Glasgow* Harbour; and for authorizing the Formation of a Joint Station there; and for other Purposes.

cclxxii. An Act for the Incorporation of "The *Ilfracombe* Railway Company," and the making and maintaining of "The *Ilfracombe* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

cclxxiii. An Act for the Construction of Railways in the County of *Lancaster*, to be called "The *Lancashire Union* Railways;" and for other Purposes.

cclxxiv. An Act to authorize the *London, Brighton, and South Coast* Railway Company to make certain Lines of Railway and other Works in and near the Parish of *Battersea* in the County of *Surrey;* and for other Purposes.

cclxxv. An Act for authorizing the *Rhymney* Railway Company to make and maintain Lines of Railway to join the *Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction* Railway and the *Merthyr, Tredegar, and Abergavenny* Railway respectively; and for other Purposes.

cclxxvi. An Act to authorize the *Rickmansworth, Amersham, and Chesham* Railway Company to make and maintain a level Crossing on their Railway at *Rickmansworth;* and for other Purposes.

cclxxvii. An Act for extending the Limits within which the *Stockport* District Waterworks Company may supply Water, and for authorizing them to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

cclxxviii. An Act for making a Railway from the *Mid-Sussex* Railway in the Parish of *Hardham* to the *Shoreham, Steyning, and Henfield* Railway near the Town of *Steyning;* and for other Purposes.

cclxxix. An Act to empower the *Edinburgh and Glasgow* Railway Company to make Railways at *Cowlairs*, and between *Maryhill* and the River *Clyde;* to authorize the Construction of a Tramway at the Harbour of *Glasgow;* and for other Purposes.

cclxxx. An Act for the Incorporation of the *Herne Bay, Hampton, and Reculver* Oyster Fishery Company; and for authorizing them to establish and maintain an Oyster Fishery in the Estuary of the River *Thames*, and to make and maintain a Pier and a Tramway and other Works; and for other Purposes.

cclxxxi. An Act to authorize the Construction of Railways from *Dublin* to *Rathmines, Rathgar, Roundtown, Rathfarnham*, and *Rathcoole*, and for other Purposes with relation to the said Railways.

cclxxxii. An Act to authorize the *Great Eastern* Railway Company to make several short Junction Railways for connecting different Railways in their System at various Points; and for other Purposes.

cclxxxiii. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway from *Alford* to *Mablethorpe* in the County of *Lincoln;* and for other Purposes.

cclxxxiv. An Act for making Railways in the Counties of *Salop* and *Stafford*, to be called "The *Drayton Junction* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

cclxxxv. An Act to authorize the Construction of Railways from *Cheltenham* to *Witney* in *Oxfordshire*, and to *Faringdon* in *Berkshire*, to be called "The *East Gloucestershire* Railway."

cclxxxvi. An Act for making and maintaining the City of *Glasgow Union* Railway; and for other Purposes.

cclxxxvii. An Act for incorporating a Company, and for making and maintaining the *Kingsbridge* Railway; and for other Purposes.

cclxxxviii. An Act for authorizing a Lease of a Portion of the Undertaking of the Company of Proprietors of the *Lancaster* Canal Navigation to the Company of Proprietors of the Canal Navigation from *Leeds* to *Liverpool*, and of the Remainder thereof to the *London and North-western* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

cclxxxix. An Act for incorporating the *Launceston, Bodmin, and Wadebridge Junction* Railway Company, and authorizing them to make and maintain the *Launceston, Bodmin, and Wadebridge Junction* Railway; and for authorizing Arrangements between that Company and the *Okehampton* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

ccxc. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway in the Borough of *Liverpool*, to be called "The *Liverpool Central Station* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

ccxci. An Act to enable the *Metropolitan* Railway Company to extend their Railway to *Notting Hill, Kensington*, and *Brompton*.

ccxcii. An Act for enabling the *Scottish Central* Railway Company to extend their Stations at *Perth* and *Dundee*, and to execute certain other Works in the Counties of *Perth, Forfar*, and *Stirling;* and for other Purposes.

ccxciii. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway to connect the *Swansea Vale* and *Neath and Brecon* Railways.

ccxciv. An Act for making a Railway from the River *Tamar* in the Parish of *Calstock* to *Callington* in the County of *Cornwall;* and for other Purposes.

ccxcv. An Act to enable the *Worcester, Dean Forest, and Monmouth* Railway Company to extend their Railway to the *Great Western* Railway near *Gloucester;* and for other Purposes.

ccxcvi. An Act for vesting the Undertaking of the *Saint Helen's* Canal and Railway Company in the *London and North-western* Railway Company.

ccxcvii. An Act to enable the *South Wales Mineral* Railway Company to extend their Undertaking.

ccxcviii. An Act for changing the Name of the *Alton, Alresford, and Winchester* Railway Company, and for authorizing them to make and maintain Railways (the *Mid-Hants* Lines) in extension of their authorized Railways (the *Alton* Lines), and to raise Monies for the Purpose, and to make Arrangements with other Companies; and for other Purposes.

ccxcix. An Act to enable the *Great Northern and Western* (of *Ireland*) Railway Company to use a Portion of the *Midland Great Western* Railway (of *Ireland*) near *Athlone*, and to issue a Portion of their Share Capital as Preference Shares; and for other Purposes.

ccc. An Act to extend the Time for the Purchase of Lands for and Completion of the *Kilpurcell* Branch Railway of the *Kilkenny Junction* Railway Company, and to confer upon that Company Power to use Stations at *Kilkenny*, and to enable them to raise further Money; and for other Purposes.

ccci. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway from the *Parsonstown and Portumna Bridge* Railway to the Town of *Portumna*.

cccii. An Act for authorizing certain Arrangements between the *Much Wenlock and Severn Junction* Railway Company and *Wenlock* Railway Company and the *Great Western* Railway Company; and for extending the Time for the compulsory Purchase of Property required for the *Wenlock* Railway; and for other Purposes.

ccciii. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway from the *Metropolitan* Railway through *Saint John's Wood* to the *Hampstead Junction* Railway.

ccciv. An Act to enable the *Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction* Railway Company to construct new Lines between their authorized Lines and the *Rhymney* Railway, and to connect the *Rumney and Rhymney* Railways, and between the *Rumney* Railway and *Caerphilly* and *Llantwit-fardre*, and to join the *Great Western* Railway; and to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

cccv. An Act to amend "The *Dublin* Improvement Act, 1849," and "The *Dublin* Improvement Act Amendment Act, 1861," and to confer additional Powers upon the Corporation of *Dublin*.

cccvi. An Act for conferring further Powers on the *Great Western* Railway Company for the Construction of Works and the Acquisition of Lands, and otherwise in relation to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies and Persons; and for other Purposes.

cccvii. An Act for making a Railway from the *Bristol and Exeter* Railway to *Barnstaple;* and for other Purposes.

cccviii. An Act to authorize the Construction of several Railways and a Canal chiefly in the Parishes of *Wolstanton* and *Audley* by the *North Staffordshire* Railway Company, and to confer other Powers upon such Company and various other Companies and the Duke of *Bridgewater's* Trustees.

cccix. An Act to authorize the Construction of Railways from the *Silverdale and Newcastle* Railway at *Wolstanton* to the *Old Manor House* at *Madeley*, and thence to the *Nantwich and Market Drayton* and *London and North-western* Railways; and for other Purposes.

cccx. An Act for making a Railway from *Petersfield* to *Bishops Waltham;* and for other Purposes.

cccxi. An Act for the Amalgamation of the *Mid-Kent* Railway Company, and their Undertaking, Railway, and Property, with the *South-eastern* Railway Company, and their Undertaking, Railway, and Property; and for other Purposes.

cccxii. An Act to authorize the Construction of Railways between *Cannock Chase* and *Wolverhampton* in the County of *Stafford;* and for other Purposes.

cccxiii. An Act to authorize the *Great Eastern* Railway Company to make several Railways in and near the Metropolis in connexion with their existing Railway, and to purchase Lands for a Station in the City of *London*.

cccxiv. An Act to enable the *London, Brighton, and South Coast* Railway Company to make new Lines of Railway in the Counties of *Surrey* and *Sussex;* to acquire additional Lands; and to acquire the Undertakings of certain other Companies; and for other Purposes.

cccxv. An Act to enable the *Metropolitan* Railway Company to extend their Railway from *Finsbury Circus* to *Trinity Square, Tower Hill;* and for other Purposes.

cccxvi. An Act to enable the *Neath and Brecon* Railway Company to extend their Railway to the *Central Wales Extension* Railway, and to construct a Branch to the *Banwen* and *Maesmarchog* Collieries; and for other Purposes.

cccxvii. An Act to enable the *Portpatrick* Railway Company to alter certain of their Works; to increase their Capital; to make working Arrangements with certain Companies; and to use Portions of other Undertakings.

cccxviii. An Act to enable the *Portpatrick* Railway Company to establish Communication by Steam Vessels between *Portpatrick* and *Donaghadee*, and between *Stranraer* and *Belfast* and *Larne*.

cccxix. An Act to authorize the Construction of Docks, and a Branch Railway and other Works, at *Exmouth* in the County of *Devon;* and for other Purposes.

cccxx. An Act to authorize the *Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire* Railway Company to run Steam and other Vessels between *Great Grimsby* and certain Foreign Ports.

cccxxi. An Act for making Railways and Tramways in and near the City of *Dublin*.

cccxxii. An Act for authorizing the Completion of an Inner Circle of Railways North of the *Thames*.

cccxxiii. An Act for making Railways from the *Hampstead Road* to the *Charing Cross* Railway at *Hungerford*, with a Branch to the *London and North-western* Railway; and for making new Streets from *Tottenham Court Road* to *Chandos Street, Strand*, and from the *Strand* to *Duke Street;* and for other Purposes.

cccxxiv. An Act to make Provision for the Assessment of Damages claimed against the *Sheffield* Waterworks Company in consequence of an Inundation caused by the giving way of the Embankment of One of the Reservoirs of the Company; and to enable the Company to raise further Money, and to increase their Water Rents; and for other Purposes.

cccxxv. An Act for making and maintaining "The *Tooting, Merton, and Wimbledon Extension* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

cccxxvi. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Pier at *Aldborough* in the County of *Suffolk*, and of a Railway therefrom to the *Great Eastern* Railway at *Aldborough*, with a Branch Railway to *Slaughden;* and for other Purposes.

cccxxvii. An Act for making a Railway from the authorized Line of Railway from *Ryde* to *Lower Shanklin*, near *Yar Bridge*, to *Bembridge Point*, with a Pier or Landing Place there, and a Tramway from the said intended Railway to *Bembridge Down*, all in the Parish of *Brading* in the *Isle of Wight;* to authorize Arrangements with the *Isle of Wight* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

cccxxviii. An Act to authorize the Construction of Railways or Tramways from the Town of *Holywell* to *Greenfield* in the County of *Flint*, and to the *Holywell* Station of the *Chester and Holyhead* Railway; and for other Purposes.

cccxxix. An Act for making a Railway from the *Great Southern and Western* Railway in the Parish of *Naas* and County of *Kildare* to the Town of *Baltinglass* in the County of *Wicklow;* and for other Purposes.

PRIVATE ACTS,

PRINTED BY THE QUEEN'S PRINTER,

AND WHEREOF THE PRINTED COPIES MAY BE GIVEN IN EVIDENCE.

1. AN Act to incorporate the Trustees under the Trust Disposition and Settlement of *Francis Simpson* Esquire, of *Plean*, and to explain the said Trust Disposition and Settlement.
2. An Act to incorporate the Trustees of the *Scots* Episcopal Fund; to alter and amend the Trust Deeds; to empower the Trustees to sell the Estate of *Kildonan* in the County of *Ayr*; to regulate the Investment of the Trust Funds; and for other Purposes relating thereto.
3. An Act for authorizing the Dean and Chapter of *Kilkenny* to raise Money for the Repair and Restoration of *Kilkenny* Cathedral, and to endow the Parishes of *Durrow* and *Ballinamara;* and for other Purposes.
4. An Act for giving Effect to a Compromise of Suits affecting the Estates in the County of *Cork* in *Ireland*, late of *Henry Frederick John James Perceval* Fifth Earl of *Egmont* deceased.
5. An Act for giving Effect to a Compromise of a certain Suit depending in the Court of Chancery in *Ireland* relating to certain Estates in the Counties of *Limerick* and *Cork* of the Right Honourable *Standish O'Grady* First Viscount *Guillamore*.
6. An Act to raise Money for the Purchase of the *Horsham* Estate in the County of *Kent*, now in Lease from the Warden and College of *All Souls, Oxford*, to the Right Honourable *George Francis Robert* Lord *Harris*, and of Lands intermixed therewith.
7. An Act to enable the Trustees of the Will of *Pattison Ellames*, late of *Allerton Hall* in the County of *Lancaster*, Esquire, deceased, to sell the said Mansion House, Lands, and Hereditaments of *Allerton Hall*, and to purchase other Lands and Hereditaments in lieu thereof.
8. An Act for *Charles Sheils'* Almshouses Charity.
9. An Act for the Purpose of conferring Powers of jointuring and charging Portions out of and upon the Estates and Hereditaments of which the Right Honourable *William* Earl of *Abergavenny* is seised as Tenant in Tail Male under an Act passed in the Second and Third Years of the Reign of King *Philip* and Queen *Mary*, and for enabling Leases and Sales to be made of certain Parts of the same Estates and Hereditaments; and for other Purposes.
10. An Act for amending, extending, and enlarging the Powers contained in the Will and Codicil of the Right Honourable *Thomas Atherton* Lord *Lilford* deceased.
11. An Act to provide for the Settlement of the Claims of the Heirs of Entail of the Estate of *Hailes* in the County of *Edinburgh* with respect to the Construction of the *Edinburgh and Glasgow Union* Canal through the said Estate.
12. An Act to confirm and give Effect to a Decree of the Right Honourable the Lord High Chancellor of *Ireland* made in a certain Cause Petition Matter wherein *Anthony O'Reilly* was Petitioner and *Caroline Maria O'Reilly* and others were Respondents, and bearing Date the Second Day of *May* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, and to Two Indentures dated respectively the Twenty-fifth Day of *May* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-one executed in pursuance of the said Decree, and to an Indenture dated Fifteenth Day of *April* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-one therein and herein particularly mentioned.
13. An Act for authorizing the Trustees of the Will of *John Arden*, Esquire, deceased, to build a Family Mansion on Part of the Estates, subject to the Limitations of the said Will; and for other Purposes.
14. An Act to confirm Agreements between the Magistrates and Town Council of the Royal Burgh of *Dundee* and the Presbytery and Ministers of *Dundee* with respect to the Churches and Hospital of the said Burgh; and for other Purposes.

PRIVATE ACT,

NOT PRINTED.

15. An Act to enable *John Chittenden*, Clerk, to exercise his Office of a Priest, and to hold any Benefice or Preferment in the United Church of *England* and *Ireland*.

[INDEX.

GENERAL INDEX TO SESSION 1864.

EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS.

It being a principal object of this Index, that the proceedings on each Motion shall be completely recorded, some abbreviations of forms were necessary. Those who are accustomed to the proceedings of Parliament, will readily fill up the voids. Those who are not so familiar, may find the following explanation useful, but will find the whole *formulæ* set out at length in the "Contents."

The names which immediately follow the title of a Bill are those of the Peers or hon. Members who have charge of the Bill.

The numbers which are added at stages of Bills are the official numbers of the prints and reprints ordered at each stage, and, with the Statute, will enable the reader to follow all the changes the Bill has undergone.

The entries—Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}"; Amendt. "this day six months;" Question put, "That 'now' &c."—indicate the usual form of raising the issue—namely, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

"*Crown Lands, Inclosure of,* Amendt. on Committee of Supply" indicates that the Question was raised by means of an Amendment moved on the Motion (after the Order of the Day for the House to go into Committee of Supply had been read), "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair." In this case the issue is formally raised by the Motion "To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add" other words. The decision is taken on the Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The Nos. added to the "Parliamentary Papers" are in most cases those given in the Commons' "List of Papers for Sale."

INDEX

TO

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE SIXTH SESSION OF

THE EIGHTEENTH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM,

27° & 28° VICTORIA.

1864.

EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS.

In Bills, Read 1°, 2°, 3°, or 1^{a}, 2^{a}, 3^{a}, Read the First, Second, or Third Time.—In Speeches, 1R., 2R., 3R., Speech delivered on the First, Second, or Third Reading.—*Amendt.*, Amendment.—*Res.*, Resolution.—*Comm.*, Committee.—*Re-Comm.*, Re-Committal.—*Rep.*, Report.—*Consid.*, Consideration.—*Adj.*, Adjournment or Adjourned.—*cl.*, Clause.—*add. cl.*, Additional Clause.—*neg.*, Negatived.—*M. Q.*, Main Question.—*O. Q.*, Original Question.—*O. M.*, Original Motion.—*P. Q.*, Previous Question.—R. P., Report Progress.—*A.*, Ayes.—*N.*, Noes.—*M.*, Majority.—*1st. Div.*, *2nd. Div.*, First or Second Division.—*l.*, Lords.—*c.*, Commons.

☞ When in the Text or in the Index a Speech is marked thus *, it indicates that the Speech is reprinted from a Pamphlet or some authorized Report.

When in the Index a † is prefixed to a Name or an Office (the Member having accepted or vacated office during the Session) and to Subjects of Debate thereunder, it indicates that the Speeches on those Subjects were delivered in the speaker's private or official character, as the case may be.

When in this Index a * is added to the Reading of a Bill, it indicates that no Debate took place upon that stage of the measure.

ABERCROMBY, Lord
  Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 20

Abyssinia — Treatment of the British Consul in
  Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 3, [175] 1145

Accidents' Compensation Act Amendment Bill (*Mr. Ferrand, Colonel Edwards*)
c. Ordered * *June* 3
  Read 1° * *June* 10 [Bill 143]
  Read 2° * *June* 16
  Committee *; Report *June* 21
  Considered as amended * *June* 22
  Read 3° * *June* 23
l. Read 1^{a} * (*Viscount Sidmouth*) *June* 24
  Read 2^{a} * *July* 8 (No. 158)
  Committee* *July* 15; Report* *July* 19
  Read 3^{a} * *July* 22
  Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 95]

ADAIR, Mr. H. E., *Ipswich*
  Lisburn Election, [174] 391, 393, 476, 530; Res. 854, 1272

ADAM, Mr. W. P., *Clackmannanshire, &c.*
  Greenwich Hospital, Res. [175] 1154
  India—The Native Press, [175] 1949

ADDERLEY, Right Hon. C. B., *Staffordshire, N.*
  Canada—British Troops in, [175] 1731; [176] 373;—Defences of Quebec, 494
  Charity Commissioners, Comm. moved for, [173] 1876
  Education, Res. [173] 1659, 1665;—Minutes of Council on Endowed Schools, [175] 190;—Withdrawal of Minutes, 365;—Inspectors' Reports, Comm. moved for, 394; —Endowed Schools, Res. 1065
  Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [175] 1724; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1940, 1946
  Gaols, 2R. [175] 2055
  Head, Sir F. B.—Services of, Res. [176] 1338
  Highways Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 24, [176] 1374
  New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), Comm. Res. [175] 1696; 2R. [176] 1501, 1504, 1508
  Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Leave, [173] 741; 2R. Amendt. 1496; Comm. Amendt. [174] 1250, 1251, 1255; *cl.* 2, 1258

ADDERLEY, Right Hon. C. B.—*cont.*
- Rape, Punishment of, Comm. [176] 943
- Scientific Institutions of Dublin, [174] 678; Nomination of Comm. 1274
- Street Music (Metropolis), 2R. [175] 1531; Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 681
- Supply—Governors, &c., West Indies, &c. [175] 1885, 1886; — Heligoland, 1890;—Emigration, 1891, 1893;—Public Education, [176] 531; — Royal Academy of Music, 1606; — Civil Establishments, West Coast of Africa, 1670, 1671, 1674, 1680
- Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [173] 1731, 1733;—Comm. [175] 3; *cl.* 2, 9, [176] 105

ADDINGTON, Hon. W. W., *Devizes*
- Malta, Dock at, Res. [173] 902
- Navy Estimates—Wages, [173] 1297;—Scientific Departments, 1311;—Naval Establishments at Home, 1315
- Union Relief to Wives of Soldiers, [173] 1822

Administration of Trusts (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Sir George Grey, Sir William Dunbar*)
- *c.* Ordered* *May* 2
- Read 1°* *May* 6 [Bill 95]
- Read 2°* *May* 30
- Considered in Committee and reported *June* 28, [176] 423
- Considered as amended* *July* 4
- Read 3°* *July* 11
- *l.* Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 12
- Read 2ª* *July* 18
- Committee discharged* *July* 19
- Parl. Papers—*Commons* . . . Bill 95
- As amended in Committee . . Bill 179
- *Lords* . . . . No. 199

Admiralty Lands and Works Bill
(*Lord Clarence Paget, Mr. Childers*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1°* *May* 2 [Bill 88]
- Read 2°* *May* 4
- Committee*; Report *May* 9
- Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 11
- Considered as amended* *May* 12
- Read 3°* *May* 19
- *l.* Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Somerset*) *May* 23
- Read 2ª* *May* 31 (No. 88)
- Committee *June* 7, [175] 135 (No. 119)
- Report* *June* 13 (No. 129)
- Read 3ª* *June* 21
- Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 57]

ADVOCATE, The Lord (Right Hon. J. Moncreiff), *Edinburgh*
- Administration of Trusts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [176] 424, 425
- Bankruptcy Act, Nomination of Comm. [174] 1568
- Denmark and Germany — Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 801
- Education (Scotland), [173] 1067
- Hypothec, Law of, [174] 1978
- Lunacy (Scotland), Comm. [176] 420; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 422; *cl.* 2, 423
- Police Rate (Edinburgh) — Clergy Stipends, [175] 361, 363

cont.]

ADVOCATE, The Lord—*cont.*
- Scotch Affairs, Administration of, Comm. moved for, [175] 1179
- Supply — Procurators Fiscal, Scotland, [175] 1686, 1687;—Sheriffs Clerks, Scotland, 1687
- Valuation of Lands, &c. (Scotland) Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 1436
- Writs Registration (Scotland), 2R. [175] 869, 879, 1505

African Traders—Company of
- Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 20, [175] 2026

AGAR-ELLIS, Hon. L. G. F., *Kilkenny Co.*
- Registration of Voters (Ireland), 2R. [174] 530

AGNEW, Sir A., *Wigtonshire*
- Bank Acts (Scotland), [173] 182
- Bank of England Notes (Scotland), 2R. [176] 115
- India—British Burmah, [175] 1949
- United States—Compulsory Enlistment of British Subjects, [174] 628

Agricultural Statistics
- Motion, "That, in the opinion of this House, the collection and early publication of the Agricultural Statistics of Great Britain would be advantageous to the public interest" (*Mr. Caird*) *June* 7, [175] 1362
- After long debate, previous Question (*Viscount Palmerston*) put, A. 74, N. 62; M. 12; Main Question put, and *agreed to*

AIRLIE, Earl of
- Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Report, [175] 1934
- Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [176] 1898
- Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [175] 630

ALCOCK, Mr. T., *Surrey, E.*
- Land Clauses Act, [173] 1249
- Settlement, Law of, [173] 1249
- Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 998
- Thames Conservancy, Comm. *cl.* 75, Amendt. [176] 415, 417

Alkali Works Regulation Act
- Question, Lord Ravensworth; Answer, Lord Stanley of Alderley *June* 24, [176] 253

Anderson, Rev. Fortescue
- Motion, for Copies or Extracts of Correspondence (*Lord Campbell*) *June* 6, [175] 1225
- After short debate, Motion *agreed to*
- *Parl. P.* [No. 1808]

ANGERSTEIN, Mr. W., *Greenwich*
- Army Estimates, [173] 26
- Fortifications and Works, Comm. [176] 1534
- Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [176] 1873
- Greenwich Hospital, Res. [175] 1165
- Head, Sir F. B., Services of, Res. [176] 1339
- Public Lands and Buildings (Local Rates), Res. [174] 499

ANSTRUTHER, Sir R., *Fifeshire*
Army Estimates—Volunteers, [175] 48

Appeal Committee—Appointed *Feb* 4

Appeal in Criminal Cases Act Amendment Bill
(*Sir FitzRoy Kelly, Mr. William Ewart, Mr. M'Mahon*)
c. Ordered* *Feb* 9; read 1° * *Feb* 12 [Bill 14]
Order for second reading read *July* 20, [176] 1773, and after short debate discharged; Bill withdrawn

ARCHDALL, Captain M. E., *Fermanagh Co.*
Administration of Justice (Ireland) — The Queen *v.* Duigan and others, Papers moved for, [174] 1269, 1271; [176] 1340
Crawley, Col., Case of, Papers moved for, [174] 90, 99
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1396
Ireland—The Constabulary, [174] 697
Malicious Burnings (Ireland), [175] 22
Marriage Laws, Scotch and Irish, [176] 2193
Rule of the House — Questions to Private Members, [174] 1914
Trespass (Ireland), Comm. [174] 955, 957, 1752
Watching of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1719

Archway and Kentish Town Junction Road Bill (*by Order*)
Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 25, [173] 1063; Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Cox*); Question, "That 'now' &c.," put, and negatived; Words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to; Bill put off for six months

ARGYLL, Duke of (Lord Privy Seal)
Denmark and Germany, Res. [174] 730;—Vote of Censure, Res. [176] 1094, 1096, 1102, 1113
Malt for Animals, 2R. [174] 6
Sentences of Death, 2R. [175] 255, 256
United States—Steam Rams in the Mersey, Papers moved for, [174] 1908
Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [176] 1784

ARMAGH, Archbishop of
Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland), 2R. [175] 1053; Comm. *cl.* 83, Amendt. 1707

Armagh Archiepiscopal Revenues Bill
(*Sir Hugh Cairns, Mr. Whiteside*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 13 [Bill 202]
Read 2°* *July* 18
Committee*; Report *July* 19
Read 3° * *July* 21
l. Read 1ª * (*Viscount Hutchinson*) *July* 22
Read 2ª * *July* 25 (No. 232)
Committee *; Report *July* 26
Read 3ª * *July* 27
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 81]

ARMY
Army Estimates—see SUPPLY—Question, Lord Hotham; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 1, [173] 1336; Notice, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 11, [174] 788
Army and Navy Expenditure (1862-3)—Considered in Committee; Resolutions (*Lord Clarence Paget*), after short debate, agreed to *July* 18, [176] 1695—see *Navy*
Army Receipt and Expenditure, Question, Sir Henry Willoughby; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Feb* 18, [173] 712
Aldershot—Married Soldiers' Quarters, Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 10, [175] 1544

Artillery
Armstrong Guns at Kagosima, Question, Admiral Duncombe; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Mar* 14, [173] 1905; Question, Mr. Hanbury Tracy; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *April* 26, [174] 1624
Armstrong Guns, Trial of, Question, Mr. H. Berkeley; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 15, [174] 1079
Armstrong Guns, Conversion into Muzzle Loaders, Question, Mr. Hussey Vivian; Answer, The Marq. of Hartington *June* 16, [175] 1838
Armstrong Guns in New Zealand, Question, Mr. Bernal Osborne; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *July* 22, [176] 1904
Armstrong Gun Factory at Woolwich, Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *July* 25, [176] 2021
Mackay's Gun, Observations, The Earl of Derby; Reply, Earl De Grey and Ripon; short debate thereon *April* 18, [174] 1176
Mr. Lynall Thomas's Gun, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 31, [175] 914; Question, Lord Fermoy; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 15, [174] 14
Whitworth's Guns, Trial of, Question, Major Gavin; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 1, [173] 1334
Trial of Heavy Rifled Guns, Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 23, [176] 157
French Breech-Loading Cannon, Question, Mr. Dawson Damer; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Mar* 10, [173] 1774
Rifled Ordnance, Experiments with, Question, Mr. J. A. Smith; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *July* 18, [176] 1624

Ashantee War—Withdrawal of the Troops, Question, Sir James Elphinstone; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 21, [176] 33; *Requisition to Admiralty for Transports*, Question, General Peel; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 23, [176] 153; *Officers at Cape Coast Castle*, Question, Mr. Longfield; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 23, [176] 159; *Field Allowance to Troops on the Gold Coast*, Question, General Peel; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 23, [176] 152—see *title, Ashantee, The War in*
Artillery Practice in Plymouth Sound, Question, The Duke of Marlborough; Answer, Earl De Grey and Ripon *June* 6, [175] 1223

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Barrack Masters, Question, Mr. C. P. Berkeley; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 30, [176] 494

Breech Loading Rifles, Motion for Address for "Copy of the Reports made to the Military Authorities on Storm's Rifle, and on any other Breech-loading Rifle that has been reported on" (*Colonel Dunne*) *May* 12, [175] 435; after short debate, Question negatived

Brompton, Church and Schools at, Question, Sir Frederic Smith; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Feb* 29, [173] 1277

Bermuda, Officers' Allowances at, Question, Mr. Clay; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 19, [175] 258

De Burgh, Captain, Case of—Uxbridge Yeomanry Cavalry, Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *July* 14, [176] 1467

Canada, British Troops in, Question, Mr. Adderley; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *June* 14, [175] 1731; *Guards in,* Question, Major Knox; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 20, 522; Question, Sir Frederic Smith; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 26, 633

Captain Grant's System of Cooking, Amendt. on Committee of Supply, *May* 20, To leave out from "That" and add "this House will, upon Monday next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of an humble Address to be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to consider the services of Captain Grant, and order him some suitable reward for his services in improving the system of Cooking in the Army, and effecting a considerable saving in the Public Expenditure for Fuel" (*Colonel North*), [175] 523; after debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.," A. 104, N. 70; M. 34

Ceylon, Military Expenditure of, Question, Mr. Lyall; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *June* 6, [175] 1261

Chelsea Hospital, Rating of Officers of, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 9, To leave out from "That" and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to relieve the Officers of Her Majesty's Royal Hospital of Chelsea from the payment of all Rates and Taxes which have been charged upon them by a recent regulation for houses in that Hospital occupied by them in the performance of their duties" (*Colonel North*), [175] 198; after short debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.," A. 184, N. 102; M. 82

Commissioners to United States and Denmark, Question, Mr. W. Ewart; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Feb* 15, [173] 564; Question, Lord Campbell; Answer, Earl De Grey and Ripon *Feb* 22, 856

Court Martial Law, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Mr. Headlam *Mar* 11, [173] 1824

Enlistment and Discharge of Soldiers

Discharge of Soldiers in 1864-5, Question, Mr. Dawson Damer; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 14, [173] 1905

Limited Enlistment and the Reserve Force, Motion for "Return of the Strength of

[*cont.*

Army—*Enlistment*—cont.

the Reserve Force" (*The Earl of Lucan*) *April* 15, [174] 1064; after debate, agreed to

Recruiting for the Army, Observations, Colonel Dunne; Reply, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 27, [176] 387

Reduction of the Army, Observations, Viscount Palmerston; Reply, Mr. H. Baillie *Mar* 3, [173] 1370

Ten Years' Enlistment Act, Question, The Earl of Desart; Answer, Earl De Grey and Ripon *Mar* 17, [174] 163

Enfield Rifle, Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 13, [175] 456

Forage Money of Cavalry Officers, Observations, Mr. Whiteside; Reply, The Marquess of Hartington *July* 11, [176] 1329

Gough, Lieut-General, Appointment of, to the 2nd Dragoons, Question, Colonel Barttelot; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington; debate thereon *Feb* 19, [173] 818

Gunnery Instructors, Question, Mr. Tracy; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Mar* 16, [173] 1756

Horse Artillery, New Brigade of, Question, Colonel North; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 8, [173] 1649

Instruction of Soldiers in Trades, Resolution (*Sir Harry Verney*) *Mar* 3, [173] 1414; Motion not proposed, not being in Order

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 7, To leave out "That," and add "it is expedient that the recommendations contained in the Report of the Committee on the proper means for the Instruction and Employment of Soldiers and their Children in Trades, and of the Under Secretary of State in a Letter to the Quartermaster General, Horse Guards, dated 23rd May, 1862, be carried into effect, with due regard to the duties and discipline of the Army" (*Sir Harry Verney*), [174] 624; after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Japan—The 20th Regiment, Question, Colonel Sykes, [174] 620; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 7, 624

Kertch Prize Money, Question, Mr. J. C. Ewart; Answer, Mr. Hutt *May* 12, [175] 364

Marchwood Powder Magazine, Question, Mr Alderman Rose; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 23, [176] 151

Military Establishments, Observations, Mr. Bentinck; Reply, Viscount Palmerston *Feb* 8, [173] 219

Militia Regiments, Question, Colonel Dickson; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 31, [175] 913

Norfolk Rifle Volunteers, Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 10, [173] 1755

Ordnance Survey—The Civil Assistants, Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, Mr. Peel *Feb* 22, [173] 1250

Percussion Caps for Military Practice, Question, Mr. Morrison; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 2, [175] 1064

Prussian Breech-Loading Rifles, Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 7, [174] 536

Regimental Quartermasters, Motion for Address for inquiry "into the condition as to

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

provision, pay, and allowances of the Regimental Quartermasters of Her Majesty's Service" (*Sir Frederic Smith*) *June* 21, [176] 92; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Rifle Practice near the New Croydon Railway, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 23, [176] 151

Sanitary Measures (*Camps, &c.*), Motion, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire whether it be possible, by sanitary or other measures, to mitigate some of the evils to which Soldiers and Sailors quartered in permanent Camps or in Garrison or Seaport Towns are peculiarly exposed (*Sir John Trelawny*) *June* 16, [175] 1914; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Sanitary Regulations for Field Service, Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 24, [176] 258

Soldiers' Gardens, Question, Mr. W. Ewart; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 14, [173] 1906; Question, Mr. W. Ewart; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 12, [174] 875

South Kensington, Engineer Officers at, Question, Lord John Manners; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 23, [176] 150

Stamp Duty on Commissions, Question, Lord Hotham; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *July* 25, [176] 2020

Storekeeper's Department, Pimlico, Question, Sir Robert Clifton; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 10, [173] 1757

Volunteer Artillery Force, Observations, Mr. H. Berkeley, [174] 621; Reply, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 7, 624

Volunteer Drill Instructors, Question, General Buckley; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 14, [174] 969

Volunteer Service, Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Hutt *July* 29, [176] 2189

War Department Clerks, Question, Mr. Alderman Rose; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 5, [174] 478

Army Prize (Shares of Deceased) Bill
(*Mr. Hutt, Mr. Peel*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 11 [Bill 105]
Read 2°* *May* 23
Committee*; Report *May* 26
Read 3°* *May* 27
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl De Grey*) *May* 31 (No. 106)
Read 2ª* *June* 24
Committee*; Report *June* 27
Read 3ª* *June* 28

Arnold, Mr., and the Police

Explanation, Sir George Grey; Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 18, [176] 1625; Question, Mr. G. H. Whalley; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 19, 1707

Art, Schools of

Select Committee appointed *Mar* 8, "To inquire into the constitution and working, and into the success, of the Schools of Art wholly or partially supported by Government Grants, or otherwise assisted by the Government, and into the system upon which the sums granted by Parliament for the promotion of National Education in Art are distributed and administered" (*Sir Stafford Northcote*)

Committee nominated *Mar* 16, Sir Stafford Northcote (Chairman), Mr. Lowe, Mr. Adderley, Mr. Edward Egerton, Mr. Tite, Mr. William Ewart, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Trefusis, Mr. Cave, Mr. Maguire, Mr. Gregson, Mr. Arthur Mills, Mr. Crum-Ewing, and Mr. Potter. *Mar* 18 Mr. Salt added. *May* 3 Mr. Bruce added

Report *July* 8 (*Parl. P.* No. 466)

Arundell of Wardour, Lord

Mount St. Bernard's Reformatory, [176] 21

Ashantee, The War in

Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 10, [175] 257; Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 20, 545; Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 14, 1728; Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 16, 1839

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 17, To leave out from "That" and add "Her Majesty's Government, in landing Forces on the Gold Coast for the purpose of waging war against the King of Ashantee, without making any sufficient provision for preserving the health of the Troops to be employed there, have incurred a grave responsibility; and that this House laments the want of foresight which has caused so large a loss of life" (*Sir John Hay*), [175] 2017; after long debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.," A. 233, N. 226; M. 7

See *Army—Navy* "Gladiator"

Parl. Papers—
Papers relating to . . . . . No. 385
Army Medical Reports 1863-4. No. 544
Military Operations on Gold Coast [3364]
Plan of Operations . . . . [3364-1]

Athlumney, Lord

Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. [176] 76, 81

Attorney General, The (Sir Roundell Palmer), *Richmond*

Bankruptcy Act, [174] 686

Bewicke, Mr., Case of, Comm. moved for, [174] 1930

Chain Cables and Anchors, Comm. *cl.* 2, [174] 511

Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1377; 2R. [175] 1113; Comm. [176] 300

Chancery Funds, [174] 874

China— Trial of George White at Shanghai, [174] 1774;—Hong Kong Ordinances, [175] 191

Church Building Acts, [174] 184

Church Building and New Parishes Acts Amendment, Leave, [174] 853, 854; 2R. Amendt. [175] 1509

Courts of Justice (Money), [175] 24

[*cont*

ATTORNEY GENERAL—*cont.*
  Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [174] 1553 ; Consid. *cl.* 12, 1985
  Denmark and Germany — Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 1941 ; — Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1043
  Forfeiture of Lands and Goods, 2R. [174] 1397 ; [175] 1804 ; [176] 1597
  Greek Loan, 3R. [176] 571
  Insolvent Debtors, Comm. Adj. moved, [176] 1431, 1432
  Japan—Bombardment of Kagosima, Res. [173] 403
  Law Courts, The, [176] 368
  Lisburn Election, [174] 461, 475 ; Res. 855 ; Comm. moved for, 1430
  Merthyr Tydvil Writ, [174] 1195 ;—Privilege, 1288
  Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia), Comm. [176] 2059, 2062, 2065
  O'Malley Irwin, Mr., Case of, [176] 1976 ; Address moved, 2112, 2119
  Partnership Law Amendment, Comm. [175] 244
  Patent Office Library and Museum, Comm. moved for, [175] 245
  Street Music (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 478 ; *add. cl.* 683
  Supply — Ecclesiastical Commissioners, [176] 657
  Under Secretaries Indemnity, 2R. [175] 83
  Under Secretaries of State— Privilege, Res. [174] 1235, 1245, 1246
  United States — Capture of British Ships, Papers moved for, [173] 508, 522, 533 ;—English Ships and American Cruisers, 714 ; —Vessels "El Tousson" and "El Monassia," Papers moved for, 965, 980, 982, 999 ; [174] 695, 1202 ; [175] 804, 808, 1002 ;—Capture of the "Saxon," [173] 1365—of the "Tuscaloosa," 1463 ; Res. [174] 1825, 1833, 1835 ; — Confederate Cruisers, [173] 1544 ; —Forged Report of Secretary of the Confederate Navy, Explanation, [175] 24 ;—Confederate Ship "Georgia," 474
  Vacating of Seats (House of Commons), 2R. [175] 596

Attorneys and Solicitors Remuneration, &c., Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *June* 9 (No. 120)
  Read 2ª, after debate, and referred to a Select Committee ; but nothing further was done therein *June* 21, [176] 5

Augmentation Act, The Lord Chancellor's
  Return of all Sales, &c., to February 15th, 1864; *presented* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *Feb* 16, [173] 617 (No. 12)
  Question, The Earl of Derby ; Answer, The Lord Chancellor *Feb* 29, 1240

Australia, South, Legislation of
  Question, Mr. Childers ; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 4, [173] 1457

Australian Postage
  Question, Lord Alfred Churchill ; Answer, Mr. Peel *June* 21, [176] 36 ; Question, Lord Alfred Churchill ; Answer, Mr. Peel *July* 15, 1573

Austria and the Zollverein
  Question, Mr. Somerset Beaumont ; Answer, Mr. Hutt *Feb* 18, [173] 713 ; Question, Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald ; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Mar* 4, 1458

AYRTON, Mr. A. S., *Tower Hamlets*
  Army Estimates—Surveys, [175] 235
  Battersea Park, [175] 20
  Chain Cables and Anchors, Comm. *cl.* 1, [174] 503 ; *cl.* 2, 508, 511
  Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. *cl.* 2, [175] 1478, 1481 ; 3R. 2093
  Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. [176] 859
  Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 2, [174] 1859 ; Consid. Schedule A, 2013
  East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [176] 1848
  Election Petitions, Comm. Amendt. [175] 1044 ; [176] 448
  Government Annuities, Comm. Adj. moved, [174] 247, 789, 805 ; Nomination of Comm. 1479 ; 3R. [175] 2038
  Greece, King of, Annuity to the, [176] 356
  Greek Loan, Comm. Res. [175] 1528 ; *cl.* 2, [176] 405, 407 ; 3R. 570
  India—Indian Officers, Res. [174] 896
  Insolvent Debtors, 2R. [174] 2120 ; Comm. [176] 1432
  Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers), Comm. [176] 103
  Jersey Court, Comm. Adj. moved, [176] 139, 1434
  London Main Trunk Underground Railway, Instruction, [174] 1075
  Metropolitan District Railways, 3R. [176] 1619
  Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [173] 1799
  Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia), Comm. [176] 2061
  Naval and Victualling Stores, 2R. [175] 2108
  Navy—Masters in the, [175] 1214
  New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 1695
  Parks, Public Meetings in the, [175] 773
  Patent Office Library and Museum, [174] 1956; Comm. moved for, [175] 245
  Portugal—British Claims on, Papers moved for, [176] 1593, 1597
  Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Res. Amendt. [173] 1640
  Rape, Punishment of, Comm. [176] 947
  Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for, [176] 1458 ; Report, 2011, 2132, 2135, 2151
  Street Music (Metropolis), Leave, [174] 2118 ; 2R. [175] 1530 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [176] 468, 474, 476, 477 ; Adj. moved, 680 ; Amendt. 681 ; *add. cl.* 682 ; 3R. 1074
  Supply—Land, &c., at Kensington Gore, [175] 866 ;—New National Gallery at Burlington House, 1324 ; — Consular Establishments, 1901, 1902, 1908 ;—Department of Science and Art, [176] 561 ;—University of London, 1352 ;—British Museum, 1358, 1361 ;—National Gallery, 1527 ;—Royal Academy of Music, 1603
  Thames Conservancy, Lords Amendts. Amendt. [176] 2153, 2154
  Treaty of Vienna and Prussia, [176] 1623

[*cont.*

AYRTON, Mr. A. S.—*cont.*
Under Secretary of State — Privilege, Res. [174] 1249, 1957, 1958
Weighing of Grain (Port of London), 2R. [175] 1338 ; Amendt. [176] 166, 168, 176
Weights and Measures (Metric System), Comm. *cl.* 2, [175] 5, 7, 11, 12 ; Schedule, [176] 108

AYTOUN, Mr. R. S., *Kirkcaldy, &c.*
Canada—Duty on Manufactured Goods, [174] 1770
Halifax and Quebec Railway, [175] 99
Japan—Bombardment of Kagosima, Res. [173] 349 ; Explanation, 798
Lisburn Election, [174] 471
Mails in the Provinces, Comm. moved for, [174] 407
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), [175] 1261 ; Comm. Res. 1695 ; 2R. [176] 1484
Writs Registration (Scotland), 2R. [175] 1493

BAGWELL, Mr. J., *Clonmel*
Administration of Justice (Ireland) — The Queen *v.* Duigan and others, Papers moved for, [174] 1270
Beer Houses (Ireland), 2R. [175] 599
Chief Rents (Ireland), Comm. [175] 13
Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland), 2R. [176] 301
Factory Acts Extension, Comm. [175] 1939, 1940
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1387
Indictable Offences (Ireland), Return moved for, [174] 1138
Lunatic Asylums (Ireland), [176] 635
Malt for Cattle, Comm. [173] 1032
Medical Officers in Unions (Ireland), Res. [175] 154
Poor Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment, 2R. [176] 457
Trespass (Ireland), Comm. Amendt., [174] 954 ; Adj. moved, 1754 ; *cl.* 1, Adj. moved, [176] 931, 936, 937, 938 ; *cl.* 3, 939 ; *add. cl.* 940
Vestry Cess Abolition (Ireland), 2R. [173] 722

BAILLIE, Mr. H. J., *Invernesshire*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 142
Army Estimates — Land Forces, [173] 1421, 1443
Army—Reduction of the, [173] 1370 ; Rating of Officers of Chelsea Hospital, Address moved, [175] 200
Bank Notes (Scotland), 2R. [174] 1750
Casual Poor (Metropolis), [176] 1802
Education (Inspectors' Reports), Nomination of Comm. [175] 1085, 1092
Government Annuities—Mr. H. B. Sheridan—Privilege, Res. [174] 308
India — The Budget, [174] 179 ;—Claims of Azeem Jah, Comm. moved for, [175] 1661 ; —The late Marquess of Dalhousie, 2036
Mails in the Provinces, Comm. moved for, [174] 412
Navy—Claims of Mr. J. Clare, Comm. moved for, [174] 1468
Standing Orders Revision, Report, Amendt. [176] 2008, 2011, 2012, 2137
United States — English ships and American Cruisers, [173] 713

BAINES, Mr. E., *Leeds*
Assize Town for the West Riding Circuit, Address moved for, [173] 803, 816
Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Amendment, 2R. [176] 1363
*Borough Franchise, 2R. [175] 285
Education, Res. [173] 1675, 1676
Factory Acts Extension, Comm. [175] 1946
Foreign Office and the Board of Trade, Comm. moved for, [174] 1104
Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1607
Insolvent Debtors, Comm. [176] 948
Public Houses, Closing of, on Sundays, [174] 2055
Silver Coin, Supply of, [175] 802
Supply—Sir Rowland Hill, [175] 1598
Vaccination, [173] 1457
Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [173] 1739

Ballot, The
Resolution, "That it is therefore expedient that a fair trial should be given to the Vote by Ballot" (*Mr. H. Berkeley*) *June* 21, [176] 36; after debate, Question put ; A. 123, N. 212; M. 89.

BANDON, Earl of
Education, National (Ireland), [176] 702

Bank Act, 1844, *The*
Question, Mr. Hubbard ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 13, [175] 460

Bank Acts (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)
c. Considered in Committee *Feb* 11 ; Resolution, [173] 467
Resolution reported *Feb* 12 ; Bill ordered
Read 1°* *Feb* 12 [Bill 16]
Read 2° * *Feb* 19
Bill withdrawn* *May* 5

Bank Acts (Scotland) Bill
Question, Sir Edward Colebrooke ; Answer, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 19, [173] 797 ; Question, Sir Andrew Agnew ; Answer, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 11, 1825

Bank Notes (Scotland) Bill
Question, Mr. Baxter ; Answer, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 2, [174] 1077

Banking Co-partnerships Bill
(*Mr. Massey, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)
c. Resolution in Committee *May* 23, [175] 605
Resolution reported ; Bill ordered *May* 26
Read 1° * *May* 26 [Bill 118]
Read 2° * *May* 30
Committee* ; Report *June* 2
Read 3° * *June* 3
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *June* 6
Read 2ª * *June* 21 (No. 113)
Committee * ; Report *June* 23
Read 3ª * *June* 24
Royal Assent *June* 30 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 32]

Bank of England Notes (Scotland) Bill
(*Sir John Hay, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Cargill*)
c. Resolution in Committee *May* 23; Bill ordered, [175] 602
Read 1° * *May* 23 [Bill 115]
Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°," [176] 109; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Finlay*); Question proposed, "That 'now' &c.;" after debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn
Bill withdrawn *June* 22

Bank Notes (Scotland) Bill
(*Sir John Hay, Sir Edward Colebrooke, Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Finlay*)
c. Considered in Committee* *Mar* 16; Bill ordered
Read 1° * *Mar* 16 [Bill 53]
Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir John Hay*) *April* 27, [174] 1727; Amendt. to omit "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Black*); after long debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

Bank Notes, &c. Signature Bill
(*Mr. Peel, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 13 [Bill 206]
Read 2° * *July* 14
Committee*; Report *July* 15
Read 3° * *July* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 19
Read 2ª * *July* 22 (No. 217)
Committee *; Report *July* 23
Read 3ª * *July* 25
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 78]

Bank Post Bills (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)
c. Ordered * *July* 14
Read 1° * *July* 15 [Bill 211]
Read 2° * *July* 19
Committee*; Report *July* 21
Read 3° * *July* 22
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Steward*) *July* 22
Read 2ª * *July* 23 (No. 236)
Committee*; Report *July* 25
Read 3ª * *July* 26
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 86]

Bankruptcy Act, The New
Observations, Mr. Moffatt; Reply, The Attorney General; short debate thereon *April* 8, [174] 680
Select Committee appointed "to inquire into the working of the New Bankruptcy Act, and to report thereon" (*Mr. Moffatt*) *April* 14; Committee nominated *April* 21:—Mr. Moffatt, (Chairman), Mr. Attorney General, Mr. G. Carr Glyn, Mr. Murray, Mr. Malins, Mr. Weguelin, Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Lowe, and Mr. Hassard, [174] 1482; Motion, "That the Lord Advocate be one other Member of the said Committee;" debate adjourned; debate resumed *April* 25; Question put, and agreed to. Mr. Goschen, Mr. Cave, and Mr. Crum-Ewing nominated other Members of the said Committee. *April* 26, Mr. Roebuck, Mr. Vance added; Mr. Hassard disch. *June* 3, Mr. George Carr Glynn disch., Mr. Taverner John Miller added
Report *July* 22 (*Parl. P.* No. 512)

Baring, Right Hon. Sir F. T., *Portsmouth*
Education—Inspectors' Reports, Nomination of Comm. [175] 1088
Navy—Case of Mr. Thomas, [173] 1782
Navy Estimates—Wages, [173] 1292
Public Lands and Buildings (Local Rates), Res. [174] 498
Supply—Sir Rowland Hill, [175] 1600;—Civil Establishments, West Coast of Africa, [176] 1658

Baring, Mr. T., *Huntingdon*
Brazil—Relations with, [176] 1645
Mails in the Provinces, Comm. moved for, [174] 418
Partnership Law Amendment, Comm. Amendt. [174] 2121; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 2127; [175] 242, 243
United States — Vessels "El Tousson" and "El Monassia," Papers moved for, [173] 1018;—Confederate Ship "Georgia," [175] 467
Ways and Means—Fire Insurance Duty, [174] 1450

Baring, Mr. T. G. (Under Secretary for the Home Department), *Penryn & Falmouth*
Canon of Westminster, The New, [176] 2158
Cattle Diseases Prevention, Re-Comm. *cl.* 6, [176] 1568, 1569
County Voters Registration, 2R. [175] 1818
Jersey Court, Comm. [176] 1435
Salmon Fisheries Act, [174] 1916
Supply—West Coast of Africa, [176] 1667
Turnpike Gates, [176] 951

Barnstaple Election—Petition
Committee nominated by General Committee of Elections *April* 12:—Edward Howes, Esq. (Chairman), Alexander Murray Dunlop, Esq., Sir Francis Henry Goldsmid, bart., William Henry Humphery, Esq., George Sclater-Booth, Esq.
Report of the Select Committee *April* 15:—That Thomas Lloyd, Esq., is not duly elected; That Richard Bremridge, Esq., is duly elected; That Thomas Lloyd, Esq., was, by his agents, guilty of bribery at the last Election; That they have not reason to believe that corrupt practices have extensively prevailed at the said Election
Return amended accordingly *April* 18
Minutes of Evidence (*Parl. P.* No. 219)

Barrow, Mr. W. H., *Nottinghamshire, S.*
Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. [175] 1469; *cl.* 12, 1482, 1483
Gaols, 2R. [175] 2073
Malt for Cattle, 2R. [173] 609
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [174] 1257
Poor's Rate, Leave, [173] 706
Private Bills—Standing Order, [175] 1136
Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 1028

BARTTELOT, Colonel W. B., *Sussex, W.*
Agricultural Statistics, Res. [175] 1367
Army—Appointment of Lieut.-Gen. Gough to the 2nd Dragoons, [173] 818, 820
Army Estimates—Commissariat, [174] 831 ;—Volunteers, [175] 48 ;—Manufacturing Departments, 75 ;—Works, Buildings, &c. 81 ; Adj. moved, 82, 214 ;—Administration of the Army, 238
Beckenham, Lewes, and Brighton Railway, 2R. [173] 639
Government Manufacturing Establishments, Res. [176] 1932
Malt for Cattle, Comm. [173] 227 ; *add. cl.* 1225
Navy Estimates—Naval Establishments, [174] 2029, 2033
Patent Office, The, [174] 1955
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, [174] 1258
Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, [174] 958 ; Res. 972, 1028
Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [173] 1739

BASS, Mr. M. T., *Derby*
Agricultural Statistics, Res. [175] 1379
Borough Franchise, 2R. [175] 345
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 613
Foreign Office and the Board of Trade, Comm. moved for, [174] 1105
India—Indian Officers, Res. [174] 896
Malt for Cattle, Comm. [173] 229, 233, 1025, 1026
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 2, [173] 1802
Street Music (Metropolis), Leave, [174] 2116, 2118 ; 2R. [175] 1532 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 467, 469, 471 ; *add. cl.* 683
Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 1033
Supply, Report, [175] 1913

BATH, Marquess of
Chimney Sweepers, Comm. *cl.* 6, [175] 1133 ; *cl.* 12, 1134
Improvement of Land, 2R. [174] 1286
Mortgage Debentures, Comm. *cl.* 32, [175] 1053
Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, 2R. [176] 1787

BATHURST, Mr. A. A., *Cirencester*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Consid. Schedule A, [174] 2015

Battersea Park
Question, Mr. Ayrton ; Answer, Mr. Cowper *May* 5, [175] 20

BAXTER, Mr. W. E., *Montrose, &c.*
Bank Notes (Scotland), [174] 1977
Bank of England Notes (Scotland), 2R. [176] 125
China—Affairs of, [175] 527, 532, 533
Confederate States, The, [175] 912
Factory Acts Extension, Comm. [175] 1945
Galway Packet Service, [173] 1455
Harbours of Refuge, Res. [174] 1678
Lunacy (Scotland), Comm. [176] 421
Navy Estimates—Wages, [173] 1288
Supply—Harbours of Refuge, [175] 854
United States—Confederate Cruisers, Papers moved for, [173] 1486, 1487
Writs Registration (Scotland), 2R. [175] 1489

BAZLEY, Mr. T., *Manchester*
Borough Franchise, 2R. [175] 302
Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. *cl.* 2, [175] 1481
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [176] 1841
Foreign Office and the Board of Trade, Comm. moved for, [174] 1119
Gaols, Discipline and Dietary in, [175] 1063
India—Medical Officers, [174] 184, 966
Judgments, &c. Law Amendment, 2R. [174] 101
Supply—Department of Science and Art, [176] 560

BEACH, Mr. W. W. B., *Hampshire, N.*
Highways Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 24, [176] 1373
Malt for Cattle, Comm. [173] 1037
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, 2R. [173] 1503 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, [174] 1256 ; *cl.* 4, 1262
Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 995

BEAUMONT, Mr. Somerset A., *Newcastle-upon-Tyne*
Bewicke, Mr., Case of, Comm. moved for, [174] 1933, 1939
Borough Franchise, 2R. [175] 346
Denmark and Germany — Bombardment of Sonderborg, [174] 718 ;—Danish Blockade in the Baltic, 1625
Germany—Austria and the Zollverein, [173] 713
Mexico—Affairs of, [173] 793
Navy Estimates—Naval Stores, [174] 439
South Kensington, New Museums at, [174] 1078

BEAUMONT, Mr. Wentworth B., *Northumberland, S.*
Union Assessment Committee Act Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [175] 520

Beckenham, Lewes, and Brighton Railway Bill (by Order)
Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir John Shelley*) *Feb* 16, [173] 635 ; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Hankey*), 637 ; after debate, Question, "That 'now' &c.," put, and negatived, Words added ; Main Question, as amended, agreed to ; Bill put off for six months

BEECROFT, Mr. G. S., *Leeds*
Assize Town for the West Riding Circuit, Address moved for, [173] 810
Insolvent Debtors, Comm. [176] 1432

Beerhouses (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *May* 12 [Bill 109]
Read 2° after debate *May* 23, [175] 597
Committee *May* 26, [175] 693
After short debate, Comm. report progress
Committee* ; Report *May* 31
Considered as amended* *June* 13
Read 3°* *June* 14

[*cont.*

Beerhouses (Ireland) Bill—cont.

l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Steward*) *June* 16
Read 2ª * *June* 23 (No. 134)
Committee *; Report *June* 24
Read 3ª * *June* 27
Royal Assent *June* 30 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 35]

Belmore, Earl of
- Civil Bill Courts (Ireland), 2R. [176] 332
- Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland) Comm. *cl.* 83, [175] 1707

Bentinck, Mr. G. C., *Taunton*
- Denmark and Germany—Treaty of London, 1852, Res. [174] 1331
- Dyce, Mr., Case of, [175] 517, 518
- Garibaldi, General — Admiral Mundy's Explanation, [174] 1550
- Herbert, Mr., Case of, [175] 516
- National Gallery, [175] 260
- National Portrait Gallery, [174] 1623
- Street Music (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [176] 467, 473, 474, 477, 478
- Supply—Houses of Parliament, [175] 433;—Consular Establishments, 1903, 1905;—Department of Science and Art, [176] 564, 565;—British Museum, 1361;—National Gallery, 1526, 1527, 1531;—Gallery of Portraits, 1532
- United States — Capture of British Ships, Papers moved for, [173] 521, 522

Bentinck, Mr. G. W. P., *Norfolk, W.*
- Address in Answer to the Speech, Report, [173] 190
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, [173] 1440, 1451
- Army—The Military Establishment, [173] 219
- Business of the Evening, [173] 1188
- Chain Cables and Anchors, 2R. [173] 692; Select Comm. moved for, 1362; Comm. *cl.* 1, [174] 507, 508; *cl.* 8, 513, 514
- Counsel's Fees in Parliament, [173] 1253
- County Franchise, 2R. [174] 943
- Denmark and Germany—Baltic Coast Lights, [173] 858;—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1031
- Factory Act—Scutch Mills, [174] 300
- Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 608*d*
- Mails in the Provinces, Comm. moved for, [174] 413
- Malt for Cattle, Leave, [173] 229; 2R. 598, 615; Comm. 1040; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1218; *add. cl.* 1225
- Merchant Seamen's Act, [174] 967
- Navy—Royal Commission on, Dockyards, [173] 906
- Navy Estimates, [173] 860;—Wages, 1286, 1297;—Admiralty Office, 1304;—Naval Stores, [174] 428, 438
- Norfolk Rifle Volunteers, [173] 1755
- Private Bills, Res. 5, [173] 676
- Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 1035
- Supply—Holyhead Harbour, &c. [175] 858
- United States — Capture of British Ships, Papers moved for, [173] 528

Berkeley, Hon. C. P. F., *Gloucester*
- Army—Barrack Masters, [176] 494
- Army Estimates — Works, Buildings, &c. Amendt. [175] 81, 203, 214
- Ashantee War, The, [176] 33, 34
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. *cl.* 20, Amendt. [176] 1865, 1866
- Gold Coast—Forts on the, [176] 1709
- Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [173] 1151, 1157;—Wages, 1284;—Scientific Departments, 1310;—Naval Stores, [174] 418;—Pay of Officers, [175] 683;—Retirement of Officers, Adj. moved, 691
- Navy — Masters in the, Res. [175] 1213;—Royal Naval Reserve, 1353;—Payment of Officers, [176] 1790, 1791
- Supply—Captured Negroes, [175] 1898

Berkeley, Hon. F. H. F., *Bristol*
- Army Estimates—Yeomanry Cavalry, [175] 44, 45
- Army—Trial of Armstrong Guns, [174] 1079, 1080
- Ballot, The, Res. [176] 36, 47
- Bewicke, Mr., Case of, [173] 464; Comm. moved for, [174] 1917, 1935, 1937, 1938; [175] 23
- Mails from Southampton, [174] 477
- Navy—Armament of the, [173] 1762
- Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [173] 1153
- Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, Comm. [176] 1436
- Volunteer Artillery Corps, [174] 621

Bernard, Hon. Col. H. B., *Bandon Bridge*
- Poor's Rate, Leave, [173] 695, 706

Berners, Lord
- Improvement of Land, 2R. [174] 1286
- Malt for Animals, 2R. [174] 4
- Mount St. Bernard's Reformatory, [176] 18, 235

Berwick-upon-Tweed Election Petition
- Select Committee *Mar* 9 :— Robert Longfield, esquire (Chairman); the hon. F. Leveson Gower; William Pollard-Urquhart, esquire; James Banks Stanhope, esquire; Charles Turner, esquire (Lancashire)
- Report of the Select Committee *Mar* 14
- "That William Walter Cargill, esq., is duly elected"
  - Minutes of Evidence (*Parl. P.* No. 127)

Bewicke, Mr., Case of
- Question, Mr. H. Berkeley; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 11, [173] 464
- Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 29, To leave out "That" and add "this House will, upon Monday next, resolve itself into a Committee, to consider of an Address to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to direct adequate compensation to be made to William Bewicke, of Threepwood Hall, &c." (*Mr. H. Berkeley*), [174] 1917
- After debate, Question put, "That the words &c." A. 118, N. 120; M. 2

[*cont.*

Bewicke, Mr., Case of—cont.

Question proposed, That the words, "This House will, &c." be added, [174] 1937

Amendt. to the said proposed Amendt., by leaving out "this House" to the end of the said proposed Amendt., and add "is of opinion that a Select Committee should be appointed, to consider a Petition presented to this House by Mr. William Bewicke, of Threepwood Hall, in the county of Northumberland, on the 28th day of April, 1863, and to report its opinion to the House as to whether Mr. Bewicke is entitled to any and what compensation" (*Sir George Grey*); after short debate, Question put, "That the words, &c." A. 100, N. 148; M. 48

Question, That the words "is of opinion, &c." be added; put, and agreed to

Committee nominated *May* 6:— Sir David Dundas (Chairman), Sir Francis Baring, Sir John Trollope, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie, Mr. Henry Berkeley, Colonel Dunne, Mr. Liddell, Viscount Enfield, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Sir George Colthurst, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Scourfield, and Mr. Baillie Cochrane. *May* 26, Colonel Dunne disch., Lord John Manners added

Report of Select Committee *June* 17 (*Parl. P.* No. 395)

Question, Mr. H. Berkeley; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 5, [175] 23

Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (Ireland) Bill

(*Sir R. Peel, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 29 [Bill 38]
Read 2° * *Mar* 3
Committee*; Report *Mar* 7
Read 3° * *Mar* 8
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Steward*) *Mar* 10
Read 2ª * *Mar* 17 (No. 26)
Committee *; Report *Mar* 18
Read 3ª * *April* 5
Royal Assent *April* 28 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 7]

Black, Mr. A., *Edinburgh*

Bank Notes (Scotland), 2R. Amendt. [174] 1728, 1751
Bank of England Notes (Scotland), 2R. [176] 122
Caledonian, Edinburgh, and Glasgow, &c. Railway Companies, 2R. [173] 641
Copyright, Law of, [173] 563
Copyright (No. 2), Leave, [174] 503
Education, National (Ireland), Res. [176] 182
Paper Manufacture, Comm. moved for, [176] 1743
Rags, Duty on (Italy), [174] 1503
Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [176] 1427
Servants Hiring (Scotland), Comm. Amendt. [175] 1820
Supply—Public Education, [176] 544, 550

Blake, Mr. J. A., *Waterford City*

Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. [176] 81

[*cont.*

Blake, Mr. J. A.—*cont.*

Cattle Diseases Prevention, Re-Comm. *cl.* 6, [176] 1568
Education, National (Ireland), Res. [176] 123
Fisheries, Coast and Deep Sea, [173] 1250
Grand Juries (Ireland), [173] 1457; 2R. [174] 1379, 1396
Harbours of Refuge, Res. [174] 1674
Ireland—State of, Res. [173] 1842
Lunatic Asylums (Ireland), [176] 628, 637, 1709
Poor Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment, 2R. [176] 462
Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [175] 2103
Supply—Public Works (Ireland), [175] 1670, 1672;—Indian Department, Canada, 1884;—Governors, &c. West Indies, &c. 1885;—Pitcairn Islanders, Norfolk Island, 1890
United States—The Barque "Science," [175] 24; [176] 1622
Victoria—Expulsion of Ticket-of-Leave Men, [175] 1729
Weights and Measures (Metric System), Comm. *cl.* 2, [175] 6

Bleaching and Dyeing Works Act Extension Bill

c. Ordered *June* 28; read 1° * *June* 29
Read 2° *July* 11 [Bill 181]
Committee *; Report *July* 14
Considered as amended* *July* 15
Read 3° * *July* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 19
Read 2ª * *July* 22 (No. 213)
Committee *; Report *July* 23
Read 3ª * *July* 25
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 98]

Blencowe, Mr. J. G., *Lewes*

Beckenham, Lewes, and Brighton Railway, 2R. [173] 639

Boiler Explosion Bill

(*Mr. Ferrand, Colonel Edwards*)

c. Ordered* *May* 3; read 1° * *May* 4 [Bill 89]
Bill withdrawn * *May* 30

Bonham-Carter, Mr. J., *Winchester*

Executions, Public, Papers moved for, [173] 954
Private Bills, Res. 1, [173] 662

Borough Franchise Bill

(*Mr. Baines, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Scholefield*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 15
Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Baines*) *May* 11, [175] 302 [Bill 47]
Previous Question put, "That that Question be now put" (*Mr. Cave*)
After long debate, A. 216, N. 272; M. 56
Division List, Ayes and Noes, 347

Borrowing Powers of Railway Companies

Question, The Earl of Donoughmore; Answer, Earl Granville *Mar* 1, [173] 1317

BOUVERIE, Rt. Hon. E. P., *Kilmarnock, &c.*
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. *cl.* 20, [176] 1866
Crawley, Col., Case of, Papers moved for, [174] 86
Education (Inspectors' Reports), Nomination of Comm. [175] 1084, 1086; Amendt. 1092
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 1873
Government Annuities—Mr. H. B. Sheridan—Privilege, Res. [174] 306
Indian Medical Service, 3R. [176] 2034
Poor Relief (Metropolis), Comm. Amendt. [176] 2043, 2056
Scotch Affairs, Administration of, Comm. moved for, [175] 1176
Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [176] 1430
Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2008, 2014
Tests Abolition (Oxford), Comm. [175] 1041
Uniformity Act Amendment, Leave, [175] 1383; 2R. [176] 1391, 1406
Writs Registration (Scotland), 2R. [175] 1503

BOVILL, Mr. W., *Guildford*
Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1599
Income Tax, Res. [175] 1756
United States—Seizure of the "Tuscaloosa," Res. [174] 1831

BOWYER, Sir G., *Dundalk*
Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. [176] 84
Condemned Pirates, Execution of the, [173] 497
Education (Inspectors' Reports), Nomination of Comm. [175] 997, 998
Inns of Court, Leave, [175] 283
Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, Leave, [173] 268; 2R. 581
Ladies Gallery, The, [176] 496
Malta—Constitution of, [173] 172;—Petition from, 565
Navy and Army Expenditure (1862-3), Comm. Res. [176] 1697
Partnership Law Amendment, 2R. [174] 1566
Private Bills, Res. 3, [173] 670, 671
St. Mary's Burial Ground, Sydenham, Comm. moved for, [174] 659
Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2134
Supply — Houses of Parliament, [175] 433, 435; — Nelson's Column, 853;— Consular Establishments, 1903, 1905, 1907;—Public Education, [176] 550; — Department of Science and Art, 559;—Royal Academy of Music, 1608

Bradford Reservoirs
174] Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, Sir George
Grey *Mar* 15, 11; Question, Mr. Ferrand;
Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 17, 185; Ob-
servations, Mr. Ferrand; Reply, Sir George
Grey *Mar* 18, 317; Question, Mr. Ferrand;
Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 8, 630;
Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer Sir George
Grey *April* 22, 1502; *Bradford and Shef-
field Reservoirs*, Question, Mr. Ferrand;
Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 28, 1773;
Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, Sir George
[*cont.*

Bradford Reservoirs—cont.
175] Grey *May* 27, 719; Observations, Mr.
176] Ferrand; debate thereon *July* 11, 1318;
Question, Mr. W. B. Ferrand; Answer, Sir
George Grey *July* 19, 1706; Question, Mr.
Ferrand; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 21,
1793; Question Mr Ferrand; Answer, Sir
George Grey *July* 26 2102; *Inundation at
Sheffield*, Question, Mr Roebuck; Answer,
Sir George Grey *Mar* 14, [173] 1909; Re-
port, Messrs. Rawlinson and Beardmore
(*Parl. P.* 290, 290-I)

BRADY, Mr. J., *Leitrim Co.*
Army Estimates — Military Education, [175] 228
Cattle Diseases Prevention, Re-Comm. *cl.* 6, [176] 1568
Chief Rents (Ireland), Comm. [175] 13
Indian Medical Service, Consid. *add. cl.* [176] 1902
Registration of Titles in Ireland, Address moved, [175] 744
Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2147
Supply—Public Education (Ireland), [176] 1350
Thames Conservancy, Lords Amendts. [176] 2155
Watching of Towns (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [173] 1718

Brazil
Case of Mr. Reeves, Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 12, [175] 367; Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 31, 913
Relations with, Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer,
173] Mr. Layard *Feb* 18, 716; Question, Mr.
Macaulay; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 3,
175] 18; Question, Sir Minto Farquhar; Answer,
176] Mr. Layard *July* 4, 706; Question, Mr. Ber-
nal Osborne; Answer, Viscount Palmerston
July 15, 1572; Observations, Mr. Bernal
Osborne and other hon. Members, 1626;
Reply, Viscount Palmerston *July* 18, 1636
Slave Trade, Observations, Lord Brougham; Reply, Earl Russell *June* 28, [176] 411; Question, Mr. Hardcastle; debate thereon *July* 12, 1377

Bribery Bill
(*Lord Brougham and Vaux*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 23 (No. 155)
Bill withdrawn* *July* 5

Bribery Bill
Question, Lord Cranworth; Answer, Lord Brougham *July* 5, [176] 821

Bribery at Elections Bill
(*Sir FitzRoy Kelly, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Whiteside*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 19 [Bill 227]

Bridges (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Greene, Mr. Waldron*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 15 [Bill 70]
Read 2° *April* 18
Committee* *April* 19, R.P.
Committee* *April* 20, R.P.
Committee* *April* 21 [No Report]

Bridges, Sir B. W., *Kent, E.*
Herne Bay, Hampton and Reculver Fishery, 2R. [175] 1635
Navy Estimates—Scientific Department, [173] 1313
Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 1007

Briggs, Mr., Murder of, on the North London Railway
Question, Mr. C. S. Butler; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 12, [176] 1389

Bright, Mr. J., *Birmingham*
Brazil—Slave Trade, Adj. moved, [176] 1380, 1383
China—Affairs of, Res. [175] 974
Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. *cl.* 2, [175] 1481
Death, Punishment of, Comm. moved for, [174] 2092, 2104
Denmark and Germany — The Conference, [175] 2034
Education (Inspectors' Reports), Nomination of Comm. [175] 1090
Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, Leave, [173] 271
Intoxicating Liquors, 2R. [175] 1402, 1411
Ireland—State of, Res. [173] 1879, 1891
Jersey—Laws of, [174] 203
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 26, [173] 1809
Navy Estimates—Wages of Artificers Abroad, [173] 1787, 1789
Partnership Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, [174] 2128 ; [175] 241
Police Rate (Edinburgh) — Clergy Stipends, [175] 362
Stansfeld, Mr., and the Greco Conspiracy, Res. [174] 273, 275
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [175] 428
Trespass (Ireland), Comm. [174] 955
United States—Neutrality in America, [173] 1924

Briscoe, Mr. J. I., *Surrey, W.*
Malt for Cattle, 2R. [173] 597
Poor Relief (Metropolis), Comm. [176] 2048
Street Music (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 467

British Museum, The Attendants at
Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis ; Answer, Mr. Walpole *July* 8, [176] 1194
Supply — £92,127, for British Museum (*Mr. Walpole*) *July* 11, [176] 1356 ; after debate, Vote agreed to.

British North American Provinces, Federal Union of the
Question, Mr. Hopwood ; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 30, [175] 803 ; Question, Sir John Walsh ; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 19, [176] 1708

British Provident Society, see *Government Annuities Bill*

Brokers Bonds and Rents Bill
l. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}" (*Lord Taunton*) *June* 28, [176] 408
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Six Months") (*Lord Kingsdown*), 409
After debate, on Question, That ("now") &c., Resolved in the Negative ; Bill to be read 2^{a} on this Day Six Months

Brougham, Lord
Attorneys and Solicitors Remuneration, 2R. [176] 12
Brazilian Slave Trade, [176] 411, 414
Bribery at Elections, 1R. [176] 140, 821
County Courts Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 566 ; Petition, 1824, 1917
Cuba Slave Trade, [176] 1613, 1616 ;—General Dulce, Explanation, 1781
Denmark and Germany — The Prussians in Jutland, [175] 615 ;—The Conference, [176] 332 ;—Vote of Censure, Res. 1110
Education, Middle Class, [175] 697, 698
Hill, Sir Rowland, Address moved, [175] 1704
Hypothec, Law of, [175] 881
Jamaica—Affairs of, Papers moved for, [175] 1122
Land, Improvement of, Comm. [175] 1828
Middle Class Schools, [176] 1877
Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia), Comm. [176] 1700
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Comm. [175] 1339 ; Commons Amendts. [176] 1446
Public and Refreshment Houses, Report, *cl.* 9, [176] 1314
Public Schools, 2R. [175] 1250
Railway Carriages, Offences in, [176] 1439
Slave Trade in the Pacific, [176] 1700
United States—Enlistment of Irish Immigrants, Papers moved for, [175] 1445
Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [176] 1785
West Riding of Yorkshire Assizes, Address moved, [175] 1618

Browne, Lord J. T., *Mayo Co.*
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1390
Law Life Assurance Company, [175] 754
Medical Officers in Unions (Ireland), Res. [175] 156
Tobacco Juice for Sheep Dressing, [174] 629

Bruce, Rt. Hon. Lord E. A., *Marlborough*
St. Michael and St. George, Order of, [176] 2019
Traffic of the City of London, [176] 1623

Bruce, Rt. Hon. H. A. († Under Secretary for the Home Department: *afterwards* Vice President of the Committee of Council for Education), *Merthyr Tydvil*
Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Amendment, 2R. [176] 1364
†Cattle Diseases Prevention, [173] 1455 ; 2R. 1740 ; Comm. *cl.* 6, [176] 1569, 1570
†Cattle, &c., Importation, Nomination of Comm. [174] 389, 390
Charity Commissioners, Comm. moved for, [175] 1866

[*cont.*

Bruce, Rt. Hon. H. A.—*cont.*
  †Children Employment Commissioners, [173] 561
  Education—Minutes of Council on Endowed Schools, [175] 189, 190, 191;—Supplementary Rules, 259;—The Revised Code, 365;—Withdrawal of Minutes, 366;—Inspectors' Reports, Comm. moved for, 382, 1543, 1544;—Endowed Schools, Res. 1079, 1083;—Science Certificates, 1837
  Education (Scotland), [175] 1592
  Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [175] 1708; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1940, 1941, 1947; Adj. moved, 1948
  †Intoxicating Liquors, Leave, [173] 1814
  Supply—Privy Council Office, [175] 1334;—County Roads, South Wales, 1675;—Charity Commission, 1676;—Public Education, [176] 516;—Department of Science and Art, 559, 562, 565
  †Turnpike Trusts, Nomination of Comm. [174] 501
  Vaccination Act, [175] 1640
  †Vaccination of Sheep, [174] 1977; [175] 193

Bruce, Sir H. H., *Coleraine*
  Ireland—State of, Res. [173] 1858;—The Constabulary, [174] 184, 304;—The Regium Donum, [176] 824
  Lisburn Election, Res. [174] 858
  Medical Officers in Unions (Ireland), Res. [175] 155
  Poor Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment, 2R. [176] 465
  Poor Rates (Ireland), Res. [175] 143, 147
  Supply—Non-conforming, &c. Ministers in Ireland, [176] 400
  Watching of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1706, 1710, 1720

Bruce, Major C. L. Cumming, *Elgin & Nairnshire*
  Education, Res. [173] 1683
  Supply—Houses of Parliament, [175] 430, 434;—Civil Contingencies, [176] 658
  Valuation of Lands, &c. (Scotland) Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 1434

Buccleuch, Duke of
  Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, 2R. [176] 1787
  Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [175] 617, 630

Buchanan, Mr. W., *Glasgow*
  Administration of Trusts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [176] 424; *cl.* 10, 426
  Bank Notes (Scotland), 2R. [174] 1747
  Caledonian, Edinburgh, and Glasgow, &c. Railway Companies, 2R. Amendt. [173] 640
  Customs and Inland Revenue, Consid. Schedule A, [174] 2015
  Government Annuities, Nomination of Comm. [174] 1481
  Partnership Law Amendment, 2R. [174] 1567; Comm. 2126; *cl.* 3, 2127; *cl.* 4, Amendt. [175] 242, 243
  Supply—Royal Parks, &c., [175] 424

Buckingham and Chandos, Duke of
  Railway Construction Facilities, 2R. Amendt. [176] 949

Buckley, Lieut. Gen. E. P. *Salisbury*
  Park Lane, South Entrance to, [175] 363
  Volunteer Drill Instructors, [174] 969

Bulkeley, Sir R., *Anglesey*
  Egham Railway Accident, [176] 335

Buller, Sir A. W., *Devonport*
  Controller of the Navy—Devonport Election, [173] 1399, 1409, 1411
  Navy—Labourers in the Dockyards, [174] 1080

Burghley, Lord, *Northampton, N.*
  Denmark and Germany—The Conference, [176] 655

Burial Grounds
  Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 12, [174] 872

Burials Registration Bill
  (*Mr. Bovill, Mr. Macaulay, Mr. Walter*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 30 [Bill 126]
  Read 2°* *June* 3
  Committee*; Report *June* 13
  Read 3°* *June* 20
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl of Powis*) *June* 21 (No. 144)
  Read 2ª* *July* 7
  Committee* *July* 18; Report* *July* 21
  Read 3ª* *July* 22
  Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 97]

Burial Service, The
  Question, Lord Ebury; Answer, The Archbishop of Canterbury *June* 17, [175] 1928
  Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying for the Appointment of a Commission to consider what steps should be taken to obviate the evils complained of as arising from the present compulsory and indiscriminate Use of the Burial Service of the Church of England" (*Lord Ebury*) *July* 11, [176] 1306
  After short debate, Motion withdrawn

Burke, Sir T. J., *Galway Co.*
  Law Life Assurance Company, [175] 766

Bury, Viscount (Treasurer of the Household), *Wick, &c.*
  Army Estimates—Surveys, [175] 233

Butler, Mr. C. S., *Tower Hamlets*
  Murder on the North London Line, [176] 1389
  Poor Relief (Metropolis), Comm. [176] 2053

Butt, Mr. I., *Youghal*
  Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. [176] 91
  Belfast, Borough of, Paper moved for, [174] 1075
  Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1593; Comm. *cl.* 12, [176] 30; Res. 97, 297
  Chief Rents (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1400

[*cont.*

BUTT, Mr. I.—*cont.*
Civil Bill Courts (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [174] 1556, 1557
Costs Security, 2R. [175] 1811, 1814
Education, National (Ireland), Res. [176] 216
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1397
Greek Loan, 3R. [176] 571
Law and Equity Courts (Ireland), [174] 876
Lisburn Election, Comm. moved for, [174] 1426, 1431
Registration of Titles in Ireland, Address moved, [175] 744
Street Music (Metropolis), 2R. [175] 1530, 1531; Adj. moved, 1532; Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 474; Adj. moved, 477
Supply—Public Works (Ireland), [175] 1670; Amendt. 1671, 1673;—Landed Estates Record Offices, 1677;—Report, Amendt. 1912, 2024; — Special Missions, Amendt. [176] 397
Trespass (Ireland), Comm. [174] 1755
United States—Case of Mr. J. M'Hugh, [176] 159

BUXTON, Mr. C., *Maidstone*
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c., [175] 206
Denmark and Germany — Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1250
Gaol Dietary, [173] 1754
Herne Bay, Hampton and Reculver Fishery, 2R. [175] 1635
Intoxicating Liquors, 2R. [175] 1418
Japan — Bombardment of Kagosima, Res. [173] 335, 389, 422; Explanations, 717, 1370
Navy Estimates—Scientific Departments, [173] 1311
New Zealand—War in, Papers moved for, [174] 1633
Paper Manufacture, Comm. moved for, [176] 1733
Supply—Department of Science and Art, [176] 564
Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [174] 146
Weights and Measures (Metric System), [173] 2R. 1739

CAIRD, Mr. J., *Stirling, &c.*
Administration of Trusts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [176] 423, 424
Agricultural Statistics, Res. [175] 1362, 1367, 1376, 1377, 1382
Bank Acts (Scotland), Comm. Res. [173] 472
Cattle Diseases Prevention, 2R. [173] 1750; Re-Comm. *cl.* 6, [176] 1568
Corn, Duty on, [174] 1201
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 616
Fisheries, Coast and Deep Sea, [173] 1250
Herring Fisheries (Scotland), [173] 561
Ireland—State of, Res. [173] 1867
Lunacy (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 422
Malt for Cattle, Leave, [173] 231; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1218
Peru—The Chincha Islands, [176] 1575
Police Rate (Edinburgh)—Clergy Stipends, [175] 361
Scottish Affairs, Administration of, Comm. moved for, [175] 1174
[*cont.*

CAIRD, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Sewage (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [174] 1699
Servants Hiring (Scotland), Comm. [175] 1821
Supply—County Roads, South Wales, [175] 1675
United States—Neutrality in America, [173] 1929

CAIRNS, Sir H. M., *Belfast*
Belfast, Borough of, Paper moved for, [174] 1074, 1075
Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension, 2R. [176] 1364
Brazil—Relations with, [176] 1640
Denmark and Germany—The Danish Papers, [173] 334
Education, National (Ireland), [174] 12, 13; [175] 25; Res. 1761; [176] 207, 209, 225, 226, 229, 232, 233
Factory Acts Extension, Comm. [175] 1946
India—Banda and Kirwee Booty, Address moved, [175] 736
Inland Revenue, Consid. [176] 817
Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties), Consid. [176] 402
Lisburn Election, [174] 463
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Lords Amendts. [176] 567
Private Bills—Standing Order, [175] 1139, 1142
United States—Vessels "El Tousson" and "El Monassia," Papers moved for, [173] 987, 999, 1007; Seizure of the "Tuscaloosa," Res. [174] 1850

CAITHNESS, Earl of
Chain Cables and Anchors, Comm. [175] 1826

Caledonian, Edinburgh, and Glasgow, and Scottish Central Railway Companies Bill, by Order
c. Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°," *Feb* 16, [173] 640; Amendment, to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Buchanan*); after short debate, Question "That 'now' &c.," put, and negatived; Words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to; Bill put off for six months

CAMBRIDGE, Duke of (Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief)
Crawley, Col., Court Martial on—Deputy Judge Advocate, [173] 1164, 1174
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan) 2R. [176] 1992
Park Lane, Crowded State of, [175] 1236

CAMPBELL, Lord
Anderson, Rev. F., Papers moved for, [175] 1225, 1230
Army—Military Commissioners in North America, [173] 856
Denmark and Germany — Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 550; Res. [174] 772, 785
Poland, Condition of, [174] 1862; Res. [175] 177, 187
Public Schools, 3R. [175] 1831

Canada
- *Manufactured Goods, Duty on,* Question, Mr. Aytoun; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 28, [174] 1770
- *Defences of Quebec,* Question, Mr. Adderley; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *June* 30, [176] 494, see *Army*
- *British Troops in*— Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 27, "That in the opinion of this House it is inexpedient that detachments of British troops should be stationed upon exposed posts on the Canadian frontier unless adequately supported by Canadian Forces" (*Mr. Adderley*), [176] 373

Canterbury, Archbishop of
- Burial Service, [175] 1929; Commission moved for, [176] 1307, 1311
- Church Services (Apocrypha), 2R. Amendt. [175] 1930
- Collegiate Schools, Facilities for Divine Worship in, 2R. [176] 145
- Convocation, Powers of—Essays and Reviews, [176] 1549, 1552, 1558
- Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Papers moved for, [173] 163
- Public Schools, 2R. [175] 1256
- Regius Professorship of Greek (Oxford), Comm. [175] 454
- Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [175] 623

Cape Race, Fog Signals at
- Question, Mr. Dawson; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Feb* 9, [173] 321

Cape of Good Hope
- *British Kaffraria,* Question, Mr. Arthur Mills; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 25, [176] 2018
- *Kaffir War,* Question, Mr. S. Western; Answer, 176] Mr. Cardwell *July* 21, 1806; Question, Mr. Warner; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 22, 1905; Question, Lord Robert Cecil; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 25, 2019

Cardwell, Right Hon. E. (Secretary of State for the Colonies), *Oxford City*
- Army Estimates — Military Education, [175] 227
- Ashantee, War in, [175] 257, 548; Res. 2010
- British American Provinces, Union of the, [175] 803
- Canada—Duty on Manufactured Goods, [174] 1771;—British Troops in, [175] 1731; [176] 378, 381, 383;—Defences of Quebec, 494;—North American Colonies, 1708
- Cape of Good Hope—Kaffir War, [176] 1806, 1906, 2019;—British Kaffraria, 2018
- Ceylon—Military Expenditure, [175] 1261
- Colonial Possessions, Annual Report on, [176] 155
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. *cl.* 20, [176] 1865
- Gold Coast—Forts on the, [176] 1710
- Governors of Colonies, Pensions to, [174] 1948; [175] 459; Papers moved for, [176] 431
- Halifax and Quebec Railway, [175] 100

[*cont.*

Cardwell, Right Hon. E.—*cont.*
- Head, Sir F. B., Services of, Res. [176] 1335
- Hudson's Bay Company, [175] 1061;—Territory, Papers moved for, [176] 625
- Ionian Islands—State of the, [175] 634;—Officials in the, 803
- Lagos—Colony of, [175] 1456
- Malta—Docks at, [176] 158
- New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), [175] 1261; Comm. Res. 1690, 1695, 1697; 2R. [176] 1489, 1496, 1497, 1504, 1522; Comm. 1685; *cl.* 1, 1693, 1694; *cl.* 2, 1695; 3R. 1869
- New Zealand—War in, Papers moved for, [174] 1641, 1650; [175] 1263; [176] 1469, 1907, 2104
- Passports in France, [176] 1652
- Russo-American Telegraph, [175] 803
- St. Michael and St. George, Order of, [176] 2019
- Sierra Leone—Case of Mr. Fitzjames, [176] 2104
- Supply—Convict Establishment Colonies, [175] 1690;—Bermuda, 1882;—Governors, &c., West Indies, &c., 1887; — West Coast of Africa, 1888, 1890; [176] 1662, 1667, 1671, 1680;—Emigration, [175] 1893, 1895
- Tasmania—Gold in, [174] 1625
- United States—Outrages of the Sioux Indians, [174] 2054;—Cruisers of the Belligerents, 2055
- Vancouver's Island, [176] 1903
- Victoria—Expulsion of Ticket-of-Leave Men, [175] 1730
- Ways and Means—Sugar Duties, Report, [174] 1166, 1173

Carlisle, Bishop of
- Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [175] 630

Carnarvon, Earl of
- Convict George Hall, Papers moved for, [174] 861, 864, 869
- Denmark and Germany — Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 308;—The Conference, [174] 1417; [175] 176;—Vote of Censure, Res. [176] 1158
- Japan, Res. [176] 607
- Needlewomen of London, Report of Commission, [175] 1834
- Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, 2R. [175] 892; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1343; Report, *cl.* 4, 1937; Commons Amendt. [176] 1444
- Penal Servitude, Returns moved for, [173] 920
- Public Schools, 2R. [175] 1242, 1243, 1258, 1260
- Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [173] 459
- Rape, Punishment of, Comm. *cl.* 1, [174] 960, 961; Res. Amendt. 1281, 1282
- Regius Professorship of Greek (Oxford), 2R. [174] 1767; Comm. Amendt. [175] 450
- Supply—Lunatic Asylum, Isle of Man, [175] 862;—Land, &c., Kensington Gore, 866
- Townley, The Convict, Postponement of Motion, [173] 169
- United States—British and American Claims, Returns moved for, [173] 618, 624, 628, 629, 634; — Correspondence with the Federal Government, [173] 1060
- Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [176] 1785

CARNEGIE, Hon. C., *Forfarshire*
- Army Estimates—Clothing, [174] 833, 835
- Hypothec, Law of, [174] 1978
- Privilege, [174] 1959
- Scotch Affairs, Administration of, Comm. moved for, [175] 1192
- Supply—Royal Parks, &c. [175] 419
- Writs Registration (Scotland), 2R. [175] 1500

CARTER, Mr. J. BONHAM-, *Winchester*
- Public Lands and Buildings (Local Rates), Res. [174] 499

Casual Poor (*Metropolis*) *Bill*
- Observations, Mr. Harvey Lewis, and other hon. Members, 1799; Reply, Mr. T. J. Miller *July* 21, [176] 1800

Cathedral Minor Corporations Bill [H.L.]

(*The Archbishop of York*)

l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 23 (No. 157)
Read 2ª* *June* 28
Committee*; Report *July* 1 (No. 166)
Read 3ª* *July* 4
c. Read 1°* *July* 18 [Bill 220]
Read 2°* *July* 19
Committee*; Report *July* 20
Read 3°* *July* 21
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 70]

Cattle Diseases Prevention Bill [Bill 27]

Cattle, &c. Importation Bill [Bill 28]

(*Mr. Bruce, Sir George Grey*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 19
- Motion, "That the Cattle Diseases Prevention Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. H. A. Bruce*) *Mar* 9, [173] 1740
- After long debate, Motion agreed to; Bill read 2°; and Cattle, &c. Importation Bill read 2°
- After short debate, Ordered, That these Bills be committed to the same Committee *Mar* 18, [174] 389
- Committee:—Mr. Bruce (Chairman), Lord Naas, Mr. Caird, Mr. Leader, Mr. Miller, Mr. Leslie, Mr. Hodgkinson, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Thompson, Colonel Barttelot, Mr. Holland, Mr. Bentinck, Mr. Cox, Sir William Miles, Mr. Alderman Salomons, Mr. Algernon Egerton, and Sir Thomas Burke. Mr. J. Ewart and Mr. Beecroft added *April* 8. Mr. Bruce disch., Mr. Baring (Chairman) added *May* 27
- Report of Select Comm. *June* 27 (No. 431)
- *Cattle Diseases, &c. Bill* re-comm. [Bill 175]
- Considered in Committee (on re-comm.) *July* 15, [176] 1567
- Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Monsell*), 1507; the Committee divided; A. 24, N. 39; M. 15; after short debate, Committee report progress; to sit again this day month
- *Cattle, &c. Importation Bill* withdrawn *June* 27

CAVE, Mr. S., *New Shoreham*
- *Borough Franchise, 2R. previous Question moved, [175] 302, 342
- Chain Cables and Anchors, 2R. [173] 691; Comm. *cl.* 2, [174] 512; *cl.* 8, 514
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Schedule A, [174] 2003
- Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 601
- Government Annuities, 3R. [175] 2041
- Harbours of Refuge, Res. [174] 1666
- Ionian Islands—Papers moved for, [174] 387
- London, &c. Docks Amalgamation, 2R. [175] 1387
- Oyster Dredging at Beachy Head, [175] 1457, 1458
- Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Leave, [173] 758, 761, 762; Consid. *add. cl.* [174] 1963
- Slave Trade, [173] 1191;—The "Castilla," &c. [175] 2026
- Supply—Governors, &c. West Indies, &c. [175] 1885, 1887;—Emigration, 1895;—Captured Negroes, &c. 1897, 1898;—Consular Establishments, 1900;—Post Office Packet Service, [176] 1654, 1658
- Tickets-of-Leave—Penal Servitude, [173] 1073
- United States—Clearance of British Ships at New York, [176] 385
- West India Mails, [174] 1421, 1548

CAVENDISH, Lord G. H., *Derbyshire, N.*
- Valuation of Lands, &c. (Scotland), Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 1426

CECIL, Lord R. T. G., *Stamford*
- Army Estimates, [173] 1337
- Austrian Fleet, The, [174] 1979
- Canada—British Troops in, [176] 381
- Cape of Good Hope—Kaffir War, [176] 2019
- Denmark and Germany—Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 217, 500;—The Danish Papers, 324, 334, 335, 861, 871;—Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, [175] 165;—The Conference, 1289;—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 842, 962
- Education, Res. [173] 1677;—Report of Inspectors of Schools, Res. [174] 897, 905, 906;—Resignation of Mr. Lowe, 1211;—Supplementary Rules, [175] 259;—The Revised Code, 365;—Inspectors' Reports, Comm. moved for, 389, 393, 465; Nomination of Comm. 985, 1000, 1091, 1543;—Res. [176] 2079
- Government Annuities—Mr. H. B. Sheridan—Privilege, Res. [174] 309
- Greek Loan, Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 404; Adj. moved, 406
- Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [173] 838, 839
- Morell, Mr., Dismissal of, [174] 478
- Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia), Comm. [176] 2058
- New Zealand—War in, Papers moved for, [174] 1650
- Poor Relief (Metropolis), Comm. [176] 2048
- Private Bills, Res. 1, Amendt. [173] 647, 654, 662; Res. 7, 678
- Private Bills, Committees on, Res. [175] 1545, 1552, 1553, 1556, 1573
- Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for

[cont.

CECIL, Lord R. T. G.—*cont.*
[176] 1463; Report, 2007; Amendt. 2011, 2013
Stansfeld, Mr., and the Greco Conspiracy, Res. [174] 277
Starvation in the Metropolis, Cases of, [173] 1758, 1821
Supply—Public Education, [176] 523
Tests Abolition (Oxford), Comm. [175] 1029, 1034; 3R. [176] 670
United States—Correspondence with the Federal Government, [173] 498;—Capture of British Ships, Papers moved for, 515;—Vessels "El Tousson" and "El Monassia," Papers moved for, 977, 980, 982; [174] 1202;—Seizure of the "Tuscaloosa," [173] 1069;—Neutrality in America, 1926;—Outrage on a British Subject, [174] 1504;—Confederate Ship "Georgia," [175] 505
Ways and Means, Res. [174] 1551

Ceylon, Military Expenditure of
Question, Mr. Lyall; Answer, Mr. Cardwell, [175] 1261

Chain Cables and Anchors
Question, Mr. Laird; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *April* 5, [174] 479
Proof Certificates, Question, Mr. Laird; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Feb* 26, [173] 187
Messrs. Brown, Lennox & Co., Question, Mr. Laird; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Mar* 4, [173] 1458

Chain Cables and Anchors Bill
(*Mr. Layard, Sir James Elphinstone*)
c. Considered in Committee*; Bill ordered *Feb* 9
Read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 9]
173] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Laird*) *Feb* 17, 682; after debate, Motion agreed to
Bill read 2° *Feb* 17
. Committee—Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Laird*) *Mar* 2, 1360; Amendt. To leave out from "That," and add "the Bill be committed to a Select Committee" (*Mr. Milner Gibson*)
Question, "That the words, &c." negatived; Words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to; Ordered, "That the Bill be committed to a Select Committee"
Committee nominated *Mar* 9:—Mr. Laird, Mr. Milner Gibson, Sir James Elphinstone, Sir Frederick Smith, Mr. George Bentinck, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Richard Hodgson, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Lindsay
Report* *Mar* 15; Bill re-committed [Bill 46]
174] Considered in Committee *April* 6, 503
. *cl.* 1, (Board of Trade to grant licenses), 503; Amendt. (*Mr. Humberston*); after debate, Amendt. negatived; *cl.* agreed to
. *cl.* 2, (Resident inspector to be appointed), 508; Amendt. to omit "resident;" after short debate, Amendt. agreed to; *cl.* agreed to
cl. 3 to 7 agreed to, with Amendments
. *cl.* 8, (After 1st July, 1865, unlawful to sell unproved chain cables and anchors), 512; Amendt. (*Mr. Humberston*); after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; *cl.* agreed to
[*cont.*

Chain Cables and Anchors Bill—cont.
174] *cl.* 9, (Certain offences misdemeanours); after short debate, *cl.* agreed to, 515
c. *cl.* 10 agreed to
Bill reported
Considered as amended* *April* 18 and re-comm.
175] Committee (*on re-comm.*)*; Report *May* 11, 103
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 23
Considered as amended* *May* 26
Read 3°* *May* 27
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl of Hardwicke*) *May* 30
. Read 2ª after short debate *June* 10, 1534
. Committee; Report *June* 16, 1826
Read 3ª* *June* 21
Royal Assent *June* 23 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 27]
Parl. Papers—*Commons* . . . Bill 9
As amended by Select Committee Bill 46
As amended on Re-Comm. . . Bill 103
Lords . . . . . No. 101

Chairman of Committees (LORDS)
The Lord Redesdale appointed, *Nemine Dissentiente*, to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session *Feb* 4

CHANCELLOR, The LORD (Lord Westbury)
Admiralty Lands and Works, Comm. *cl.* 14, [175] 1351
Attorneys and Solicitors Remuneration, 2R. [176] 5, 18
Augmentation of Benefices Act, Return, [173] 617, 618, 1241
Chancery, Court of (Despatch of Business), 1R. [173] 1452
Charitable Assurances Enrolments, 2R. [174] 721
Clerks of the Peace, [173] 709
Collegiate Schools, Facilities for Divine Worship in, 2R. [176] 146, 150; 3R. 1368
Convict George Hall, Papers moved for, [174] 864
Convocation, Powers of—Essays and Reviews, [176] 1544, 1552, 1565
County Courts Act Amendment, 1R. [175] 85, 98; 2R. 437, 583, 585, 1454, 1916
Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Papers moved for, [173] 168
Improvement of Land, 2R. [174] 1283; Comm. [175] 1827
Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, Select Comm. moved for, [174] 3
Judgments, &c. Law Amendment, 3R. [176] 2084
Land Securities Company, 2R. [174] 1279
Land Transfer Act, [174] 1406, 1407, 1416
Legal Process, [173] 1754
Mortgage Debentures, Comm. [175] 1051; *cl.* 32, 1053
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, [175] 1347, 1349
Prorogation, The [176] 2156, 2184, 2188
Public and Refreshment Houses, Report, [176] 1316
Rape, Punishment of, 2R. [174] 861; Comm. *cl.* 1, 960, 961; Report, 1281; 3R. 1758
Regius Professorship of Greek (Oxford), 1R. [174] 720; 2R. 1760, 1762; Comm. [175] 448, 451, 452, 454, 558, 560, 563
Settled Estates Act Amendment, 2R. [174] 535
[*cont.*

CHANCELLOR, The Lord—*cont.*
- United States—The Law of Prize, [174] 1614, 1617
- West Hartlepool Railway Directors, [173] 1180
- West Riding of Yorkshire Assizes, Address moved, [175] 1623, 1624

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone), *Oxford University*
- Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 131, 132
- African Traders, Company of, [175] 2026
- Army—Rating of Officers of Chelsea Hospital, Address moved, [175] 199
- Bank Act, 1844, [175] 460 ; Comm. Res. 605
- Bank Acts (Scotland), Comm. Res. [173] 467, 471, 472, 474, 798, 1825
- Bank Notes (Scotland), 2R. [174] 1738, 1751, 1977
- Bank of England Notes (Scotland), Leave, [175] 603 ; 2R. [176] 117
- Bewicke, Mr., Case of, Comm. moved for, [174] 1935, 1938
- *Borough Franchise, 2R. [175] 312
- Business of the House, [174] 1776, 1777
- China—Affairs of, [175] 539
- Collection of Taxes, Leave, [173] 234, 240, 241 ; 2R. 616 ; [174] 321 ; Re-Comm. [175] 1471, 1477 ; *cl.* 2, 1479, 1482 ; *cl.* 12, 1483, 1484 ; 3R. 2089, 2090, 2094, 2100, 2101
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. [176] 1857, 1859
- Corn, Duty on, [174] 1202
- Court of Chancery (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1378
- Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [174] 1552, 1555 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1860 ; Amendt. 1861 ; Consid. 1980, 1981 ; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1982 ; *cl.* 12, 1983 ; Schedule A. 2018 ; Amendt. 2023
- Denmark and Germany—Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 869, 876 ;—The Conference, [175] 2030 ;— Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 751, 752, 773, 1004, 1006 ; Explanation, 1196
- Education (Inspectors' Reports), Nomination of Comm. [175] 1086
- Education, National (Ireland), Res. [176] 219, 229, 233
- Epping Forest, Papers moved for, [175] 1206
- Expenditure without Account, [174] 14
- Financial Statement, [173] 1254 ;—Ways and Means, Comm. Res. [174] 536, 616, 618
- Fire Insurance, [174] 1174
- Garibaldi, General, Departure of [174] 1423, 1426
- Governors of Colonies, Papers moved for, [176] 429
- Government Annuities, Leave, [173] 478, 480, 796, 1369 ; Comm. 1526, 1528, 1549, 1550, 1591, 1605, 1611, 1658, 1761 ; Explanation, 1820 ; [174] 178 ;— Mr. H. B. Sheridan, Explanation, 191, 193, 194, 195, 197, 202, 210 ; Comm. 221, 223, 224, 234, 247, 250 ; —Privilege, Res. 305, 311, 314, 316, 800, 806, 808 ; Nomination of Comm. 1473, 1474, 1479, 1481 ; 3R. [175] 2041
- Greece, King of, Annuity to, Res. [176] 360
- Greek Loan, Comm. Res. [175] 1527 ; Report, 1606 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 404, 406, 407, 408 ; 3R. 568, 570

[*cont.*

CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER—*cont.*
- Harbours of Refuge, [173] 1359 ; Res. [174] 1697
- Holyhead Harbour — Vessels wrecked, &c. ; Return moved for, [173] 425
- Income Tax Commissioners of Blything, [176] 32, 33
- Income Tax Deductions, [176] 515
- Income Tax, The, [173] 216 ; [174] 971 ; Res. [175] 1750
- Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties), Comm. [176] 281 ; *cl.* 9, 282 ; *cl.* 10, 283 ; Consid. 400, 401, 403, 817
- Ionian Islands—Papers moved for, [174] 377, 381 ;—Annexation to Greece, [176] 1581
- Ireland—Taxation of, Comm. moved for, [173] 1213
- Life Annuities and Life Assurances, 2R. [174] 719
- Life Annuities and Life Assurances [Deficiency of Assets, &c.], Comm. Res. [175] 695
- Mails in the Provinces, Comm. moved for, [174] 415, 417
- Malt, Duty on, Res. [176] 263
- Malt for Cattle, Leave, [173] 225, 232, 233 ; 2R. 609 ; Comm. 1046 ; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1052, 1218 ; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1218 ; *cl.* 6, 1219 ; *add. cl.* 1220, 1223, 1226
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 26, [173] 1812, 1814
- National Portrait Gallery, [174] 1624
- Navy and Army Expenditure (1862-3), Comm. Res. [176] 1696
- Navy Estimates—Wages of Artificers Abroad, [173] 1786, 1788
- Navy—Masters in the, Res. [175] 1215, 1218
- New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1475
- Paper Manufacture, Comm. moved for, [176] 1720, 1729, 1730, 1732, 1733
- Partnership Law Amendment, Comm. [175] 244
- Private Bills, Res. 3, [173] 668
- Public Lands and Buildings (Local Rate), Res. [174] 494, 497
- Public Schools Commission, Res. [175] 127
- Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) [Advances], Comm. Res. [176] 1698
- Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [175] 2106
- Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford, Stipend of, [173] 1758
- Spirit Duties, Res. [175] 825, 833, 835
- Stamp Duties—Orders on Bankers, [176] 160
- Stamp on Proxy Papers, Res. [173] 1461 ; [174] 971
- Stansfeld, Mr., and the Greco Conspiracy, Res. [174] 278
- Street Music (Metropolis), 2R. [175] 1531 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 475
- Supply—The Scheldt Toll, [173] 1792 ;—Civil Services, [174] 292 ;—Civil Service Estimates, [175] 410 ;—Royal Palaces, 412 ;—Repair of Furniture, 417 ;—Houses of Parliament, 430, 434 ;—Paymaster General, 1604 ; —Printing and Stationery, 1679 ;—Postage of Public Departments, 1681 ; Report, 2024 ; —British Museum, [176] 1360, 1362 ;—National Gallery, 1526 ;—Gallery of Portraits, 1532 ;—Royal Academy of Music, 1601, 1604, 1608 ;—Superannuation, Customs, &c. 1609
- Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, [174] 958, 959 ; Res. 1029, 1037
- Taxation, Comm. moved for, [175] 275
- Taxation and Expenditure, [173] 476

[*cont.*

CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER—*cont.*
Taxes, Collection of, [174] 17
Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [174] 127
Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans), Comm. Res. [176] 660, 661, 662, 663
Tobacco Cultivation in Ireland, [173] 562
Tobacco Juice for Sheep Dressing, [174] 629
Warehousing of British Spirits, Leave, [173] 616 ; 2R. 1023 ; Comm. 1613
Ways and Means, Comm. Res. [174] 1057 ;—Sugar Duties, Res. 1172 ;—Fire Insurance Duty, 1431, 1447 ; Res. 1450, 1452 ; Report, [176] 1610
Weighing of Grain (Port of London), 2R. [176] 173
Yeomanry Cavalry, Res. [173] 1388

Chancery Fund Commissioners—Report of
Question, Mr. Murray ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 17, [174] 183
Report, *Parl. P.* No. [3280]

Chancery—Accountant General's Office
Question, Mr. Murray ; Answer, The Attorney General *April* 12, [174] 873

Channel Islands, Transportation of Convicts from
Question, Mr. Digby Seymour ; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 6, [175] 150

Charitable Assurances Enrolment Bill
(*Lord Cranworth*)
l. Read 1ª * *April* 7 (No. 38)
Read 2ª after short debate *April* 11, [174] 721
Committee* *April* 12
Report* *April* 14 (No. 49)
Read 3ª * *April* 15
c. Read 1° * *April* 19 [Bill 72]
Read 2° * *April* 21
Committee* ; Report *April* 25
Read 3° * *April* 26
Royal Assent *May* 13 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 13]

Charitable Estates and Trusts Acts
Motion for Returns (*Mr. Ferrand*) *Feb* 11, [173] 483
After debate, Motion amended, and agreed to (*Parl. P.* No. 83)

Charitable Trusts Fees Bill
(*Mr. Hankey, Sir Francis Goldsmid, Mr. G. Shaw Lefevre*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *May* 31 [Bill 128]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 18

Charity Commission — Salary of the Secretary
Question, Mr. Ferrand ; Answer, Mr. Lowe *Feb* 19, [173] 794 ; Explanation, Mr. Ferrand *Feb* 19, 798
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 16, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the construction, the expense, and the working of the Board of Charity Commissioners" (*Mr. Ferrand*), [175] 1841
After long debate, Question put, "That the words, &c." A. 116, N. 40 ; M. 76

CHELMSFORD, Lord
Attorneys and Solicitors Remuneration, 2R. [176] 15, 17
Brokers Bonds and Rents, 2R. [176] 410
China—Death of Lieut. Tinling, [173] 441, 453, 454
County Courts Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 437, 571, 585, 1455
Crawley, Colonel, Court Martial on—Deputy Judge Advocate, [173] 1165, 1895
Denmark and Germany—Vote of Censure, Res. [176] 1102, 1134
Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Papers moved for, [173] 168
Ireland—Agrarian Outrages, Res. [176] 491
Kertch and Yenikale Prize Money, [173] 1530, 1537, 1538, 1539
Land Transfer Act, [174] 1401
Legal Process, [173] 1754
Mhow Court Martial—Sir W. Mansfield, [174] 162
Navy—Retirement of Naval Captains, [174] 1492, 1498
Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, 2R. [176] 1787
Prorogation, The, [176] 2156
Public and Refreshment Houses, Report, [176] 1316
Railway Companies Powers, Commons Amendts. [176] 2156
Regius Professorship of Greek (Oxford), Comm. [175] 443
United States—Correspondence with the Federal Government, [173] 1058, 1059 ;—The Law of Prize, [174] 1595, 1617 ;—Steam Rams in the Mersey, Papers moved for, 1902

CHICHESTER, Earl of
Agrarian Offences (Ireland), Paper moved for, [175] 360
Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Papers moved for, [173] 166

Chief Rents (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Donoughmore*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *Feb* 26 (No. 15)
Read 2ª * *Mar* 3
Committee* ; Report *Mar* 10
Read 3ª * and passed *Mar* 11
c. Read 1° * *Mar* 16 [Bill 52]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Longfield*) *April* 20, [174] 1397
Amendt. to leave out "now," &c., and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir E. Grogan*)
After debate, Amendment withdrawn
Bill read 2°
Committee *May* 4, [175] 12
Clauses 1 to 11 considered ; Comm. R.P.
Committee* ; Report *May* 23
Re-comm.* ; Report *May* 26
Considered as amended* *June* 3
Read 3° * *June* 8
Royal Assent *June* 30 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 38]
Parl. Papers—*Lords* . . . . No. 15
As amended on Report . . No. 28
With Commons Amendts . . No. 156
Commons . . . Bill 52

Chief Rents (Ireland) [Stamps]
c. Resolutions in Committee * *May* 6
Reported *May* 19 ; re-comm.* *May* 23
Reported and agreed to *May* 26

Chigwell, Recreation Ground at
Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, Mr. Peel *May* 2, [174] 2023

CHILDERS, Mr. H. C. E. (†Lord of the Admiralty), *Pontefract*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [173] 1447
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 609
†Government Manufacturing Establishments, Res. [176] 1947, 1962, 1964
†Greenwich Hospital, Res. [175] 1155
Ionian Islands—Papers moved for, [174] 386
†Navy Estimates—Navy Establishments, [174] 2033, 2049
†Navy—Guns of the "Royal Sovereign," [175] 522;—Naval Stations in the Pacific, 1636
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Leave, [173] 776, 780
South Australia—Legislation of, [173] 1457
†Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2151
†United States—Confederate Steam Rams, [175] 808

Children Employment Commissioners
Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Feb* 15, [173] 561
Second and Third Reports, *Parl. P.* [3414]

Chimney Sweepers
Question, Mr. Digby Seymour; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 29, [174] 1940

Chimney Sweepers and Chimneys Regulation Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Shaftesbury*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *May* 10 (No. 76)
Read 2ª* *May* 27
Considered in Committee *June* 3, [175] 1123
Amendts. reported *June* 9, 1439 (No. 112)
new cl. (*Earl Grey*); after debate, withdrawn
Read 3ª* *June* 10
c. Read 1º* *June* 13 [Bill 148]
Read 2º* *June* 17
Committee*; Report *June* 24
Read 3º* *June* 27

CHINA
Affairs of, Question, Lord Naas; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 8, [173] 216; Observations, Mr. Liddell *Mar* 1, 1359; Question, Mr. Liddell; Answers, Mr. Layard, Viscount Palmerston *Mar* 7, 1543; Question, Mr. J. B. Smith; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 26, [175] 635: Resolution moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the policy of non-intervention, by force of arms, in the internal political affairs of Foreign Countries, which we profess to observe in our relations with the States of Europe and America, should be observed in our intercourse with the Empire of China" (*Mr. Cobden*) *May* 31, [175] 916; after long debate, Motion withdrawn
[*cont.*

CHINA—cont.
Anglo-Chinese Fleet, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Feb* 26, [173] 1182
Osborne's, Captain, Expedition, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 22, [173] 60
British Subjects in, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 23, [175] 588
Civil War in, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 22, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, further interference on the part of this Country in the Civil War in China is impolitic and unnecessary" (*Mr. Liddell*), [174] 1505; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" House counted out
Gordon's, Major, Appointment, Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 13, [175] 1639
Gordon, Major, and the Futai of Shanghai, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 18, [174] 1199
Gordon's, Major, Retirement, Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Mr. Layard *July* 8, [176] 1195
Hong Kong Ordinances, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 9, [175] 191
Lay, Mr., Question, Mr. Leslie; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 26, [173] 1184
Policy of European Powers, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 13, [175] 459; Observations, Mr. Baxter; Reply, Viscount Palmerston; long debate thereon *May* 20, 527
Railways in, Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 16, [175] 1836
Soochow, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 8, 215; Observations, Colonel Sykes; Reply, Viscount Palmerston; debate thereon *Mar* 4, [173] 1463
Tinling, Death of Lieutenant, Question, Lord Chelmsford; Answer, The Duke of Somerset; debate thereon *Feb* 11, [173] 441
Votes of Credit for, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Peel *June* 7, [175] 1352
White, Trial of George, at Shanghai, Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, The Attorney General *April* 28, [174] 1774

Parl. Papers—
Orders in Council . . . . . . No. 525
Correspondence—
„ Mr. Lay's Memorandum . . [3240]
„ Anglo-Chinese Fleet . . . [3271]
Papers, No. 3 (1864) . . . . . [3295]
Reports of Consuls, No. 4 . . . . [3302]
Memorials—Port of Rangoon, No. 5 . [3315]
Despatch—Treaty Rights, No. 6 . . [3345]
Correspondence—Col. Gordon, No. 7 [3408]
Prince Kung's Answer to Sir F. Bruce, No. 8 . . . . : . . . [3406]

Chincha Islands—see *Spain*

Church Building Acts
Question, Mr. F. S. Powell; Answer, Th Attorney General *May* 17, [175] 184

Church Building and New Parishes Acts Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered, after short debate; read 1° *April* 11, [174] 853 [Bill 61]
Order for Second Reading read *June* 9, [175] 1509
Motion, "That the said Order be discharged" (*Mr. Attorney General*)
After long debate, Question put, and agreed to
Order for Second Reading discharged; Bill withdrawn

Church of England Estates Bill
(*Mr. Henry Seymour, Mr. Alderman Copeland, Mr. Locke King, Mr. Henry Fenwick*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 30 [Bill 127]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 19

Church Rates Commutation Bill
(*Mr. Newdegate, Lord Robert Montagu*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 8]
Order for second reading read *April* 27
174] Observations, Mr. Hadfield; Reply, Mr. Speaker, 1700
. Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Newdegate*), 1701
Amendment to leave out "now," and add, "upon this day six months" (*Sir Charles Douglas*) *April* 27; after long debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.," A. 60, N. 160; M. 100; Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; second reading put off for six months
. Division List — Ayes and Noes, 1725

Church Services (Apocrypha) Bill [H.L.]
(*Viscount Gage*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 10 (No. 125)
175] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 17, 1930
. Amendt. to leave out "now" and insert "upon this day six months" (*Archbishop of Canterbury*)
After debate, Amendt. and original Motion withdrawn
Order for second reading discharged

CHURCHILL, Lord A. S., *Woodstock*
Ashantee—War in, Res. [175] 1984
Australian Postage, [176] 36, 1573
New Zealand—War in, Papers moved for, [174] 1652
Patent Offices—Fife House, [174] 182
Slave Trade on the East Coast of Africa, [173] 1902

Circassians—Emigration of the (Russia)
Question, Mr. Hennessy; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 19, [175] 517; Question, Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe; Answer, Earl Russell *June* 2, 1047
(*Turkey*)—Motion for an Address for Copy of further Papers showing what steps are being taken by the Turkish Government relating to the Immigration of Circassians into Turkey (*Mr. Henry Seymour*) *July* 25, [176] 2082; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Papers respecting, Parl. Paper . [3350]
Map . . . . [3350-1]

Civil Bill Courts (Ireland) Bill
[Original title, *County Courts (Ireland) Bill*]
173] c. Ordered, after short debate, *Feb* 11 480
Read 1° * *Feb* 12; 2° *Feb* 26 [Bill 12]
Committee*; Report *April* 14; re-comm.
174] Considered in Committee *April* 25, 1555
. *cl.* 3 (Interpretation of terms); Amendt. (*Mr. Torrens*) (Civil Bill Court, Carrickfergus); after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; *cl.* agreed to
. *cl.* 37 (Power to refer matters of account) withdrawn; Remaining clauses agreed to; Schedules agreed to
. *new cl.* (Chairman may find bailiffs) (*Mr. Longfield*), agreed to
. *new cl.* (Sheriff may issue a special warrant) (*Mr. Butt*), negatived
. *new cl.* (Interest in land not to be sold under civil bill execution) (*Sir C. O'Loghlen*) agreed to
. *new cl.* (*Mr. Longfield*) withdrawn
. *new cl.* (Cases above £20 removable by *certiorari*) (*Mr. Butt*) withdrawn
. Bill reported *April* 25
. Bill, as amended, considered *April* 29, 1966
. *cl.* (Judge of Assize may state case) (*Sir C. O'Loghlen*), added
. *another cl.* (Judges to make rule) (*Sir C. O'Loghlen*) added
. *another cl.* (Claims to goods taken in execution to be adjudicated in the Civil Bill Court only) (*Mr. Longfield*); after debate, withdrawn; *cl.* withdrawn
. Read 3° * *May* 2
. Lords Amendments [Bill 228]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chancellor*) *May* 6
176] Read 2ª after short debate *June* 27, 332
. Committee* *July* 7; Report* *July* 12
. Read 3ª* *July* 15
. Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 99]
Parl. Papers—*Commons* . . . . Bill 12
As amended in Committee . . 66
As amended on Re-Comm. . 79
Lords Amendments 228
Lords. . . . . No. 67
As amended in Committee . . 192
As amended on Report . . . 200
Commons' Reasons 245
As amended by Commons . . 246

Civil Service Estimates
Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. Peel *Mar* 15, [174] 17

Civil Service and Miscellaneous Estimates
Motion, "That the Civil Service and Miscellaneous Estimates have been for many years rapidly increasing, and ought to be reduced" (*Mr. Marsh*) *Mar* 1, [173] 1338; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Clare, Claims of Mr. John, jun.
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 21, To leave out from "That" and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the Claims of Mr. John Clare, junior, on the Government for compensation for Inventions and Designs supplied to the Admiralty in connection with Iron Ship Building and the Construction of Gun Boats" (*Colonel Dickson*), [174] 1464; after debate, Question, "That the words, &c." put, and agreed to

CLANCARTY, Earl of
- Agrarian Offences (Ireland), Paper moved for, [175] 360
- Education, National (Ireland), [176] 686
- New Zealand, [175] 788

CLANRICARDE, Marquess of
- Civil Bill Courts (Ireland), 2R. [176] 332
- Confederate States—British Consuls in the, Papers moved for, [174] 450, 460
- County Courts Act Amendment, [175] 1917
- Denmark and Germany—The Armistice, [175] 1439, 1926;—Alleged Prussian Atrocities, [176] 821;—Vote of Censure, Res. Amendt. 1112, 1113, 1170;—Correspondence moved for relating to Treaties, 1985
- Elgin, Earl of, and Lord Canning, Explanation, [175] 1698
- English and Irish Courts of Common Law and Chancery, [174] 1485
- Head, Sir F. B.—Memorial of, [176] 1371
- Hill, Sir Rowland, Address moved, [175] 1704
- Holy Alliance, Alleged Revival of the, [176] 684
- Ireland—The Constabulary, [174] 174
- Oyster Fishery (England and Wales), 2R. [176] 480, 482
- Pilotage Order Confirmation (No 2), 2R. [176] 2000, 2001
- Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, 2R. [176] 1788
- United States—Correspondence with the Federal Government, [173] 549;—Federal Recruiting in Ireland, Papers moved for, 1317, 1332; [174] 295, 300, 449; [175] 1439, 1449, 1453; The "Kearsarge," [174] 295, 300;—Case of Mr. Levey, [176] 5
- White, Captain Melville, Case of, [173] 1063

CLARENDON, Earl of (Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster)
- Denmark and Germany—The Conference, [176] 317;—Vote of Censure, Res. 1123, 1127
- Garibaldi, General, Departure of, [174] 1277
- Public Schools, 1R. [175] 778; 2R. 1236, 1243, 1249, 1256; Comm. 1632
- Public Schools Commission, Paper moved for, [175] 711

CLAY, Mr. J., *Kingston-upon-Hull*
- Army—Officers' Allowances at Bermuda, [175] 258
- Denmark and Germany—Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 880;—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1260
- Education (Inspectors' Reports), Nomination of Comm. Amendt. [175] 983, 1000, 1092
- Indian Medical Service, 3R. [176] 2039
- Insolvent Debtors, Comm. [176] 1432
- Intoxicating Liquors (Sale on Sundays), Leave, [175] 173
- Middlesex Sessions—Mr. Sergeant Payne, [175] 1061
- Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia), Comm. [176] 2062
- Private Bills—Standing Order, [175] 1137
- Rape, Punishment of, Comm. [176] 947
- Street Music (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 473, 681; *add. cl.* 683
- Supply—Consular Establishments, [175] 1911;—Royal Academy of Music, [176] 1605

Clerk of the Parliaments and of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, Offices of the
- Select Committee appointed* *July* 22: The Lords following were named of the Commitee; the Committee to meet on *Tuesday* next, at Three o'clock:—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. President, D. Richmond, M. Lansdowne, M. Salisbury, M. Bath, E. Devon, E. Carnarvon, E. Malmesbury, E. Chichester, Ld. Chamberlain, V. Eversley, L. Willoughby de Eresby, L. Colville of Culross, L. Ponsonby, L. Foley, L. Redesdale, L. Colchester, L. Wynford, L. Cranworth, L. Chelmsford

Clerks of the Peace
- Observations, The Earl of Romney; Answer, The Lord Chancellor *Feb* 18, [173] 708

Clerks of the Peace Removal Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 10 (No. 126)
Read 2ª* *June* 30
Committee* *July* 4; Report* *July* 5
Read 3ª* *July* 7
c. Read 1º* *July* 14 [Bill 209]
Read 2º* *July* 18
Committee*; Report *July* 19
Read 3º* *July* 20
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 65]

CLIFFORD, Mr. C. C., *Isle of Wight*
- Naval Force, Res. [173] 1101
- Tests Abolition (Oxford), Comm. [175] 1013
- Thames, Impurities in the, [175] 459

CLIFTON, Sir R. J., *Nottingham*
- Army — Storekeeper's Department, Pimlico, [173] 1757
- Tobacco, Exportation of, from the Southern States, [173] 931

CLIVE, Hon. Capt. G. H. W., *Ludlow*
- India—Delhi Prize Money, [176] 705

CLIVE, Mr. G., *Hereford*
- Mails in the Provinces, Comm. moved for, [174] 406
- Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford, Stipend of, [173] 1758
- Turnpike Trusts, Comm. moved for, [173] 1699; Nomination of Comm. [174] 500

COBBETT, Mr. J. M., *Oldham*
- Malt for Cattle, Comm. [173] 1034
- Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 979

COBDEN, Mr. R., *Rochdale*
- Army Estimates—Manufacturing Departments, [175] 66;—Works, Buildings, &c. 201
- China—Affairs of, Res. [175] 916, 980
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. *cl.* 20, [176] 1866
- Denmark and Germany — Vote of Censure, Address moved, Adj. moved, [176] 817, 827
- Foreign Office and the Board of Trade, Comm. moved for, [174] 1115
- *Government Manufacturing Establishments, Res. [176] 1907, 1940, 1976

[*cont.*

Cobden, Mr. R.—*cont.*
Japan—Troops for, [176] 1710
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1513
Sugar Duties and the Malt Tax, Res. [174] 1021
United States—Confederate Ship "Georgia," [175] 496
Weights and Measures (Metric System), Comm. *cl.* 2, [175] 11

Cochrane, Mr. A. D. Baillie, *Honiton*
Ashantee—War in, Res. [175] 1980
China—Affairs of, Res. [175] 933, 952
Denmark and Germany — Treaty of London, 1852, Res. [174] 1336 ; [175] 720 ;—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1236
Governors of Colonies, Pensions to, [174] 1944 ; [175] 458 ; Papers moved for, [176] 426
Ionian Islands—Affairs of, [175] 1147 ; [176] 35 ;—Annexation to Greece, 1575, 1578, 1579
Navy Estimates, Supplementary—Pay of Officers, [175] 690
Railway Guards, Communication with, [176] 1388, 1389, 1468, 1469
Servants Hiring (Scotland), Comm. [175] 1822
South Kensington, New Museums at, [174] 1079
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [175] 428, 435
Turkey—Prince Couza and the Porte, [176] 1905
United States—American Securities, [175] 259

Cogan, Mr. W. H. F., *Kildare Co.*
Cattle Diseases Prevention, Re-Comm. *cl.* 6, [176] 1568, 1569
Denmark and Germany — Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1037
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1396
Penal Servitude Act Amendment, Consid. *add. cl.* [174] 1965
Scientific Institutions (Dublin), Nomination of Comm. [174] 1273

Colebrooke, Sir T. E., *Lanarkshire*
Administration of Trusts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8 [176] 423 ; *cl.* 10, 425
Bank Acts (Scotland), [173] 797
Bank Notes (Scotland), 2R. [174] 1744
Bank of England Notes (Scotland), 2R. [176] 114
Beckenham, Lewes, and Brighton Railway, 2R. [173] 638
Indian Medical Service, 3R. [176] 2038
Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2009
United States—Confederate Cruisers, Papers moved for, [173] 1495
Valuation of Lands, &c. (Scotland) Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 1431
Writs Registration (Scotland), 2R. [175] 1500

Collection of Taxes Bill
(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*, *Mr. Peel*)
173] *c.* Ordered, after debate, *Feb* 8, 234
Read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 7]
. Read 2°, after short debate, *Feb* 15, 616
Committee * ; Report *Mar* 18 ; and re-comm.
Re-comm.* ; Report *May* 9 [Bills 57, 96]
Order for Committee (on *re-comm.*) read *June* 9
[*cont.*

Collection of Taxes Bill—cont.
175] Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 9, 1463 ; Amendt. To leave out from "That" and add "it is not expedient that the Land Tax, Assessed Taxes, and the Income Tax should be collected by the officers of the Inland Revenue" (*Sir Henry Willoughby*), 1467 ; Question proposed, "That the words &c."
. After short debate, Question put, A. 137, N. 103 ; M. 34 ; main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill considered in Committee, 1478
. *cl.* 2 (Appointment of officers of inland revenue to be collectors of taxes) ; Amendt. proposed, to leave out Proviso at end of clause (*Mr. Horsfall*), 1478
. After short debate, Question put, "That the Proviso stand part of the clause ;" A. 73, N. 62 ; M. 11 ; *cl.* agreed to ; Amendt. (*Mr. Knight*) negatived ; *cl.* agreed to
. *cl.* 12 (Schedule of defaulters), 1482 ; Amendt. (*Mr. Hunt*) withdrawn ; *cl.* agreed to
. *cl.* 18 (Poundage to collectors), 1484 ; after short debate, *cl.* agreed to
. *cl.* 21 (Treasury may award compensation to collectors) 1484 ; after short debate, *cl.* agreed to
. Bill reported, without Amendment
. Motion, "That the Bill be now read 3° *June* 13 ; Debate adjourned
. Debate resumed *June* 20, 2088
Amendment proposed, to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Sir John Trollope*) ; Question proposed, "That the word 'now,' &c."
. After debate, Question put, A. 128, N. 132 ; M. 4 ; Words added *June* 20 ; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to ; third reading put off for three months

Collection of Taxes Bill
Question, Mr. Hanbury ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 15, [174] 17 ; Question, Sir Henry Willoughby ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 18, 321

College of Physicians Bill
(*Mr. Peel*, *Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *May* 9 [Bill 98]
Read 2° * *May* 30
Committee* ; Report *June* 2
Read 3° * *June* 3
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *June* 6 (No. 114)
Read 2ª * *July* 15
Committee* ; Report *July* 21
Read 3ª * *July* 22
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 60]

Collier, Sir R. P., *see* Solicitor General, The

Collins, Mr. T., *Knaresborough*
Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension, 2R. [176] 1363
Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Comm. Adj. moved, [176] 299
[*cont.*

COLLINS, Mr. T.—*cont.*
- Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. *cl.* 2, [175] 1480
- Collegiate Schools, Facilities for Divine Service in, 2R. [176] 1774, 1780
- County Franchise, 2R. [174] 950
- County Voters Registration, 2R. [175] 1818
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Consid. *cl.* 12, [174] 1986
- Denmark and Germany — Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 886
- Election Petitions, 2R. [174] 161; Comm. [175] 1045
- Factory Acts Extension, Comm. [175] 1948
- Highways Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 36 [176] 1375; *cl.* 45, Amendt. 1376
- Indian Medical Service, Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 1703
- Lisburn Election, Res. [174] 856
- Street Music (Metropolis), 2R. [175] 1533
- Supply—Rates for Government Property, [175] 865
- Tests Abolition, 3R. [176] 675

Colonial Governors Retiring Allowances
- Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Feb* 15, [173] 562; Observations, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Reply, Mr. Cardwell *April* 29, [174] 1944; Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 13, [175] 458
- Motion for an Address for a "Copy of any Correspondence which has passed between any Departments of the Government, with respect to the granting of Pensions to Colonial Governors" (*Mr. Baillie Cochrane*) *July* 28, [176] 426; after debate, Motion, withdrawn
  - Parl Papers—
    - Correspondence . . . . No. 359
    - Return respecting . . . No. 561

Colonial Possessions, Annual Report on
- Question, Mr. Rogers; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *June* 23, [176] 155

COLTHURST, Sir G. C., *Kinsale*
- Cattle Diseases Prevention, Re-Comm. *cl.* 6, [176] 1568

COLVILLE of CULROSS, Lord
- Crawley, Colonel, Court Martial on—Deputy Judge Advocate, [173] 1161, 1175

Committee of Selection
- Committee nominated *Feb* 11:—Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Bonham-Carter, Lord Hotham, Mr. Mowbray, and the Chairman of the Select Committee on Standing Orders
- First Report *Feb* 17, second Report *Mar* 4, third Report *Mar* 11, [173] (No. 62)

Common Law Procedure (Ireland) Act (1853) Amendment Bill

(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Sir R. Peel*)
- Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 7 [Bill 43]
- Read 2° * *April* 11
- Committee *; Report *April* 14 [*cont.*

Common Law Procedure (Ireland) Act (1853) *Amendment Bill*—cont.
- *c.* As amended, considered * *April* 15; re-comm. and reported*
- Read 3° * *April* 18
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*The Lord Steward*) *April* 19 (No.51)
- Read 2ª * *May* 10
- Committee * *May* 12; Report * *May* 13
- Read 3ª * *May* 23
- Royal Assent *June* 23 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 28]

Consolidated Fund (£4,500,000) Bill
- *c.* Read 1° * *Mar* 11; 2° * *Mar* 14
- Committee *; Report *Mar* 15
- Read 3° * *Mar* 16
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *Mar* 16
- Read 2ª * and 3ª * *Mar* 17 (No. 34)
- Royal Assent *Mar* 18 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 6]

Consolidated Fund (£584,650) Bill
- *c.* Read 1° * *Mar* 11; 2° * *Mar* 14
- Committee *; Report *Mar* 15
- Read 3° * *Mar* 16
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *Mar* 16
- Read 2ª * and 3ª * *Mar* 17 (No. 33)
- Royal Assent *Mar* 18 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 5]

Consolidated Fund (£15,000,000) Bill
- *c.* Read 1° * *April* 14; 2° * *April* 15
- Committee *; Report *April* 18
- Read 3° * *April* 19
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *April* 21
- Read 2ª * *April* 22; 3ª * *April* 25 (No. 54)
- Royal Assent *April* 28 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 11]

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill

(*Mr. Massey, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *July* 19 [Bill 225]
- Read 2° * *July* 20
- Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 21, [176] 1857
- After short debate, agreed to
- Bill considered in Committee, 1865
- Bill reported, without Amendment
- Read 3° * *July* 22
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 22
- Read 2ª * *July* 25 (No. 54)
- Committee*; Report *July* 26
- Read 3ª * *July* 27
- Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 72]

Constabulary, Reports of the Inspectors of —Police Spy System
- Question, Mr. Roebuck; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 3, [173] 1388

Contagious Diseases Bill

(*Lord Clarence Paget, Sir John Pakington, Sir Morton Peto, Sir James Fergusson*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *June* 20 [Bill 163]
- Read 2° * *June* 27, and referred to Select Committee
- Select Committee nominated *June* 30
- Members: — Mr. Walpole (Chairman), Lord Clarence Paget, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Hennessy, Mr. Hunt, Lord Hotham, Sir James Fergusson, General Peel, Mr. Liddell, [*cont.*

Contagious Diseases Bill—cont.

c. Sir Harry Verney, Mr. Aytoun, Sir Morton Peto, Sir John Trelawny, Mr. Kinnaird, Mr. Locke, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir George Grey, Captain Jervis, and Mr. Longfield
Report of Select Committee *July* 15
Committee on re-comm.* ; Report *July* 19
Considered as amended* *July* 20
Read 3°* *July* 21
l. Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Somerset*) *July* 22
Read 2ª* *July* 23 (No. 234)
Committee* ; Report *July* 25
Read 3ª* *July* 26
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 85]
Parl. Papers—
Commons . . . Bill 163
As amended by Select Comm. . Bill 212
With Lords Amendment . . . Bill 239
Lords . . . . No. 234

Controller of the Navy and the Devonport Election
Question, Mr. Ferrand ; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget ; debate thereon *Mar* 3, [173] 1392

Controverted Elections—Chairmen's Panel
Hugh Edward Adair, James Wentworth Buller, Edward C. Egerton (Macclesfield), Viscount Enfield, George Ward Hunt, Robert Longfield *Feb* 18
Edward Howes, esq., *v.* George Ward Hunt, esq., disch. *Mar* 1

Controverted Elections—General Committee of Elections
Committee (by Mr. Speaker's Warrant): Sir William Miles, bart. (Chairman) ; The right hon. Sir F. T. Baring, bart. ; right hon. S. H. Walpole ; right hon. H. A. Herbert ; H. Ker-Seymer, esq., John Bonham-Carter, esq., *Feb* 8. Mr. Hunt *v.* Mr. H. Ker-Seymer *Feb* 18

Conveyancers, &c. (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Att. Gen. for Ireland, Sir R. Peel*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *Feb* 8 [Bill 5]
173] Read 2°, after short debate, *Feb* 15, 595
Considered in Committee *Feb* 26, 1227
cl. 1 agreed to
cl. 2, as to granting Certificates ; Amendt. "English barristers may practise in Ireland, and Irish barristers may practise in England" (*Mr. M'Mahon*), 1227 ; after short debate, Amendt. negatived ; Amendt. "on the 11th day of January, 1864" (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*) ; after short debate, Amendt. agreed to ; *cl.* as amended agreed to
cl. 3 (Penalties on persons acting as attorneys, &c. unless qualified) ; after short debate, *cl.* agreed to ; remaining clauses agreed to
Bill reported *Feb* 26
Considered as amended* *Feb* 29
Read 3°* *Mar* 1
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *Mar* 3
Read 2ª* *Mar* 18 (No. 17)
Committee* ; Report *April* 5
Read 3ª* *April* 7
Royal Assent *April* 28 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 8]

Convicts — see *Criminal Law, Penal Discipline*

Convocation, Powers of, to pass Synodical Judgment on Books — Essays and Reviews
Question, Lord Houghton ; Answer, The Lord Chancellor ; long debate thereon *July* 15, [176] 1535

COPELAND, Mr. Ald. W. T., *Stoke-upon-Trent*
Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [175] 1723

Copyright Bill
(*Mr. Black, Mr. Massey, Mr. Stirling*)
Ordered ; read 1°* *Feb* 23 [Bill 34]
Bill withdrawn *April* 6, [174] 503

Copyright (No. 2) **Bill**
(*Mr. Black, Mr. Stirling, Mr. Massey*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *April* 6 [Bill 59]
Read 2°*, and referred to Select Committee *April* 15
Committee nominated *April* 26 :—Mr. Black (Chairman), Mr. Massey, Mr. Walpole, Mr. Dunlop, Sir William Heathcote, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Cave, Earl Grosvenor, Mr. Maguire, Mr. Arthur Mills, Mr. Neate, Mr. Walter, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart, Mr. Lowe, and Mr. Whiteside ; and, on *May* 11, Mr. Milner Gibson added and Mr. Cave disch.
Report of Select Comm. *June* 29 (No. 441)

Copyright—Law of
Question, Mr. Black ; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Feb* 10, [173] 563

CORBALLY, Mr. M. E., *Meath Co.*
Cattle Diseases Prevention, Comm. *cl.* 6, [176] 1569
Lunatic Asylums (Ireland), [176] 639
Passports in Rome, [176] 1574
Supply—Consular Establishments, [175] 1902, 1904

CORK, Earl of
Vestry Cess Abolition (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [174] 9

Corn Accounts and Returns Bill
(*Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Hutt*)
c. Resolution in Committee* *July* 15
Ordered ; read 1°* *July* 15 [Bill 214]
Read 2°* *July* 18
Committee* ; Report *July* 20
Committee* (on re-comm.) ; Report *July* 21
Considered as amended* *July* 21
Read 3°* *July* 21
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *July* 22
Read 2ª* *July* 23 (No. 238)
Committee* ; Report *July* 25
Read 3ª* *July* 26
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 87]

Corn, Duty on
Question, Mr. Caird ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 18, [174] 1201

Corn Rents
Question, Mr. Hubbard; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *April* 18, [174] 1199

Cornwall, Proposed Bishopric of
Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 16, [173] 680
Motion, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Copy of Correspondence between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Sir George Grey in reference to the Formation of a Bishopric of Cornwall" (*Earl Nelson*) *July* 22, [176] 1896; after short debate, Motion agreed to

CORRY, Rt. Hon. H. T. L., *Tyrone Co.*
Ashantee—War in, Res. [175] 2012
Government Manufacturing Establishments, Res. [176] 1945
Greenwich Hospital, Res. [175] 1165, 1166, 1167
Malta Dock, [174] 395
Naval Reserve, Ensign for the, [176] 258
Navy and Army Expenditure (1862-3), Comm. Res. [176] 1696
Navy Estimates—Naval Stores, [174] 420, 423, 426, 433;—Steam Machinery, [174] 441;—Pay of Officers, [175] 680, 690
Navy—The Channel Fleet, [174] 1472;—Masters in the, Res. [175] 1221;—Guns for the, [176] 337
Patriotic Fund Commission, [175] 720
Supply—Harbours of Refuge, [175] 855;—Holyhead Harbour, &c. 857;—Lighthouses Abroad, 860
United States—The "Kearsarge," [176] 256

Costs Security Bill
(*Mr. Butt, Mr. Murray*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 18 [Bill 58]
Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Butt*) *June* 15, [175] 1811; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Whiteside*), 1813; Question proposed, "That the word 'now' &c.;" after short debate, Question put, A. 99, N. 64; M. 35; Bill read 2° *June* 15
Bill withdrawn* *July* 19

Countess of Elgin and Kincardine—The Queen's Message—see *Elgin and Kincardine, Countess of*

Countess of Elgin and Kincardine Bill
(*Mr. Massey, Viscount Palmerston, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
175] *c.* Resolution in Committee (Queen's Message, 6th June) *June* 9, 1458
. After short debate, Resolution reported; Bill ordered *June* 10, 1604
Read 1°* *June* 16 [Bill 156]
Read 2°* *June* 20
Committee*; Report *June* 21
Read 3°* *June* 22
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *June* 23
Read 2ª* *June* 24 (No. 149)
Committee*; Report *June* 27
Read 3ª* *June* 28
Royal Assent *June* 30 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 31]

County Bridges Bill
(*Mr. Heygate, Mr. Evans, Mr. Hartopp*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 21 [Bill 77]
173] Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Heygate*) *May* 11, 351
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Henley*)
After short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn
Bill withdrawn

County Courts Act Amendment Bill
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
175] *l.* Presented; read 1ª after debate *May* 6, 85 (No. 70)
. After debate, *May* 13, 437, second reading put off to 23rd instant
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 23, 566; after long debate, Motion agreed to; Bill read 2ª
Bill withdrawn* *June* 17

County Courts Act Amendment Bill
Question, The Earl of Derby; Answer, The Lord Chancellor *June* 9, [175] 1454; Petition, Lord Brougham *June* 16, 1824

County Courts (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Sir Robert Peel, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered, after short debate, *Feb* 11, [173] 480
Read 1°* *Feb* 12 [Bill 12]
Read 2°, after short debate, *Feb* 26, 1230
Committee*; Report *April* 14, and re-comm.
(*Afterwards entitled Civil Bill Courts Bill*)

County Constabulary Superannuations Bill (*Sir John Trollope, Colonel Packe*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 8 [Bill 136]
Read 2°* *June* 13
Committee*; Report *June* 15
Read 3°* *June* 17
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Aveland*) *June* 21 (No. 140)
Read 2ª* *June* 23
Committee* *June* 28
Bill withdrawn* *July* 4

County Franchise Bill
(*Mr. Locke King, Mr. Hastings Russell*)
173] *c.* Motion for leave (*Mr. Locke King*), 933
After debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered
Read 1° *Feb* 23 [Bill 33]
174] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Locke King*) *April* 13, 916; after debate, Previous Question moved (*Mr. R. Knightley*); after long debate, Previous Question put, A. 227, N. 254; M. 27

County Voters Registration (England and Wales) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Algernon Egerton, Mr. Locke King, Mr. Collins*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 19 [Bill 112]
Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Dodson*) *June* 15, [175] 1815
Bill read 2°, after short debate
Bill withdrawn* *July* 13

Court of Chancery (Despatch of Business) Bill (*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented, and, after short debate, read 1ª *Mar* 4, [173] 1452 (No. 18)
Read 2ª * *Mar* 18
Committee * ; Report *April* 5
Read 3ª * *April* 8
c. Read 1° * *April* 14 [Bill 69]
Read 2° * *April* 19
Committee * ; Report *April* 25
Considered as amended * *April* 26
Read 3° * *April* 28
Royal Assent *May* 13 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 15]

Court of Chancery (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Sir Robert Peel, Sir George Grey*)
174] *c.* Motion for leave *April* 19, 1376
Motion, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Hennessy*)
After short debate, Question put, A. 28, N. 57 ; M. 29 ; original Question again proposed ; Motion withdrawn
. Motion for leave *April* 25, 1569
After long debate, Motion "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Hennessy*)
Motion withdrawn ; original Question put, and agreed to ; Bill ordered
Read 1° *April* 25 [Bill 78]
175] Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 2, 1093
. Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Longfield*), 1099 ; Question proposed, "That 'now' &c." Amendt. withdrawn ; main Question put, and agreed to
Bill read 2° *June* 2
. Moved, "This House will, on Thursday next, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House to consider further of the progress of the Court of Chancery (Ireland) Bill" (*The Attorney General for Ireland*), 95
After debate, Motion agreed to *June* 12
176] Bill considered in Committee *June* 21
. *cl.* 12 (Appointment of chief clerks), 23
Amendt. to leave out "one chief clerk" and insert "two clerks" (*Sir C. O'Loghlen*)
Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" Whereupon Motion, "That the Chairman do leave the Chair" (*Mr. Whiteside*) ; after debate, Question put, A. 42, N. 41 ; M. 1 ; [No Report]
. Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 24, 285
. Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "the Bill be committed to a Select Committee" (*Mr. Longfield*), 291 ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn ; Amendt. To leave out from "That" and add "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Whiteside*), 297 ; Question put, "That the words, &c. ;" A. 51, N. 49 ; M. 2 ; original Question again proposed, A. 51, N. 56 ; M. 5 ; original Question again proposed ; Whereupon Motion, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Collins*) ; A. 53, N. 56 ; M. 3
Original Question again proposed ; Motion, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Vance*) ; after debate, Debate adjourned"
Bill withdrawn* *July* 11

Court of Chancery (Ireland) Bill—The Division
Explanation, Sir Colman O'Loghlen *June* 21, 30

Court of Justiciary (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Sir George Grey, Sir William Dunbar*)
c. Ordered* *Feb* 22 ; read 1° * *Feb* 23
Read 2° * *Mar* 1 [Bill 31]
Committee—Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Sir W. Dunbar*) *Mar* 8, [173] 1704 ; after short debate, A. 84, N. 49 ; M. 35
Bill considered in Committee
Motion to report Progress (*Sir John Hay*) agreed to ; Committee R.P.
Committee * ; Report *April* 21
Considered as amended* *May* 9
Read 3° * *May* 11
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chancellor*) *May* 12
Read 2ª * *June* 9 (No. 82)
Committee * *June* 10 ; Report * *June* 13
Read 3ª * *June* 13
Royal Assent *June* 23 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 30]

Court of Queen's Bench (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Sir Robert Peel*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *May* 27 [Bill 123]
Read 2° * *June* 2
Bill withdrawn * *July* 13

Courts, New Law
Question, Mr. Selwyn ; Answer, Mr. Cowper *April* 21, [174] 1420 ; Question, Mr. Arthur Mills ; Answer, Mr. Cowper *May* 3, 2052 ; Observations, Mr. Montague Smith ; Reply, The Attorney General *July* 27, [176] 363

Courts of Justice—Concentration of
Question, Mr. Arthur Mills ; Answer, Mr. Cowper *Mar* 10, 1756 ; Question, Mr. Arthur Mills ; Answer, Mr. Cowper *April* 15, [174] 1142 ; Question, Mr. Montague Smith ; Answer, Mr. Cowper *Feb* 12, [173] 496

Courts of Conciliation Bill
(*Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie, Mr. Hardcastle*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *July* 22 [Bill 242]

Courts of Justice Money Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Peel*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *July* 1 [Bill 188]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 14

Courts of Justice (Money) Bill
Question, Mr. Arthur Mills ; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 5, [175] 24

Courts of Justice Site Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Peel*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *July* 1 [Bill 189]
176] Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 7
Motion, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Lygon*) ; Motion withdrawn ; Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee

Coventry Free Grammar School Bill
(*Mr. Bruce, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *May* 30 [Bill 124]
Read 2° * *June* 13
Committee * ; Report *June* 17
Read 3° * *June* 21
l. Read 1ª (*The Lord President*) *June* 23
Read 2ª * *June* 27 (No. 153)
Committee * ; Report *June* 28
Read 3ª * *June* 30
Royal Assent *July* 14 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 41]

Coventry, Trade of
Observations, Mr. Treherne and other hon. Members, 505 ; Reply, Mr. Milner Gibson *June* 30, [176] 509

Cowper, Right Hon. W. F. (Chief Commissioner of Works), *Hertford*
- Army—Rating of Officers of Chelsea Hospital, Address moved, [175] 200
- Battersea Park, [175] 20
- Bridge Street, Westminster, [173] 1186
- Courts of Justice, The New, [173] 496, 1756 ; [174] 1142, 1420, 1421, 2052 ; [176] 372, 373
- Dyce, Mr., Case of, [175] 518
- Exhibition Building, The, [173] 793
- Herbert, Mr., his Picture, [175] 912
- Horticultural Society, The, [176] 952
- Ladies Gallery, The, [176] 496
- National Gallery, The, [174] 1776 ; [175] 260, 1637, 1639
- Open Spaces (Metropolis), Res. [176] 437
- Park Lane, South Entrance to, [175] 363 ; [176] 2015
- Patent Offices—Fife House, [174] 182, 1954 ; —Library and Museum, Comm. moved for, [175] 245
- Richard Cœur de Lion, Statue of, [174] 1771
- Royal Academy, The, Report of Commissioners, [173] 793 ; [175] 21, 22
- St. James's Park, Road round, [173] 1894
- Sewage of the Metropolis, [174] 2052
- South Kensington, New Museums at, [174] 1078, 1079, 1287 ; [175] 21
- Supply—Royal Palaces, [175] 410, 411, 412 ;—Public Buildings, 414, 415 ;—Repair of Furniture, 415, 416, 417 ;— Royal Parks, &c. 422, 424, 425 ;—New Foreign Office, 553, 845, 846 ;—Probate Court Registries, 846, 847 ; —Westminster Bridge Approaches, 848 ; —Architectural Designs for Public Buildings, 848, 849, 850, 851 ;—Nelson's Column, 852 ; —Land, &c. Kensington Gore, 866, 867, 868, 869 ;—New National Gallery at Burlington House, 1297, 1302, 1318 ;—National Gallery, [176] 1523, 1529, 1532
- Victoria Tower, Improvements near the, [174] 183
- Volunteer Review, The, [175] 809
- Westminster Bridge Traffic, [176] 495 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1698
- Westminster Palace Clock, [173] 1068

Cox, Mr. W., *Finsbury*
- Archway and Kentish Town Junction Road, 2R. Amendt. [173] 1064
- Battersea Park, [175] 20
- Chigwell, Recreation Grounds at, [174] 2023

[*cont.*

Cox, Mr. W.—*cont.*
- Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. *cl.* 2, [175] 1480 ; 3R. 2091
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. *cl.* 20, [176] 1865, 1866
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 2, [174] 1860
- Epping Forest, Papers moved for, [175] 1205, 1206, 1207
- Forests, Royal, in Essex, [176] 154, 647
- Government Buildings, [173] 1068
- Herbert, Mr., his Picture, [175] 912
- India—Central India Prize Money, [173] 1071
- Mazzini, M.—The Greco Conspiracy, [173] 1255, 1258
- Mutiny, Comm., *cl.* 22, Amendt. [173] 1797, 1806 ; *cl.* 26, Amendt. 1806
- Poor's Rate, Leave, [173] 698
- Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2147
- Stansfeld, Mr., and the Greco Conspiracy, Res. [174] 283
- Supply—Royal Parks, &c. [175] 418, 421 ;—Harbours of Refuge, 855 ;—Holyhead Harbour, &c. 856, 857 ;— Sir Rowland Hill, 1600 ;—Lord Privy Seal, Adj. moved, 1603 ; Nonconforming, &c. Ministers in Ireland, [176] 399 ; Wine Licenses, 1794, 1906

Cranbourne Street Bill
(*Mr. Cowper, Mr. Peel*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 16 [Bill 154]
Read 2° * *June* 24
Committee ; R.P.* *June* 30
Committee * ; Report *July* 1
Committee (*on re-comm.*) R.P.* *July* 4
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *July* 7
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) R.P. *July* 21
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *July* 22
Read 3° * *July* 25
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 26
Read 2ª * *July* 27 (No. 252)
Read 3ª * *July* 28
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 111]

Cranworth, Lord
- Attorneys and Solicitors Remuneration, 2R. [176] 17
- Bribery at Elections, [176] 821
- Charitable Assurances Enrolment, 2R. [174] 721
- Chimney Sweepers, Comm. *cl.* 7, [175] 1133
- Clerks of the Peace, [173] 709
- Collegiate Schools, Facilities for Divine Worship in, 2R. [176] 149
- County Courts Act Amendment, 1R. [175] 98, 2R. 582
- Crawley, Colonel, Court Martial on—Deputy Judge Advocate, [173] 1172
- Land Securities Company, 2R. Amendt. [174] 1280, 1281
- Land Transfer Act, [174] 1416
- Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, 2R. [175] 888 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1341 ; *cl.* 4, 1344
- Rape, Punishment of, 2R. 861 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, [174] 960, 961
- Regius Professorship of Greek (Oxford), Comm. [175] 454
- Settled Estates Act Amendment, 2R. [174] 534
- West Riding of Yorkshire Assizes, Address moved, [175] 1623

Craufurd, Mr. E. H. J., *Ayr, &c.*
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1378
Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers), Comm. Amendt. [176] 102 ; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 103
Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia), Comm. [176] 2065
Partnership Law Amendment, Comm. [175] 244
Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation, Leave, [175] 17
Writs Registration (Scotland), 2R. [175] 1501

Crawford, Mr. R. W., *London*
Chain Cables and Anchors, Select Comm. moved for, [173] 1360, 1362
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 2 ; Proviso, [174] 1836, 1860 ; Consid. Schedule 2011
Diseased Meat, Conviction for Sale of, [176] 1792
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [176] 1833
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 601
Government Annuities, [173] 1369
Harwich Corporation, 2R. Amendt. [173] 643
Hudson's Bay Company, [175] 1060
Metropolitan District Railways, 3R. Amendt. [176] 1617, 1619
Metropolitan Railways, [174] 17
Navy—Greenwich Hospital, [176] 2016
Partnership Law Amendment, Comm. [175] 243
Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [173] 283 ; Res. 1636, Amendt. 1644
Street Music (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 474
Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, [174] 959 ; Res. 991
Supply—Sir Rowland Hill, [175] 1598
United States — Capture of British Ships, Papers moved for, [173] 524
*Ways and Means — Sugar Duties, Report Amendt. [174] 1143, 1167, 1170, 1172
Weighing of Grain (Port of London), 2R. [175] 1337 ; [176] 163, 168, 176

Crawley Colonel—Court Martial on
173] Question, Mr. Dudley Fortescue ; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Feb* 5, 170
Address for "Copy of the Proceedings of the late Court Martial for the Trial of Colonel Crawley" (*Mr. Dudley Fortescue*) *Feb* 8, agreed to (*Parl. P.* No. 96), 215 ; Question, Colonel Gilpin ; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Feb* 11, 465 ; Question, Lord Hotham ; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Feb* 15, 564 ; Question, Mr. Dudley Fortescue ; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington ; debate thereon *Mar* 3, 1367
The Deputy Judge Advocate, Question, Lord Colville of Culross ; Answer, Earl De Grey and Ripon ; long debate thereon *Feb* 26, 1161
The Judge Advocate General, Question, Lord Chelmsford ; Answer, Earl De Grey and Ripon *Mar* 14, 1895 ; Question, Mr. Dudley Fortescue ; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Headlam *Mar* 8, 1655 ; Question, Sir James Fergusson ; Answer, Mr. Headlam *Mar* 14, 1904

[*cont.*

Crawley, Colonel—Court Martial on—cont.
174] Motion for an Address for Papers (*Mr. Dudley Fortescue*) *Mar* 15, 18 ; Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "the production of any further Papers relating to the court martial on Colonel Crawley is inexpedient" (*General Peel*), 36 ; after long debate, Question, "That the words, &c." put, and negatived ; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
Parl. Papers—
Proceedings of Court Martial . No. 96
Mem. of Commander-in-Chief . No. 97
Expenses of Court Martial . . No. 98

Criminal Justice Act (1855) Extension Bill
(*Sir Edward Dering, Sir Brook Bridges*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *July* 1 [Bill 190]
Read 2° * *July* 11
Committee * ; Report *July* 13 [Bill 201]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *July* 19
Read 3° * *July* 21
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 22
Read 2ª * *July* 25 (No. 231)
Committee * ; Report *July* 26
Read 3ª * ; *July* 27
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 80]

Criminal Law
Assaults with Knives—Question, Mr. Horsfall; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 3, [173] 1366
Corporal Punishment, Question, Mr. Hadfield ; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 26, [176] 2105 ; Questions, Colonel Sykes, Mr. Darby Griffith ; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 29, 2190
Convicts — Remission of Penal Servitude — Question, Sir Stafford Northcote ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 14, [173] 1907
Convicts in County Gaols—Question, Mr. J. R. Ormsby Gore ; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 8, [174] 630
Costs of Prosecutions, Question, Sir Jervoise Jervoise ; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 14, [174] 968
Criminal Returns, Question, Mr. Denman ; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 6, [175] 102
Execution of the Pirates of the "Flowery Land," Question, Sir George Bowyer ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 12, [173] 497
Game Law Prosecutions, Question, Colonel Sykes ; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 11, [176] 1324
Gaols, Discipline and Dietary in, Question, Mr. Buxton ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 10, [173] 1754 ; Question, Sir John Pakington ; Answer Sir George Grey, [174] 1083 ; Question, Mr. Bazley ; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 2, [175] 1063 ; Question, Sir John Pakington ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 9, [173] 324
Hall, Convict George — The Prerogative of Mercy, Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Copy of Correspondence relative to George Hall, convicted of Murder at the Warwick Assizes, and respited on the 13th of March" (*The Earl of Carnarvon*) *April* 12, [174] 861 ; after debate, Motion withdrawn

[*cont.*

Criminal Law—*cont.*

Public Executions, Motion for Papers (*Mr. Hibbert*) *Feb* 23, [173] 941; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Penal Servitude, Returns of Sentences to 1862 *and* 1863 (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) *Feb* 28, [173] 919; after debate, Motion agreed to

Tickets-of-Leave and Sentences of Penal Servitude, Question, Mr. Cave; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 25, [173] 1073

Townley, the Convict, Motion (*The Earl of*
173] *Carnarvon*) postponed *Feb* 5, 169; Question, Lord Henry Lennox; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 8, 218; Question, Sir FitzRoy Kelly; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 9, 328; Question, Mr. W. J. S. Morritt; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 26, 1185; Parl. Papers respecting (L) No. 11, (C) No. 37

Victoria, Expulsion of Ticket-of-Leave Men from, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Cardwell, *June* 14 [175] 1729

Wakefield Prison, Dietary in, Question, Lord Fermoy; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 15, [174] 16

See—

Penal Servitude Acts Amendment Bill
Penal Servitude Acts Consolidation Bill
Punishment of Death

Crossley, Sir F., *Yorkshire, West Riding*

Bank Acts (Scotland), Comm. Res. [173] 472
Death, Punishment of, Comm. moved for, [174] 2112
Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [175] 1727; Comm. 1944
Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1527
Japan—Bombardment of Kagosima, Res. [173] 367
Malt for Cattle, 2R. [173] 606
Street Music (Metropolis), Leave, [174] 2118
Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 1008
Supply—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers in Ireland, [176] 400
Ways and Means—Fire Insurance Duty, Res. [174] 1458

Customs and Inland Revenue Bill

(*Mr. Massey, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)

c. Read 1° * *April* 19 [Bill 73]
174] Read 2°, after debate, *April* 25, 1552
Considered in Committee *April* 28, 1859
cl. 2 Amendt. (*Mr. Crawford*); after short debate, withdrawn; *cl.* agreed to; remaining clauses agreed to
Schedule (C)—Amendt. (*Mr. Hennessy*); withdrawn
Bill reported *April* 28 [Bill 82]
Considered as amended *May* 2, 1980
Motion, "That the duties on sugar be continued in force for one year only" (*Mr. J. B. Smith*), 1981; not put
cl. 5 (Occasional licences, &c.), 1981; Amendts. (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) agreed to; Amendt. to leave out "if," in line 13, to "behalf," in line 15 (*Mr. Malins*), 1983; after debate, Question put, "That the words, &c." A. 161, N. 124; M. 37

[*cont.*

Customs and Inland Revenue Bill—cont.

174] Amendt. to Schedule (A) by adding after "sixty-four," the words "until the 1st of August, 1865" (*Mr. J. B. Smith*), 1986; Question put, "That those words be there added," A. 14, N. 97; M. 83; Division List—Ayes and Noes, 2022
Amendt. (Powers of attorney by seamen), to leave out "20*s*." and insert "1*s*.;" agreed to
Amendt. (Duty on presentation to perpetual curacies) as to annual income, to leave out "shall not amount to £100" and insert "shall not exceed £100."
Other Amendments made
Read 3° * *May* 3
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *May* 6
Read 2ª * *May* 9 (No. 69)
Committee *; Report *May* 10
Read 3ª * *May* 12
Royal Assent *May* 13 [27 & 28 *Vict. c.* 18]

Customs Gaugers
Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Peel *May* 13, [175] 459

Customs Officers, Complaints of the
Question, Mr. C. Turner; Answer, Mr. Peel *July* 19, [176] 1705

Dalglish, Mr. R., *Glasgow*

Army Estimates—Manufacturing Departments, [175] 72
Bank Acts (Scotland), Comm. Res. [173] 473
Bank Notes (Scotland), 2R. [174] 1733
Bank of England Notes (Scotland), 2R. [176] 115
Caledonian, Edinburgh, and Glasgow, &c. Railway Companies, 2R. [173] 642
Denmark and Germany—Danish Blockade, [173] 1825
Navy—Royal Commission on Dockyards, [173] 918; The "Pampero," 1544;—The Course of the "Gladiator," 256
War Steamer in the Clyde, [173] 1251

Dalhousie, Earl of

Army—Limited Enlistment and the Reserve Force, Return moved for, [174] 1072

Damer, Capt. L. S. D., *Portarlington*

Army—Discharge of Soldiers in 1864-5, [173] 1905
Navy—French Breech Loading Cannon, [173] 1774

Dawson, Mr. R. P., *Londonderry Co.*

Army—Appointment of Lt. Gen. Gough to the 2nd Dragoons, [173] 821
Chief Rents (Ireland), Comm. [175] 15
Fog Signals at Cape Race, [173] 321
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [174] 1386
Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, Comm. [176] 1435
Rents (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1025
Supply—Treasury Chest, [175] 1896; Nonconforming, &c. Ministers in Ireland, [176] 399
Trespass (Ireland), Comm. [174] 955; *cl.* 1, [176] 932

Defence Act Amendment Bill
(*Earl de Grey*)
l. Read 1ª* *July* 8 (No. 193)
Read 2ª* *July* 12
Committee*; Report *July* 14
Read 3ª* *July* 15
c. Read 1º* *July* 18 [Bill 223]
Committee*; Report *July* 22
Read 3º* *July* 25
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 89]

De Grey and Ripon, Earl (Secretary of State for War)
Admiralty Lands and Works, Comm. *cl.* 14, [175] 1351
Army—Ten Years Enlistment Act, [174] 163, 165;—Limited Enlistment and the Reserve Force, Return moved for, 1068;—Artillery—Mackay's Gun, 1177, 1179
Artillery Practice in Plymouth Sound, [175] 1223, 1224
Crawley, Colonel, Court Martial on—Deputy Judge Advocate, [173] 1162, 1175, 1896
Fortifications—Defences of the Bristol Channel, [175] 1047
Lawrence's, Sir J., Salary, 2R. [173] 1539
Mhow Court Martial—Sir W. Mansfield, [174] 162
Military Commissioners in North America, [173] 857
Navy—Marine Artillery, [173] 319
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1993
West Riding of Yorkshire Assizes, Address moved, [175] 1619

Denison, Rt. Hon. J. E., *see* Speaker, The

Denman, Lord
Rate in Aid Act, [173] 492

Denman, Hon. G., *Tiverton*
Ashantee—War in, Res. [175] 2001, 2013
Criminal Returns, [175] 102
Death, Punishment of, Comm. moved for, [174] 2064, 2085
Education (Inspectors' Reports), Nomination of Comm. [175] 986, 1000
Greco Conspiracy, The — M. Mazzini — Mr. Stansfeld, [174] 340
Insolvent Debtors, 2R. [174] 2120
Navy—Claims of Mr. J. Clare, Comm. moved for, [174] 1467
Partnership Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, [174] 2128
United States—Seizure of the "Tuscaloosa," Res. [174] 1826
Whitecross Street Prison, [173] 1826

Denmark and Germany
Lords—
Affairs of
Integrity of Danish Monarchy—Treaty of 1852, Question, The Earl of Malmesbury; Answer, Earl Russell; debate thereon *Feb* 9, [173] 302; Question, Earl Grey; Answer, Earl Russell *April* 7, [174] 533
Notice of Motion, Lord Campbell, Observations, Lord Campbell; Reply, Earl Russell *Feb* 15, [173] 550

[*cont.*

Denmark and Germany—Affairs of—cont.
Resolutions (*Lord Campbell*) *Protocol of Paris*, *April* 11, [174] 722; after long debate, Motion withdrawn
Notice of Motion, The Earl of Ellenborough, Observations, Earl Russell; Reply, The Earl of Ellenborough; Notice postponed *Mar* 18, [174] 293
Notice of Motion, The Earl of Carnarvon, withdrawn *May* 9, [175] 176
The Correspondence, Question, The Earl of Malmesbury; Answer, Earl Russell *Feb* 25, [173] 1061; Question, The Earl of Derby; Answer, Earl Russell; Observations thereon *Mar* 8, [173] 1615; Motion, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Copies of any recent Correspondence relating to the Treaties between Denmark and Great Britain" (*Lord Campbell*) *July* 23, [176] 1979; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Negotiations—Joint Action of the European Powers, Question, Lord Stratheden; Answer, Earl Granville *Mar* 14, [173] 1899; *The Conference*, Question, The Earl of Carnarvon; Answer, Earl Russell *April* 21, [174] 1417
Lord Wodehouse's Mission—Speech of M. Hall, Question, The Earl of Derby; Answer, Lord Wodehouse *Mar* 14, [173] 1896

The War
The Austrian Fleet, Question, The Earl of Ellenborough; Answer, The Duke of Somerset *Mar* 14, [173] 1901; Question, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Answer, Earl Russell; Observations thereon *Mar* 8, [173] 1627
Invasion of Jutland, Question, The Earl of Malmesbury; Answer, Earl Russell *Feb* 26, [173] 1158; *Jutland, War Contributions on*, Question, The Earl of Ellenborough; Answer, Earl Russell *May* 13, [175] 437
Bombardment of Sonderborg, Question, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Answer, Earl Russell *April* 7, [174] 531; Question, The Earl of Malmesbury; Answer, Earl Russell *April* 19, 1275
The Armistice — Identical Note of Austria and Prussia, Question, The Earl of Ellenborough; Answer, The Duke of Somerset *Mar* 15, [174] 1; Observations, The Earl of Carnarvon; Reply, Earl Russell *May* 9, [175] 176
Alleged Massacre of Swedes at Duppel, Question, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Answer, Earl Russell *July* 5, [176] 820; Observations, Earl Russell *July* 8, 1076; Question, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Answer, Earl Russell *July* 12, 1366

The Conference
Ministerial Statement, Observations, Earl Rus-
176] sell *June* 27, 302; *The Conference*—Copy presented, of Protocols of Conferences held in London relative to the Affairs of Denmark [by Command]; to lie upon the Table *June* 27, 337
Vote of Censure—Resolution (*The Earl of Malmesbury*) Moved, "That this House has heard with deep concern that the sittings of the Conference recently held in London have been brought to a close without accomplishing the important purposes for which it was

[*cont.*

Denmark and Germany—The Conference—cont.

convened. That it is the opinion of this House, that while the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government has failed to maintain their avowed policy of upholding the integrity and independence of Denmark, it has lowered the just influence of this country in the councils of Europe, and thereby diminished the securities for peace" *July* 8, 1076 ; after long debate, Amendt. moved, To omit all the Words after the Word ("convened") for the Purpose of inserting the following Words: ("That this House regrets that Denmark was allowed to expect from the English Government material Aid in support of the Objects of the Treaty of May, 1852") (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*), 1112 ; after further debate, on Question, "That the words, &c." Con. (Present) 119, (Proxies) 58 ; Total 177 ; Not-Con. (Present) 123, (Proxies) 45 ; Total 168 : M. 9 ; resolved in the affirmative ; Then the said original Motion agreed to ; List of Con. and Not-Con., 1190 ; Protest against the Resolutions, 1193 ; Her Majesty's Answer to the Address *July* 11

COMMONS—

Treaty of London, 1852 — *Integrity of Danish Monarchy*

Integrity of Danish Monarchy, Question, Lord Robert Cecil ; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Feb* 8, [173] 217 ; Question, Mr. Disraeli ; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Feb* 9, [173] 325

Danish Claim for Assistance, Question, Mr. MacEvoy ; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 25, [173] 1070

Treaty of 1852 *and the Warsaw Protocol, The*, Question, Mr. Kinglake 825 ; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 19, [173] 829 ; Motion for an Address for Papers relating to (*Mr. Kinglake*), [173] 1699 ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn *Mar* 8

Treaty of London, 1852, Motion "That it is both unjust and inexpedient to insist on the provisions of the Treaty of London, 1852, so far as they relate to the order of succession in the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, as a basis for the settlement of the Dano-German dispute" (*Mr. Osborne*) *April* 19, [174] 1292 ; Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "In the opinion of this House, it is the duty of Her Majesty's Government at the approaching Conference, whilst calling upon Denmark to fulfil the promises which she made to the two great German Powers in 1851-2, to maintain the provisions of the Treaty of London of 1852, so that the various States comprising the Danish Monarchy may remain united under the same Sovereign" (*Mr. Peacocke*), [174] 1315 ; after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn ; Original Question again proposed ; whereupon Previous Question, "That that Question be now put" (*Mr. Disraeli*) put, and negatived

Treaty of London, Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane ; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 27, [175] 720 ; Question, Mr. Bernal Osborne ; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *June* 6, 1262 ; Question, Lord Henry Lennox ; Answer, Mr. Bernal Osborne *June* 6, 1276 ; Question, The Earl

Denmark & Germany—Treaty of London—cont.

of Shaftesbury ; Answer, Earl Russell *June* 9, 1438 ; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith ; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *June* 9, 1458 ; Question, Mr. Disraeli ; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *June* 10, 1542 ; Question, Mr. Bernal Osborne ; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *June* 14, 1730 ; Question, The Earl of Ellenborough ; Answer, Earl Russell *June* 17, 1917 ; Question, Mr. Disraeli ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 20, 2029

Order of Succession in Holstein and Schleswig, Question, Mr. Bernal Osborne ; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Mar* 18, [174] 303 ; Questions, Sir Harry Verney ; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 6, [175] 156 ; Question, Mr. Hopwood ; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 9, 192

Relations with the European Powers, Question, Mr. Disraeli ; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Feb* 29, [173] 1260

Motion relative to Affairs of, Observations, Viscount Palmerston ; Reply, Mr. Bernal Osborne *Mar* 17, [174] 286 ; Notice postponed

The Correspondence

Question, Lord Robert Cecil ; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 9, [173] 324 ; Observations, Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald ; Reply, Mr. Layard ; debate thereon *Feb* 9, 329 ; Question, Sir Harry Verney ; Answer Mr. Layard *Feb* 11, 466 ; Question, Mr. Peacocke ; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Feb* 12, 499 ; Question, Lord John Manners ; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 19, 799 ; Question, Lord Robert Cecil ; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 22, 861 ; Question, Mr. Disraeli ; Reply, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 22, 862 ; Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Feb* 22, "the Consideration of the Navy Estimates be postponed till this day three weeks" (*Mr. Osborne*), 873 ; after long debate, Question put, "That the words, &c." A. 220, N. 47 ; M. 173 ; Division List—Ayes and Noes, 887 ; Question, Lord John Manners ; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 17, [174] 188

Despatch of 30*th November*, 1863, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith ; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 1, [173] 1335

Further Papers, Question, Mr. Disraeli ; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Mar* 8, [173] 1657

The War

Baltic Coast Lights, Question, Mr. Bentinck ; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Feb* 22, [173] 858

Blockade of the German Ports, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster ; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 25, [173] 1069 ; Question, Mr. Dalglish ; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 11, 1825 ; Question, Mr. Fenwick ; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 14, 1907

Danish Blockade in the Baltic, Question, Mr. Somerset Beaumont ; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 26, [174] 1625

Embargoes on Danish and German Shipping, Question, Sir John Ogilvy ; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 22, [173] 859

Denmark and Germany—The War—cont.

Province of Jutland, The, Question, Mr.
Newdegate; Answer, Viscount Palmerston
Feb 19, [173] 799

Invasion of Jutland, Question, Mr. Disraeli;
Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Mar* 7, [173]
1545

Prussian Exactions in Jutland, Question, Mr.
Richard Long; Answer, Sir George Grey
May 13, [175] 458

Arrest of Danish Subjects, Question, Mr.
Darby Griffith; Answer, Viscount Palmerston
Feb 25, [173] 1068

Austrian Fleet, The, Question, Lord Robert
Cecil; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 2, [174]
1979; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer,
Sir George Grey *May* 3, [174] 2053;
Observations, Mr. Darby Griffith *May* 13,
175] 466; Question, Mr. Whiteside; Answer,
Mr. Layard *May* 19, 516; Question,
Sir John Pakington; Answer, Mr.
Layard *May* 19, 517; Question, Mr. Whiteside;
Answer, Viscount Palmerston *May* 20,
522; Question, Mr. Whiteside; Answer,
Mr. Layard *May* 23, 591; Question, The
Earl of Ellenborough; Answer, Earl Russell;
debate thereon *May* 26, 606; Question,
Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Viscount
Palmerston *May* 27, 720

Naval Action off Heligoland, Question, Mr.
Bernal Osborne; Answer, Sir George Grey
May 9, [175] 197

H.M.S. "Aurora," Question, Mr. Darby
Griffith; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget
May 6, [175] 103

Alleged Massacre of Swedes at Duppel, Question,
Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr.
Layard *July* 5, [176] 826; Question, Lord
Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. Layard
July 8, 1196

The Armistice, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith;
Answer, Viscount Palmerston *July* 14, 1522

Bombardment of Sonderborg, Question, Mr.
Dillwyn; Answer, Viscount Palmerston;
debate thereon *April* 8, [174] 696

The Rumoured Armistice, Question, Mr. Disraeli;
Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 15, [173]
565

Armistice, The, Question, Mr. Disraeli; Answer,
Sir George Grey *May* 9, [175] 197

The Conference

Proposed Conference, The, Questions, Mr
Darby Griffith, Lord John Manners; Answer,
173] Viscount Palmerston *Feb* 25, 1071;
Question, Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald; Answer,
Viscount Palmerston *Feb* 26, 1189;
Question, Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald; Answer,
Viscount Palmerston *Mar* 11, 1828

Conference, German Diet and the, Question,
Lord John Manners; Answer, Viscount
Palmerston *Feb* 26, 1190; Questions, Sir
Charles Douglas, Lord John Manners, Mr.
Seymour Fitzgerald; Answer, Viscount
Palmerston *Mar* 7, 1547

Proposed Conference, The, Question, Lord
Robert Montagu; Answer, Viscount Palmerston
174] *Mar* 17, 188; Questions, Mr.
Bernal Osborne; Answer, Viscount Palmerston
April 4, 395; Question, Sir Harry
Verney; Answer, Viscount Palmerston
April 8, 631; Question, Mr. Horsman;

[*cont.*

Denmark and Germany—The Conference—cont.

174] Answer, Viscount Palmerston *April* 11, 787;
Question, Mr. Bernal Osborne; Answer,
Mr. Layard *April* 12, 876; Question, Mr.
Bernal Osborne; Answer, Mr. Layard
April 14, 971; Question, Mr. Disraeli;
Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 29, 1914;
Question, Mr. Disraeli; Answer, Sir George
175] Grey *May* 5, 25; Question, Mr. Newdegate;
Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 6,
100

The Vote of Censure—Resolution (*Mr. Disraeli*)

Ordered, "That the Orders of the Day be postponed till after the notice of Motion relative to Denmark and Germany" (*Viscount Palmerston*)

176] Motion made, and Question proposed, "That
an humble Address be presented to Her
Majesty to thank Her Majesty for directing
the Correspondence on Denmark and Germany,
and the Protocols of the Conference
recently held in London, to be laid before
Parliament

"To assure Her Majesty, that we have heard with deep concern, that the sittings of that Conference have been brought to a close without accomplishing the important purposes for which it was convened

"To express to Her Majesty our great regret that, while the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government has failed to maintain their avowed policy of upholding the integrity and independence of Denmark, it has lowered the just influence of this Country in the councils of Europe, and thereby diminished the securities of peace" (*Mr. Disraeli*) *July* 4, 709

After long debate, Amendt. proposed, To leave out the second paragraph of the proposed Question, in order to insert the words "To submit to Her Majesty the opinion of this House, that the independence of Denmark and the possessions of that Kingdom, on the terms proposed by the Representatives of the Neutral Powers in the recent Conference, ought to be guaranteed" (*Mr. Newdegate*) instead thereof, 777

Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after further debate, Debate adjourned till To-morrow

Ordered, "That the first seven Orders of the Day be postponed till after the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate relative to Denmark and Germany" *July* 5

Debate resumed *July* 5, 826

After long debate, Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed *July* 7, 952

After long debate, Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed *July* 8, 1198

After long debate, Question, "That the words, &c." put and agreed to

Whereupon Amendt. proposed, To leave out the last paragraph of the proposed Question, in order to add the words "To express the satisfaction with which we have learnt that, at this conjuncture, Her Majesty has been advised to abstain from armed interference in the War now going on between Denmark and the German Powers" (*Mr. Kinglake*) instead thereof, 1300

Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 295, N. 313; M. 18; Words added

[*cont.*

Denmark and Germany—Vote of Censure—[cont.

176] Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to Resolved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, to thank Her Majesty for directing the Correspondence on Denmark and Germany, and the Protocols of the Conference recently held in London, to be laid before Parliament

"To assure Her Majesty, that we have heard with deep concern, that the sittings of that Conference have been brought to a close without accomplishing the important purposes for which it was convened

"To express the satisfaction with which we have learnt that, at this conjuncture, Her Majesty has been advised to abstain from armed interference in the War now going on between Denmark and the German Powers"

. Division List—Ayes and Noes, 1301

. Her Majesty's Answer to the Address *July* 11, 1322

. Language used in the Debate, Explanations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, General Peel, Mr. Layard *July* 8, 1196

. Question, Mr. Disraeli; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *June* 23, 162; Question, Lord Burghley; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *July* 1, 655; Question, Sir Lawrence Palk; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 4, 707

Riots at Copenhagen—Retreat from the Dannewerke, Question, Mr. Peacocke; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Feb* 9, [173] 322

Treaty of Vienna and Prussia, Question, Mr. Ayrton; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *July* 18, [176] 1623

Schleswig-Holstein, Question, Sir H. Verney; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *July* 29, [176] 2188

The Armistice, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *July* 29 [176] 2194

Neutral Goods in Prussian Vessels, Question Sir Lawrence Palk; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Feb* 5, [173] 172

War Steamer in the Clyde, Question, Mr. Dalglish; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 29, [173] 1251

The Treaty of London (1852), Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *July* 18, [176] 1625

The War in Denmark, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Speaker *July* 11, [176] 1328

The Prussians and the Norwegian Mail Steamer "Viken," Question, Mr. Wyld; Answer, Mr. Layard *July* 19, [176] 1708

Despatches from St. Petersburg, Question, Mr. A. Seymour; Answer, Mr. Layard *July* 12, [176] 1389

Parl. Papers—		(L)	(C)
Correspondence, 1851-2			[3268]
Accessions to Treaty of London, 1852		[1744]	[3270]
Correspondence, 1850-53		[1765]	[3301]
Correspondence, 1858		[1826]	[3383]
Correspondence, 1864—Integrity of Danish Monarchy	No. 1	[1729]	[3257]
Affairs of Holstein, &c.	No. 2	No. 2	[3267]
,,	No. 3	No. 3	[3272]
,,	No. 4	No. 4	[3276]

[cont.

Denmark and Germany—Parl. Papers—cont.

		(L)	(C)
Affairs of Holstein, &c.	No. 5	No. 5	[3300]
,,	No. 6	No. 6	[3371]
,,	No. 7		[3382]
Protocols of Conference of London		[1814]	[3366]
Summary of Proceedings in Conference		[1817]	[3372]
Reports of MM. Ward and Rainals		[1754]	[3292]

Dent, Mr. J., *Scarborough*

Agricultural Statistics, Res. [175] 1372

Derby, Earl of

Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 22, 42

Admiralty Lands and Works, Comm. *cl.* 14, [175] 1351

Agrarian Offences (Ireland), Paper moved for, [175] 359

Alkali Works Regulation, [176] 254, 255

Army—Artillery—Mackay's Gun, [174] 1176, 1178

Augmentation of Benefices Act, Return, [173] 618, 1248

County Courts Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 586, 1454

Denmark and Germany — Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 308;—The Correspondence, 1615, 1619;—Speech of M. Hall, 1896, 1897;—Res. [174] 765, 774; [175] 1924;—The Conference, [176] 317, 324

Education, Committee of Council on—Resignation of Mr. Lowe, [174] 1190

Elgin and Kincardine, Countess of, Address moved, [175] 1612

Greenwich Hospital, [175] 1541

Metropolitan Railways, [174] 446, 448;—Working Class Trains, Res. [174] 1488, 1491

Mount St. Bernard's Reformatory, [176] 21

Navy—Retirement of Naval Captains, [174] 1497, 1498

Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, [175] 1348

Poland—Condition of, [174] 1861

Public Schools, 2R. [175] 1254

Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [173] 456, 459

Rape, Punishment of, Comm. *cl.* 1, [174] 961; Report, 1282

Regius Professorship of Greek (Oxford), 2R. [174] 1760, 1761, 1769; Comm. [175] 446, 453, 554, 560, 562, 563, 565

Royal Arcade, 2R. Amendt. [173] 849

United States—Correspondence with the Federal Government, [173] 310, 311, 427, 438, 547, 549, 1053, 1061;—Federal Recruiting in Ireland, Papers moved for, 1332;—Foreign Enlistment Act — The "Kearsarge," [174] 449, 533;— Steam Rams in the Mersey, Papers moved for, 1862, 1897, 1898, 1912; —Case of Mr. Levey, [176] 2, 4

West Riding of Yorkshire Assizes, Address moved, [175] 1621, 1624

Dering, Sir E. C., *Kent, E.*

Herne Bay, Hampton and Reculver Fishery, 2R. Amendt. [175] 1634

Malt for Cattle, Leave, [173] 227, 233; 2R. 601; Comm. *cl.* 1, 1052; *add. cl.* 1220, 1227

[cont.

DERING, Sir E. C.—*cont.*
Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 993
Supply—Royal Parks, &c. [175] 419, 420

DE ROS, Lord
Public Schools, 2R. [175] 1241

DESART, Earl of
Army—Ten Years Enlistment Men, [174] 163, 173
Denmark and Germany, [174] 294
Vestry Cess Abolition (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [174] 9

DICKSON, Col. J. A., *Limerick Co.*
Army Estimates — General Staff, &c. [174] 827 ;—Martial Law, 853 ; — Works, Buildings, &c. [175] 205
Army—Instruction and Employment of Soldiers, Res. [174] 626
Beer Houses (Ireland), 2R. [175] 600 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, Adj. moved, 694, 695
Chancery, Court of (Ireland), [173] 932
Charitable Estates and Trusts Acts, Returns moved for, [173] 488
Crawley, Colonel, Case of, Papers moved for, [174] 92
Denmark and Germany, [174] 289
Education (Inspectors' Reports), Nomination of Comm. Adj. moved, [175] 999
Government Manufacturing Establishments, Res. [176] 1953
Indian Medical Service, Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 1703
Malt for Cattle, Comm. [173] 1036
Militia Regiments, [175] 913
Navy—Claims of Mr. J. Clare, Comm. moved for, [174] 1460, 1466, 1467
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [173] 1153 ; —Naval Establishments, [174] 2032
Paper Manufacture, Comm. moved for, [176] 1740
Supply—Holyhead Harbour, &c. [175] 857 ;—Public Works (Ireland), 860 ;—Privy Council for Trade, 1602 ;—Lord Privy Seal, 1604 ;—Public Education (Ireland), [176] 1351, 1352

DILLWYN, Mr. L. L., *Swansea*
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. *cl.* 20, [176] 1865
Denmark and Germany—Bombardment of Sonderborg, [174] 696, 699
Ireland—Bishoprics in, [174] 16
Irish Church, The, [173] 462
Navy—The "Research" and the "Enterprise," [175] 591
Patent Law Commission, [174] 1773
Patent Office Library and Museum, [174] 915, 1950, 1951 ; Comm. moved for, [175] 245
Private Bills, Res. 6, [173] 677
Privilege, [174] 1959
School of Naval Architecture—Sir W. S. Harris, Papers moved for, [175] 196
South Kensington, New Museums at, [174] 1078

[*cont.*

DILLWYN, Mr. L. L.—*cont.*
Supply—County Roads, South Wales, [175] 1675 ;—Emigration, 1894 ;—Department of Science and Art, [176] 561 ; — National Gallery, 1528 ;—Magnetic and Meteorological Observations, 1599 ;—Royal Academy of Music, 1606

Discriminating Duties
Moved, for an Address "for Copy of any Correspondence between Her Majesty's Government and the Governments of France, Spain, and Portugal, from 1850 to 1863 inclusive" (*Mr. Lindsay*) *June* 7, [175] 1353
Amendt. to insert "or Extracts" (*Mr. Milner Gibson*) agreed to
Address for "Copy or Extracts, &c." agreed to *Parl. P.* [No. 3407]

Diseased Cattle
Question, Mr. R. Long ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 12, [173] 495

Diseased Meat, Conviction for Sale of
Question, Mr. Crawford ; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 21, [176] 1792

DISRAELI, Right Hon. B., *Buckinghamshire*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 86
Ashantee—War in, Res. [175] 2019, 2020, 2023
Bewicke, Mr., Case of, Comm. moved for, [174] 1935, 1937
Denmark and Germany—Treaty of 1852, [173] 325, 327 ;—Res. Previous Question moved, [174] 1360, 1376 ; — The Danish Papers, [173] 330, 1657 ;—Rumoured Armistice, 565 ;—Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, 862, 877 ;—Relations with the European Powers, 1260 ; — Invasion of Jutland, 1545 ; [174] 288 ;—The Conference, 1914 ; [175] 25, 1279, 2029, 2030 ; [176] 162, 163, 351 ;—The Armistice, [175] 197, 1542 ; — Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 709, 752, 772, 975, 988, 1003, 1073, 1287, 1291
Education—Reports of Inspectors of Schools — Resignation of Mr. Lowe, [174] 1215 ; Nomination of Comm. [175] 1087
Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1549
Mazzini, M. — The Greco Conspiracy, [173] 1937
Merthyr Tydvil Writ, [174] 1196
Navy—The "Gladiator," [176] 162
Stansfeld, Mr., and the Greco Conspiracy, Res. [174] 189, 190, 270, 275
Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 1045
Under Secretaries of State, [174] 1081, 1082 ; —Privilege, Res. 1218, 1248
Ways and Means—Fire Insurance Duty, [174] 1449

Divorce and Matrimonial Causes (Amendment) Bill [H.L.]
(*Lord St. Leonards*)
l. Presented ; read 1^{a}* *May* 10 (No. 75)
Read 2^{a}* *May* 26
Committee * *May* 30 ; Report * *June* 3
Read 3^{a} *June* 6 (No. 103)

[*cont.*

Divorce and Matrimonial Causes (Amendment) Bill—cont.
c. Read 1° * *June* 17 [Bill 162]
Read 2°* *June* 20
Committee* ; Report *July* 1*
Read 3° * *July* 5
Royal Assent *July* 14 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 44]

Dockyards
Select Committee appointed* *Feb* 25, "To inquire into and report upon the Basin and Dock Accommodation of the Royal Dockyards in the United Kingdom, and its sufficiency for the Public Service, having reference especially to the proposed extension of Her Majesty's Dockyard at Portsmouth" (*Lord Clarence Paget*)
Committee nominated *Feb* 26 (after short debate), Sir Francis Baring, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Stansfeld, Sir John Hay, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Laird, Sir Morton Peto, Mr. George Bentinck, Sir Joseph Paxton, Mr. Corry, and Mr. Charles Berkeley; and, on *Feb* 29, Mr. Leatham, Mr. Lawson, Sir James Elphinstone and Mr. Hennessy, added; Mr. Stansfeld disch.; Lord Clarence Paget added *April* 13; Mr. Stansfeld, Captain Talbot added *April* 20
First Report *May* 4 (No. 270)
Second Report *May* 15 (No. 496)

Dockyards, Royal Commission on, 1860
Observations, Mr. Lindsay; long debate thereon *Feb* 22, [173] 903

Dockyards Commission, Royal—The Report of 1860
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Feb* 25, To leave out from "That," and add, "That in the opinion of this House the Recommendations contained in the Report of the Commissioners appointed by Her Majesty in 1860 to inquire into the control and mannagement of Her Majesty's Naval Yards ought to be carried into effect" (*Mr. Lindsay*), [173] 1073; after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Dodson, Mr. J. G., *Sussex, E.*
County Voters, Registration of, Nomination of Comm. [173] 681
County Voters Registration, 2R. [175] 1815
Highways District Act, [176] 257
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway, 2R. [173] 1633
Malt, Duty on, Res. [176] 262
Malt for Cattle, Comm. [173] 1039
Supply—Consular Establishments, [175] 1901; —Embassies and Missions Abroad, Amendt. [176] 393, 395
Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [174] 102, 157; Comm. [175] 1043
Union Assessment Committee Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [175] 518; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 519

Donoughmore, Earl of
Admiralty Lands and Works, Comm. *cl.* 14, [175] 1351
Agrarian Offences (Ireland), Paper moved for, [175] 358, 360

[*cont.*

Donoughmore, Earl of—*cont.*
Artillery Practice in Plymouth Sound, [175] 1224
Borrowing Powers of Railway Companies, [173] 1317
Chimney Sweepers, Comm. *cl.* 8, [175] 1133
Civil Bill Courts (Ireland), 2R. [176] 332
Denmark and Germany, [175] 176
Ireland—Constabulary, [174] 166, 176;—Agrarian Outrages, Res. [176] 482, 491
Mortgage Debentures, Comm. [175] 1053
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1997
Oyster Fishery (England and Wales), 2R. [176] 482
Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2), 2R. [176] 2000
Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, 2R. [176] 1898
Police (Ireland), [176] 2101
Poor Relief (Metropolis), 2R. [176] 2130
Public and Refreshment Houses, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [176] 822; Report, Amendt. 1312; *cl.* 9, 1313, 1316; 3R. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1447
Railway Schemes (Metropolis), [173] 848
United States—Federal Recruiting in Ireland, Papers moved for, [173] 1328; [174] 299, 448;—The "Kearsarge," 299
Vestry Cess Abolition (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1900; Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [174] 9
Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [176] 1784
West Hartlepool Railway Directors, [173] 1179, 1181

Douglas, Sir C., *Banbury*
Church Building, &c. Acts Amendment, 2R. [175] 1520
Church Rates Commutation, 2R. Amendt. [174] 1715
Denmark and Germany—Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 1547

Doulton, Mr. F., *Lambeth*
City Traffic Regulations, [175] 1836
Forests, Royal, in Essex, [176] 654
Open Spaces (Metropolis), Res. [176] 431
Standards of Weight and Measure, [176] 2015
Thames Conservancy, Comm. *cl.* 75, [176] 416

Down and Connor, Bishop of
Education, National (Ireland), [176] 700

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Peel, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 9 [Bill 100]
Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°;" Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. George*), [176] 301; Question proposed, that "now, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Main Question put, and agreed to
Bill read 2° *June* 24
Committee *; Report *July* 1
Considered as amended * *July* 4
Read 3° * *July* 5
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Steward*) *July* 7
Read 2ª * *July* 14 (No. 189
Committee *; Report *July* 15
Read 3ª * *July* 18
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 72

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental Bill
(*Mr. Peel, Sir Robert Peel*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 13 [Bill 207]
Read 2°* *July* 15
Committee*; Report *July* 18
Read 3°* *July* 19
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Steward*) *July* 20
Read 2ª* *July* 25 (No. 221)
Committee*; Report *July* 26
Read 3ª* *July* 27
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 72]

Du Cane, Mr. C., *Essex, N.*
France—Fisheries Convention, [175] 457
Malt for Cattle, Comm. [173] 1029
Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 1010

Duff, Mr. M. E. Grant, *Elgin, &c.*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 118
Denmark and Germany—Treaty of London, 1852, Res. [174] 1321
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [176] 1847
Endowed Schools, [176] 2191
Inns of Court, Papers moved for, [176] 639
Mazzini, M.—The Greco Conspiracy, [173] 1936
Poland—Despatch of September, 1863, [173] 542; Res. [175] 656
Public Schools Commission, Res. [175] 105
Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [176] 1423, 1431
Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [174] 116
Turkey—Prince Couza and the Porte, [176] 1904

Duff, Mr. R. W., *Banffshire*
Navy Estimates, Supplementary—Pay of Officers, [175] 684

Dunbar, Sir W. (Lord of the Treasury), *Wigton, &c.*
Court of Justiciary (Scotland), Comm. [173] 1704
Scotch Affairs, Administration of, Comm. moved for, [175] 1196, 1198

Duncombe, Vice-Adm. Hon. A., *Yorkshire, East Riding*
Army Estimates—Commissariat, [174] 832
Japan—Armstrong Guns at Kagosima, [173] 1905
Navy—The "Research," [175] 802
School of Naval Architecture—Sir W. S. Harris, Papers moved for, [175] 196

Duncombe, Hon. W. E., *Yorkshire, North Riding*
Address in Answer to the Speech, Report, [173] 211
Greco Conspiracy, The — M. Mazzini—Mr. Stansfeld, [174] 324

Dundas, Rt. Hon. Sir D., *Sutherlandshire*
Merthyr Tydvil Writ, [174] 1195

Dunkellin, Lord, *Galway Borough*
Denmark and Germany—Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 883
Ireland—Taxation of, Comm. moved for, [173] 1210

Dunlop, Mr. A. M., *Greenock*
Bank Notes (Scotland), 2R. [174] 1743
Costs Security, 2R. [175] 1814
Education (Scotland), [175] 1591
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 604
Ireland—State of, Res. [173] 1859
Servants Hiring (Scotland), Comm. [175] 1819, 1823
Valuation of Lands, &c. (Scotland) Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 1423
Writs Registration (Scotland), 2R. [175] 1498

Dunne, Colonel F. P., *Queen's Co.*
Administration of Justice (Ireland), [176] 1340
Army Estimates — Land Forces, [173] 1448; —General Staff, &c. [174] 811;—Clothing, 832, 835;—Barracks, 836;—Medical Establishment, [175] 36;—Disembodied Militia, 40, 42;—Enrolled Pensioners, 52;—Manufacturing Departments, 65, 69; — Works, Buildings, &c. 207, 215; — Military Education, 231; — Pensions and Allowances to Wounded Officers, 240
Army—Instruction and Employment of Soldiers, Res. [174] 626;—Rating of Officers of Chelsea Hospital, Address moved, [175] 200; —Breech Loading Rifles, Papers moved for, 435;—Recruiting for the, [176] 387
Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Leave, Adj. moved, [174] 1378; Comm. [176] 290
Chief Rents (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1400; Comm. [175] 13, 14
Conveyancers, &c. (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [173] 1229
Greek Loan, Res. Report, [175] 1606; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [176] 403, 406, 407; 3R. 567, 572
Holyhead Harbour — Vessels Wrecked, &c. Return moved for, [173] 424
Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties), Comm. *cl.* 9, [176] 282; *cl.* 10, 283
Ionian Islands—Cession of the, [173] 1082, 1087;—Annexation to Greece, [176] 1580
Ireland—Taxation of, Comm. moved for, [173] 1199, 1215
Lunatic Asylums (Ireland), [176] 638
Medical Officers in Unions (Ireland), Res. [175] 154
Rifles, Breech-loading, Papers moved for, [175] 435
Supply—Landed Estates Record Offices, [175] 1676, 1677;—County Courts, 1685;—Emigration, 1891, 1894; Report, 1913;—Special Missions, [176] 398;—Queen's Colleges (Ireland), 1355; — Royal Academy of Music, 1605, 1606
Trespass (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 935
Vestry Cess Abolition (Ireland), 2R. [173] 722
Watching of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1717

Dunsany, Lord
Jamaica, Affairs of, Papers moved for, [175] 1119

Durham, Bishop of
Scotch Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. Amendt. [175] 623

Dutton, Hon. R. H., *Hampshire, S.*
  Beckenham, Lewes, and Brighton Railway, 2R. [173] 639
  Crawley, Colonel, Case of, Papers moved for, [174] 85
  Malt for Cattle, 2R. [173] 608; Comm. 1040
  Private Bills, Committees on, Res. [175] 1570
  Public Lands and Buildings (Local Rates), Res. [174] 499
  Salmon Fisheries, [173] 323
  Stamp on Proxy Papers, Res. [173] 1461

East India Revenue Accounts
  Resolutions of Sir Charles Wood considered in Committee *July* 21, [176] 1808; after long debate, Resolutions agreed to *July* 21
  Resolutions reported *July* 22

Ebury, Lord
  Burial Service, [175] 1928, 1929; Commission moved for, [176] 1306, 1311
  Church Services (Apocrypha), 2R. [175] 1930, 1933
  Public and Refreshment Houses, Report, [176] 1312

Ecclesiastical Commission
  Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 18, [174] 1198

Ecclesiastical Commissioners
  Motion for "Copies of Two Reports of Committees of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners" (*The Archbishop of York*) *Feb* 5, [173] 160; after short debate, Motion agreed to; (*Parl. P.* Nos. 1 and 2)
  Motion for Copy "Of two Reports made to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners by the Estates Committee on the 4th and 18th days of February, 1864" (*Mr. Walpole*) *Feb* 23; after short debate, agreed to, 1021 (*Parl. P.* 88)

Ecclesiastical Courts
  Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 10, [173] 1784

Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Archbishop of Armagh*)

l. Presented; read 1ª* *May* 26 (No. 96)
  Read 2ª *June* 2
  Committee *June* 14
  Clauses 83, 84, 85 struck out (*Archbishop of Armagh*)
  Report* *June* 17
  Read 3ª *June* 21
c. Read 1º* *June* 24 [Bill 174]
  Read 2º* *June* 30
  Committee*; Report *July* 7
  Considered as amended* *July* 11
  Read 3º *July* 13
  Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 54]
    Parl. Papers—*Lords* . . . . No. 96
      As amended in Committee . . No. 132
      As amended on Report . . No. 138
      As amended by Commons . . No. 201
      Commons . . Bill 174

Ecclesiastical Registry
  Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 6, [175] 1291

Education
  Endowed Schools
    Endowments, Motion, "That Grants made from the Treasury to Schools for the Working Classes should not, in every case, be reduced by the whole amount of all endowments" (*Mr. Adderley*) *Mar* 8, [173] 1659; after long debate, Motion agreed to
    Minutes of Council on Education on Endowed Schools—Question, Mr. Mitford; Answer, Mr. H. A. Bruce *May* 9, [175] 189
    Minutes of May 19 *and March* 11—Question, Mr. Adderley; Answer, Mr. H. A. Bruce *May* 12, [175] 365
    Endowed Schools—Moved, "That this House having considered the Minute of Council of the 11th day of March, 1864, on Endowed Schools, is of opinion that it does not meet the objections made to the Minute of the 19th day of May, 1863" (*Mr. Adderley*) *June* 2, [175] 1065; after debate, Question put, A. 111, N. 119; M. 8.
    Grants to Endowed Schools, Notice of Motion, Sir John Pakington, withdrawn *June* 30, [176] 497
    Endowed Schools, Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 29, [176] 2191

  Education Reports, Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Mr. Lowe *Mar* 11, [173] 1823
  Education (*Scotland*), Question, Mr. Leslie; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Feb* 25, [173] 1067; Question, Mr. Dunlop; Answer, Mr. H. A. Bruce *June* 10, [175] 1591
  Inspection of Night Schools, Question, Mr. Sclater-Booth; Answer, Mr. Lowe *Mar* 11, [173] 1824

  Inspectors' Reports
    Morell, Mr., Dismissal of, Question, Lord Robert Cecil; Answer, Mr. Lowe *April* 5, [174] 478; Correspondence *P.P.* 215
    Reports of Inspectors of Schools, Motion, "That, in the opinion of this House, the mutilation of the Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, and the exclusion from them of statements and opinions adverse to the educational views entertained by the Committee of Council, while matter favourable to them is admitted, are violations of the understanding under which the appointment of the Inspectors was originally sanctioned by Parliament, and tend entirely to destroy the value of their Reports" (*Lord R. Cecil*) *April* 12, [174] 897; after debate, Question put, A. 101, N. 93, M. 8
      Division List—Ayes and Noes, [174] 912
    Resignation of Mr. Lowe, Observations, Earl Granville; debate thereon *April* 16, [174] 1184; Statement, Mr. Lowe; debate thereon *April* 18, [174] 1202
    Inspectors' Reports—Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 9, [175] 191
      Resolution (12th April) (*Lord Robert Cecil*) read *May* 12, [175] 368

[*cont.*

Education—*Inspectors' Reports*—cont.

Moved, 'That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the practice of the Committee of Council on Education with respect to the Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools" (*Sir George Grey*), [175] 369

Amendt. at the end of Question, to add, "and further to inquire into the constitution of that Committee, and how far their mode of conducting the business of the Department is consistent with the due control of Parliament over the annual Education Grants" (*Sir John Pakington*), [175] 371

After long debate, Question put, "That those words be there added," A. 93, N. 142; M. 49

Ordered, "That a Select Committee be appointed, &c."

Explanation, Mr. Lowe *May* 13, [175] 462

Moved, "That Mr. Bruce be nominated one of the Members of the Select Committee on Education (Inspectors' Reports)" (*Viscount Palmerston*) *May* 31, [175] 982

Amendt. To leave out from "That" and add "the Select Committee do consist of five Members, to be nominated by the General Committee of Elections" (*Mr. Clay*), [175] 985

Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Hennessy*); A. 30, N. 64; M. 34, [175] 997

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Colonel Dickson*); A. 32, N. 62; M. 30, [175] 999

Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *June* 2

After short debate, Question put, and negatived, [175] 1084

Question, "That the words 'the Select Committee do consist of five Members, to be nominated by the General Committee of Elections,' be added" (*Mr. Clay*), [175] 1091

Amendt. To the said proposed Amendment, by adding "and that two other Members, to be named by the General Committee of Elections, be appointed to serve on the Select Committee to examine Witnesses, but without the power of voting" (*Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie*), [175] 1092

Question, "That those words be there added," put, and agreed to.

Ordered accordingly

And, on *June* 7, Nomination reported—Edward Howes, esq. (Chairman), John George Dodson, esq., Sir Philip de Malpas Grey Egerton, bart., Lord Hotham, the Hon. Charles Howard

Also, The Lord Advocate, and Lord Robert Cecil, but without the power of voting.

Report of Select Committee. (*Parl. P.* 468)

Committee on Inspectors' Reports, Question, Lord Robert Cecil; Answer, Mr. H. A. Bruce *June* 10, [175] 1543; Observations, Mr. Hunt *July* 21, [176] 1798

Report of Committee — Motion, "That this House, having considered the Report of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the practice of the Committee of Council on Education with respect to the Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors of [*cont.*

Education—*Inspectors' Reports*—cont.

Schools, is of opinion that the Resolution passed on the 12th day of April last, with reference to such Reports, ought to be rescinded, and the said Resolution is hereby rescinded" (*Viscount Palmerston*); after long debate, Resolution agreed to *July* 25, 2067

Middle Class Education, Question, Lord Brougham; Answer, Earl Granville *May* 27, [175] 697

Middle Class Schools, Petitions, L. Brougham; Observations, Earl Granville *July* 22, [176] 1877

Science Certificate, Question, Mr. W. Mundy; Answer, Mr. H. A. Bruce *June* 16, [175] 1837

Supplementary Rules—Question, Lord Robert Cecil; Answer, Mr. H. A. Bruce *May* 10, [175] 259

Edwards, Lt. Col. H., *Beverley*
- Army Estimates—Yeomanry Cavalry, [175] 45
- Assize Town for the West Riding, [174] 1080
- Factories, Sub-Inspectors of, [174] 187, 632
- Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [175] 1726
- Law Life Assurance Company, [175] 768, 769
- Navy Estimates, Supplementary — Pay of Officers, [175] 690, 691
- Navy—Masters in the, Res. [175] 1212
- Yeomanry Cavalry, Res. [173] 1376

Egerton of Tatton, Lord
- Public and Refreshment Houses, Report, *cl.* 9, [176] 1313

Egerton, Hon. A. F., *Lancashire, S.*
- Denmark and Germany — Treaty of London, 1852, Res. [174] 1319

Egerton, Hon. W., *Cheshire, N.*
- India—The British Envoy to Bhootan, [175] 633

Egerton, Mr. E. C., *Macclesfield*
- Great Eastern Northern Junction Railway, 2R. [173] 710

Egypt—Suez Canal
- Question, Mr. Roebuck; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 25, [173] 1066; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Mar* 18, [174] 302; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *April* 12, [174] 870

Elcho, Lord, *Haddingtonshire*
- African Traders, Company of, [175] 2026
- Army Estimates—Volunteers, [175] 47;—Enrolled Pensioners, 54; — Manufacturing Departments, 54; Amendt. 74, 76, 77
- Army—The Enfield Rifle, [175] 456
- Denmark and Germany—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1240
- Exhibition Building, The, [173] 793
- Greco Conspiracy, The — M. Mazzini — Mr. Stansfeld, [174] 322

[*cont.*

ELCHO, Lord—*cont.*
Royal Academy — Report of Commissioners, [173] 793; [175] 21
South Kensington Museum, [175] 21
Supply—Royal Parks, &c. [175] 422;—Houses of Parliament, 432;—New National Gallery at Burlington House, 1302, 1321, 1335
Valuation of Lands, &c. (Scotland) Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 1432, 1435

Election Petitions Bill
(*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Knightley*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 12 [Bill 17]
174] Read 2°, after short debate, *Mar* 16, 161
Order for Committee read *June* 1
175] Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," 1044; Amendt. To leave out from "That" and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the expediency of amending the Election Petitions Act (1848), and the Act for the better discovery and prevention of Bribery and Treating at Elections" (*Mr. Ayrton*), 1046; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" debate adjourned
176] Order read, for resuming adjourned debate *June* 28, 448
House counted out

Election Petitions Act (1848) Amendment Bill (*Sir C. O'Loghlen, Mr. Adair*)
c. Ordered * *June* 21; read 1° * *June* 29 [Bill 182]
Read 2° * *July* 11
Bill withdrawn * *July* 13

Elgin and Kincardine, Countess of
LORDS—
Message from the QUEEN *June* 6, [175] 1225
Moved, "That an humble Address," &c. (*The Lord President*) *June* 13, [175] 1607
Address Ordered, *Nemine Dissentiente*
The QUEEN'S Answer reported* *June* 17
COMMONS—
Message from HER MAJESTY *June* 6, [175] 1264
Considered in Committee *June* 9
Resolution (*Viscount Palmerston*), [175] 1458; Resolution agreed to
Resolution reported *June* 10, 1604; Bill ordered

Elgin and Kincardine, Countess of, Bill
See *Countess of Elgin and Kincardine Bill*

Elgin, Lord, and Lord Canning
Explanation, The Marquess of Clanricarde *June* 14, [175] 1698

ELLENBOROUGH, Earl of
Army—Artillery—Mackay's Gun, [174] 1182
China—Death of Lieut. Tinling, [173] 454
Denmark and Germany—Invasion of Jutland, [173] 1160;—The Correspondence, 1621;—Austrian Fleet in the Baltic, 1629, 1901;—Identical Note of Austria and Prussia, [174] 1;—Postponement of Notice, 294; [175] 177;—War Contributions on Jutland, 437, 441, 606, 1917
Elgin and Kincardine, Countess of, Address moved, [175] 1610

ELLENBOROUGH, Earl of—*cont.*
Foreign Affairs, [176] 2084
Head, Sir F. B., Memorial of, [176] 1371
India—Seat of Government, [174] 1756;—Disposal of the Native Dead, 1757
Metropolitan Railways—Working Class Trains, Res. [174] 1491
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1997
Regius Professorship of Greek (Oxford), 2R. [174] 1761
Sentences of Death, 1R. [174] 1483; 2R. [175] 247, 257
United States—Kidnapping Foreign Subjects for Military Service, [175] 353

ELPHINSTONE, Sir J. D. H., *Portsmouth*
Ashantee — War in, [175] 1840, 1841; Res. 2013; [176] 33
Borough Franchise, 2R. [175] 347
Brazil—Slave Trade, [176] 1382
Chain Cables and Anchors, 2R. [173] 685; Select Comm. moved for, 1362; Comm. *cl.* 1, [174] 504; *cl.* 8, 514; *cl.* 9, 515
China—Affairs of, Res. [175] 961
Denmark and Germany — H.M.S. "Aurora," [175] 104
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [176] 1842, 1855, 1856, 1857
Fortifications and Works, Comm. [176] 1533, 1534
Harbours of Refuge, Res. [174] 1696
Japan—Bombardment of Kagosima, Res. [173] 395
Kertch Prize Money, [173] 1182
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [173] 1154; —Wages of Artificers Abroad, 1785; — Wages of Artificers at Home, 1965;—Naval Stores, [174] 418, 435;—Steam Machinery, 441, 442;—Naval Miscellaneous Services, 443, 444;—Freight of Ships, 445;—Naval Establishments, 2048; — Pay of Officers, [175] 684, 691
Navy — The "Prince Consort" and the "Lively," [173] 1767, 1777; — Dockyard Patronage, 1914;—Labourers in the Dockyards, [174] 1081;—The "Research" and the "Enterprise," [175] 589, 914;—Masters in the, Res. 1217, 1219;—The "Gladiator," 2028, [176] 615, 616;—Squadron on the West Coast of Africa, 1390
Public Works and Buildings (Local Rates), Res. [174] 492, 496
School of Naval Architecture—Sir W. S. Harris, Papers moved for, [175] 196
Supply—West Coast of Africa, [175] 1890
United States — Capture of British Ships, Papers moved for, [173] 520;—Seizure of the "Saxon," [174] 478; [175] 368, 1064; —of the "Tuscaloosa," Res. [174] 1813; — The Forged Despatch, 1978, 1979

ENFIELD, Viscount, *Middlesex*
Archway and Kentish Town Junction Road, 2R. [173] 1064
Army Estimates—Disembodied Militia, [175] 41
Children Employment Commissioners, [173] 561
Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [174] 1716
County Franchise, 2R. [174] 931

Enfield, Viscount—*cont.*
France and Cambodia, [174] 1286
Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, 2R. [173] 576
Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [173] 292
Supply — Land, &c. Kensington Gore, [175] 866
Turnpike Gates removed, [176] 1570

English and Irish Courts of Common Law and Chancery Commission
Observations — Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, Earl Granville *April* 22, [174] 1485

Esmonde, Mr. J., *Waterford Co.*
Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. [176] 91
Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Comm. [176] 299
Poor Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment, 2R. [176] 466
Supply—Public Works (Ireland), [175] 860;—Landed Estates Record Offices, 1676;—Consular Establishments, 1907; Report, 1913

Estcourt, Rt. Hon. T. Sotheron, *Wiltshire, N.*
County Voters Registration, 2R. [175] 1818
Gaols, 2R. [175] 2086
Government Annuities, Comm. [174] 237, 249; Nomination of Comm. 1476; 3R. [175] 2036
Indemnity, 2R. [176] 665
Jersey Court, Comm. [176] 1435
Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for, [176] 1466

Evans, Gen. Sir De Lacy, *Westminster*
India—Indian Officers, Res. [174] 881

Evans, Mr. T. W., *Derbyshire, S.*
Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, 2R. [173] 580
Ionian Islands—Cession of the, [173] 1084
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [174] 1258; *cl.* 4, 1265

Eversley, Viscount
Public and Refreshment Houses, Report [176] 1317

Ewart, Mr. J. C., *Liverpool*
Chain Cables and Anchors, Comm. *cl.* 8, [174] 513
Kertch Prize Money, [173] 858; [175] 364
Partnership Law Amendment, Comm. [175] 243
Supply—Sir Rowland Hill, [175] 1597
United States—Confederate Cruisers, Papers moved for, [173] 1495

Ewart, Mr. W., *Dumfries, &c.*
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [175] 207
Army—Garden Allotments to Soldiers, [173] 1906; [174] 875
Artillery — Commissioners to United States and Denmark, [173] 564
[*cont.*

Ewart, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Civil Service and Miscellaneous Estimates, Res. [173] 1358
Death, Punishment of, Comm. moved for, [174] 2055, 2115
Forfeiture of Lands and Goods, 2R. [175] 1802
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 26, [173] 1814
Taxation, Comm. moved for, [175] 283
Theatres — Precautions against Fire, [173] 494
Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [173] 1721; Comm. *cl.* 2, [175] 9, 11; Adj. moved, 12; Amendt. [176] 104; *add. cl.* 107

Ewing, Mr. H. E. Crum-, *Paisley*
Bank Acts (Scotland), Comm. Res. [173] 473
Bank Notes (Scotland), 2R. [174] 1747
Customs and Inland Revenue, Consid. Schedule A. [174] 2012
Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [175] 1720; Comm. 1944, 1946

Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000) Bill
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 15 [Bill 217]
Read 2° * *July* 18
Committee *; Report *July* 19
Read 3° * *July* 20
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 21
Read 2ª * *July* 22 (No. 224)
Committee *; Report *July* 23
Read 3ª * *July* 25
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 74]

Exchequer, Chancellor of the, *see* Chancellor of the Exchequer

Expenditure without Account
Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 15, [174] 13

Expiring Laws Bill
Select Committee appointed*, *June* 27, "To inquire what temporary Laws of a public and general nature are now in force, and what Laws of the like nature have expired since the last Report on the subject; and also what Laws of the like nature are about to expire at particular periods, or in consequence of any contingent public events, and to report the same, with their Observations thereupon, to the House" (*Mr. Peel*)
Committee: Mr. Peel, Mr. Massey, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Adderley, Rt. Hon. W. F. Cowper, Sir William Jolliffe, Colonel French, Mr. Baring, Mr. Brand, Mr. Williams, and Lord John Manners
Report from the Committee *July* 4 (*Parl. P.* 459)

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill (*Mr. Baring, Mr. Peel*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 5 [Bill 193]
Read 2° * *July* 11
Committee *; Report *July* 13
Read 3° * *July* 14
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 15
Read 2ª * *July* 21 (No. 208)
Committee *; Report *July* 25
Read 3ª * *July* 26
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 84]

Facilities for Divine Service in Collegiate Schools Bill [H.L.]
(*The Bishop of Oxford*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 7 (No. 117)
176] Read 2ª after debate *June* 23, 143
Bill considered in Committee *July* 5
. *new cl.* Contributions to the offertory (*The Earl of Shaftesbury*); after short debate, *cl.* negatived, 821
Report* *July* 7 (No. 183)
. Read 3ª after short debate *July* 12, 1368
c. Read 1° * *July* 14 [Bill 208]
. Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°," (*Mr. Collins*) *July* 20, 1774; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add, "upon this day month" (*Mr. Hardcastle*), 1776
Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c."
After short debate, Amendment and Motion withdrawn
Second reading put off till this day fortnight

Factories, Children in Paper Tube
Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 28, [174] 1775

Factories—Sub-Inspectors of
Question, Lord John Manners; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 10, [173] 1756; Question, Colonel Edwards; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 17, [174] 187
Return relating to (*Parl. P.* No. 318)

Factory Act—Scutch Mills
Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 18, [174] 300

Factory Acts Extension Bill
(*Mr. Bruce, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 17 [Bill 55]
175] Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. H. A. Bruce*), 1708; after long debate, Motion agreed to; Bill read 2° *June* 14
. Committee *June* 17, 1939; R.P.
Committee*; Report *June* 27
Considered as amended* *June* 30
Read 3° * *July* 1
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 4
Read 2ª * *July* 7 (No. 176)
House in Committee; after short debate, Bill reported without Amendt. *July* 14, [176] 1448
Read 3ª * *July* 15
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 48]

Factory Inspectors
Question, Colonel Edwards; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 8, [174] 632
Reports of, Question, Mr. F. S. Powell; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 22, [174] 1501

Farquhar, Sir W. M. T., *Hertford*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 156
Brazil—Relations with, [176] 706
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [174] 1555
Denmark and Germany—Prussian Exactions in Jutland, [175] 522
[*cont.*

Farquhar, Sir W. M. T.—*cont.*
Government Annuities, [173] 1369; Comm 1527, 1549, 1550; Adj. moved, 1610; Amendt. [174] 211, 219, 343, 806; Nomination of Comm. Amendt. 1474, 1478; 3R. [175] 2038
India—Delhi Prize Money, [175] 460;—Officers of the Army, 1275, 1729
Indian Medical Service, 3R. [176] 2036
Metropolis—Protection against Fire, [173] 563
New Zealand—War in, [176] 1469
Paper Manufacture, Comm. moved for, [176] 1744
Poor Relief (Metropolis), Comm. [176] 2054, 2055
Supply—Consular Establishments, [175] 1910, 1912
Tests Abolition, 3R. [176] 674

Fenwick, Mr. H., *Sunderland*
Denmark and Germany—Blockade of German Ports, [173] 1907
Highways Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 24, Amendt. [176] 1373, 1374
Malt for Cattle, Leave, [173] 228

Fergusson, Sir J., *Ayrshire*
Administration of Trusts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [174] 424; *cl.* 9, 425
Caledonian, Edinburgh, Glasgow, &c. Railway Companies, 2R. [173] 641
Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [174] 1724
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. [176] 1863
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1378
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [174] 1555
Denmark and Germany — The Conference, [176] 707
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [176] 1818
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 602, 618
Greco Conspiracy, The — M. Mazzini — Mr. Stansfeld, [174] 342
Greek Loan, Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 405
India—Claims of Azeem Jah, Comm. moved for, [175] 1658; — The late Marquess of Dalhousie, 2035, 2036
Land Securities Company (Stamp Duty on Mortage Debentures), Comm. [173] 1895
Lunacy (Scotland), Comm. [176] 419; *cl.* 2, 422
Mhow Court Martial — Case of Paymaster Smales, [173] 1649, 1650, 1818; — Colonel Crawley, 1904; Papers moved for, [174] 59, 61, 66
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1519
Private Bills—Standing Order, [175] 1143
Railway Bills, Res. [174] 1623
Scotch Affairs, Administration of, Comm. moved for, [175] 1167, 1168, 1174, 1181
Servants Hiring (Scotland), Comm. [175] 1821; Preamble, Amendt. 1823
Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for, [176] 1458
United States—Neutrality in America, 1923
Valuation of Lands, &c. (Scotland) Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 1434
Writs Registration (Scotland), 2R. Amendt. [175] 1485, 1509

Fermoy, Lord, *Marylebone*
Archway and Kentish Town Junction Road 2R. [173] 1064
Army—Thomas's Rifled Cannon, [174] 14
Borough Franchise, 2R. [175] 346
Casual Poor (Metropolis), [176] 1804
Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [174] 1719, 1720
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [173] 1155
Poor Relief (Metropolis), Comm. [176] 2053
Public and Refreshment Houses (Metropolis), Leave, [174] 2116
Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [173] 296
Street Music (Metropolis), Leave, [174] 2118
Supply—Civil Service Estimates, Report, [175] 2025
Wakefield Prison, Dietary in, [174] 16

Ferrand, Mr. W. B., *Devonport*
Bradford, &c. Reservoirs, [174] 11, 185, 186, 317, 630, 1502, 1773; [175] 719; Papers moved for, [176] 1318, 1323, 1327, 1706, 1793, 2102
Business of the House, [174] 1717
Cattle, &c. Importation, Nomination of Comm. [174] 390
Charitable Estates and Trusts Acts, Returns moved for, [173] 483, 492
Charity Commission—Salary of Secretary, [173] 794, 795, 798; Comm. moved for, [175] 1841, 1865, 1873, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1879, 1880
China—Civil War in, Res. [174] 1545
Controller of the Navy—Devonport Election, [173] 1392, 1402
Emigration (America), Papers moved for, [176] 2175
Factory Act—Children in Paper Tube Factories, [174] 1775
Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [175] 1727
Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia), Comm. Adj. moved, [176] 2065
Navy Estimates—Wages of Artificers at Home, [173] 1968;—Pay of Officers, [175] 676, 690
Navy—Royal Commission on Dockyards, [173] 909;—Gun Boats, Contracts for, 1366;—Superannuation in the Dockyards, [175] 665, 666;—The "Research," 802, 914, 1456;—Masters in the, Res. 1215
Supply—Land, &c. Kensington Gore, [175] 868;—New National Gallery at Burlington House, 1326
Trespass (Ireland), Comm. [174] 1755
Turnpike Trusts, Nomination of Comm. [174] 500, 501

Feversham, Lord
West Riding of Yorkshire Assizes, Address moved, [175] 1618

Financial Statement
Question, Mr. Goddard; Answers, Sir George Grey, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 29, [173] 1254
See *Ways and Means*

Finlay, Mr. A. S., *Argyllshire*
Administration of Trusts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 9, [176] 425

[*cont.*

Finlay, Mr. A. S.—*cont.*
Bank Acts (Scotland), Comm. Res. [173] 471; 2R. [174] 1733
Bank of England Notes (Scotland), 2R. Amendt. [176] 111
Servants Hiring (Scotland), Comm. [175] 1823

Fire Insurances, Duty on
Question, Mr. Hubbard; Answer, Mr. H. B. Sheridan *Mar* 15, [174] 11; Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 15, 1174
See *Ways and Means*

Fish (Freshwater Streams) Bill
(*Mr. Neate, Mr. Malins*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 2 [Bill 130]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 6

Fish Teinds (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Sir G. Grey, Sir W. Dunbar*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 11 [Bill 45]
Read 2° * *Mar* 18
Committee *; Report *April* 21
Considered as amended * *April* 26
Read 3° * *April* 27
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *April* 28
Read 2ª * *May* 13 (No. 62)
Committee *; Report *May* 27
Read 3ª * *May* 31
Royal Assent *June* 30 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 33]

Fisheries—Coast and Deep Sea
Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Caird *Feb* 29, [173] 1250

Fisheries — Salmon Fisheries (England) Act, 1861
Question, Mr. Dutton; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 9, [173] 323

Fitzgerald, Mr. W. R. S., *Horsham*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 112
Austria and the Zollverein, [173] 1458
Brazil—Slave Trade, [176] 1379, 1382, 1383, 1388;—Relations with, 1638, 1640
Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1378; 2R. [175] 1117
Denmark and Germany—The Danish Papers, [173] 329;—Bases of Proposed Conference, 1189, 1190, 1548, 1828, 1830, 1831;—Relations with the European Powers, 1274;—The Conference, [175] 1287, 2031;—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 918;—The Armistice, 1523
Fortifications and Works, Comm. [176] 1437 1533
Greco Conspiracy, The—M. Mazzini—Mr. Stansfeld, [174] 337
Ionian Islands—Papers moved for, [174] 372, 381
Japan—Troops for, [176] 1710, 1711
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway, 2R. [173] 1634
Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia), Comm. [176] 2062, 2066

[*cont.*

FITZGERALD, Mr. W. R. S.—*cont.*
Navy Estimates—Scientific Department, [173] 1314
Poland, Res. [175] 657, 658, 661
Railways Construction Facilities, Re-Comm. [175] 1336
Supply—Superannuations Customs, &c. [176] 1609, 1610
Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for, [176] 1464 ; Report, 2007, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2147, 2149, 2150 ; Amendt. 2151
United States—Vessels "El Tousson" and "El Monassia," Papers moved for, [173] 955, 1019 ;—Capture of British Ships, Papers moved for, 501, 534 ;—Murder of Mr. Gray, 567, 796

Fitzjames, Mr., Case of, Sierra Leone
Question, Mr. Roebuck ; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 26, [176] 2103

Fitzroy's, Admiral, Weather Predictions
Question, Mr. Augustus Smith ; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Mar* 11, [173] 1818

"Flowery Land," Execution of the Condemned Pirates
Question, Sir George Bowyer ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 12, [173] 497

FOLJAMBE, Mr. F. J. S., *Retford (East)*
Queen's Plates, Res. [176] 447

FORDE, Lieut.-Col. W. B., *Downshire*
Grand Juries (Ireland), [173] 1457

Foreign Affairs
Observations, The Earl of Ellenborough ; Reply, Earl Russell *July* 26, [176] 2084 ; Observations, Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe, 2097

Forfeiture of Lands and Goods Bill
(*Mr. C. Forster, Mr. W. Ewart, Mr. Locke King*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 15 [Bill 21]
174] Moved "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 20, 1397 ; after short debate, second reading deferred
175] Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 15, 1800 ; Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr Hunt*), 1804 ; Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c. ;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
Read 2° *June* 15
Bill withdrawn * *July* 19

Forfeiture of Lands and Goods Bill
Question, Mr. Charles Forster ; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 15, [176] 1597

FORSTER, Mr. C., *Walsall*
Forfeiture of Lands and Goods, 2R. [174] 1397 ; [175] 1800 ; [176] 1597

FORSTER, Mr. W. E., *Bradford*
Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension, 2R. Amendt. [176] 1363
Borough Franchise, 2R. [175] 341, 342
Bradford Reservoirs, [174] 631 ; Papers moved for, [176] 1327, 1328, 1707
China—Capture of Soochow, [173] 215, 216 ;—Captain Gordon and the Footai of Shanghai, [174] 1199 ;—Civil War in, Res. 1504
Customs Gaugers, [175] 459
Denmark and Germany—Blockade of the German Ports [173] 1069 ;—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 853
Discriminating Duties, Papers moved for, [175] 1361
Education—Reports of Inspectors of Schools, Res. [174] 910 ;—Resignation of Mr. Lowe, 1217 ;—The Revised Code, [175] 365 ;—(Inspectors' Reports), Nomination of Comm. 988, 998
Foreign Office and the Board of Trade, Comm. moved for, [174] 1083, 1099
Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1598
Greco Conspiracy, The — M. Mazzini — Mr. Stansfeld, [174] 325
Intoxicating Liquors, 2R. [175] 1419
Japan—Bombardment of Kagosima, Res. [173] 396
Lisburn Election, [174] 466
Mazzini, M. — The Greco Conspiracy, [173] 1259, 1935
Partnership Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, [174] 2127 ; [175] 243, 244
Patriotic Fund Commission, [175] 720
Poland—Despatch of September, 1863, [173] 541
United States — Vessels "El Tousson" and "El Monassia," Papers moved for, [173] 984 ;—Confederate Ship "Georgia," [175] 488

FORTESCUE, Earl
Brazilian Slave Trade, [176] 414
Poor Relief (Metropolis), 2R. [176] 2129
Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [176] 1782, 1786

FORTESCUE, Right Hon. C. S. (Under Secretary for the Colonies), *Louth Co.*
Ashantee—War in, [175] 1990, 1994, 1998
Canada—British Troops in, [176] 383
Colonial Governors, Allowance to retiring, [173] 563
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. *cl.* 20, [176] 1865
Hudson's Bay Company's Territory, [174] 301
Ionian Islands — Cession of the, [173] 1085, 1087 ; Papers moved for, [174] 367
Malta—Constitution of, [173] 172 ;—Petition from, 565 ;—Dock at, Res. 899
New South Wales—Import Duties, [174] 180, 181
New Zealand—The Loan, [173] 1188;—Correspondence, 1367 ;—War in, Papers moved for, [174] 1653
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1504, 1509 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, 1694
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Leave, [173] 763
South Australia—Legislation of, [173] 1457
Supply — Indian Department Canada, [175]
[*cont.*

FORTESCUE, Right Hon. C. S.—*cont.*
1884; — Governors, &c. West Indies, &c. 1885, 1886;—West Coast of Africa, 1889; —Heligoland, 1890; — Pitcairn Islanders, Norfolk Island, 1890;—Emigration, 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895;—Civil Establishments on the West Coast of Africa, [176] 1680, 1681
Tests Abolition (Oxford), Comm. [175] 1036

FORTESCUE, Hon. D. F., *Andover*
Crawley, Colonel, Court Martial on, [173] 170; Papers moved for, 215, 1367, 1655, 1656; [174] 18, 32, 61, 66, 82, 96

Fortifications
Defence of the Bristol Channel, Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *April* 22, [174] 1502; Question, Lord Portman; Answer, Earl De Grey and Ripon *June* 2, [175] 1046
The Spithead Forts, Question, Mr. Bernal Osborne; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *April* 22, [174] 1502

Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) Bill
c. Considered in Committee *July* 13, 1437
After short debate, Committee report Progress
176] Resolutions agreed to, after debate *July* 14, 1534
Resolution reported; Bill ordered* *July* 15
Read 1°* *July* 15 [Bill 218]
Read 2°* *July* 18
Considered in Committee *July* 21, 1871
cl. 2, Moved, That the words referring to the Central Arsenal be omitted (*Mr. Angerstein*), 1873; Amendt. agreed to; *cl.* agreed to; Remaining clauses agreed to
Schedule—Amendt. To omit "Pembroke" (*Sir John Hay*) negatived; Schedule agreed to
Bill reported
Considered as amended* *July* 22
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *July* 25, 2022
Bill read 3° and passed, after debate
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *July* 25
Read 2ª* *July* 26 (No. 247)
Read 3ª* *July* 27
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 109]

France
France and Cambodia, Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 19, [174] 1286
France—Fisheries Convention, Question, Mr. Du Cane; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *May* 13, [175] 457
France, Passports in, Question, Sir William Fraser; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 18, [176] 1651; Question, Sir William Fraser; Answer, Mr. Layard *July* 21, 1795; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Layard *July* 25, 2017

FRASER, Sir W. A., *Ludlow*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [173] 1450;—Martial Law, [174] 851;—Works, Buildings, &c. [175] 82

[*cont.*

FRASER, Sir W. A.—*cont.*
Controller of the Navy—Devonport Election, [173] 1406
Crawley, Col., Case of, Papers moved for, [174] 95
Elgin and Kincardine, Countess of, Res. [175] 1463
Metropolitan District Railways, 3R. [176] 1621
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 3R. [176] 1870
Open Spaces (Metropolis), Res. [176] 437
Passports in France, [176] 1651, 1795
St. James's Park, Road round, [173] 1894
Schools, Public, 2R. [176] 818
Supply—Public Buildings, [175] 412
Theatres — Precautions against Fire, [173] 534

FRENCH, Colonel F., *Roscommon Co.*
Bank of England Notes (Scotland), 2R. [176] 125
Chief Rents (Ireland), Comm. [175] 12; Adj. moved, 14
County Voters, Registration of, Nomination of Comm. Adj. moved, [173] 681
Education—(Inspectors' Reports), [175] 465
Government Annuities—Mr. H. B. Sheridan—Privilege, Res. [174] 308
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1396
Holyhead Harbour—Vessels wrecked, &c. Return moved for, [173] 425
Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties), Comm. *cl.* 10, [176] 283
Insolvent Debtors, Comm. [176] 948
Lambeth Medical Diplomas, [175] 461
Lunatic Asylums (Ireland), [176] 639
Mails in the Provinces, Comm. moved for, [174] 409
Merthyr Tydvil Writ—Privilege, [174] 1287
Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2006, 2014, 2145
Supply—Civil Contingencies, [176] 658, 659
Vacating of Seats (House of Commons), 2R. [175] 595
Vestry Cess Abolition (Ireland), 2R. [173] 721
White, Captain Melville, Case of, [173] 495; [174] 1504; Papers moved for, [175] 604

GAGE, Viscount
Church Services (Apocrypha), 2R. [175] 1930, 1933

GALLWEY, Sir W. P., *Thirsk*
Horticultural Society, [176] 952

GALWAY, Viscount, *Retford (East)*
Charity Commissioners, Comm. moved for, [175] 1881
Private Bills—Standing Order, [175] 1144
Railways Construction Facilities, Re-Comm. Adj. moved, [175] 1528
Weights and Measures (Metric System), Comm. *cl.* 2, [175] 8

Game (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Hervey Bruce, Colonel Forde*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 23 [Bill 116]

Game (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill
(*Sir Hervey Bruce, Colonel Forde*)
c. Order ed ; read 1° * *June* 8 [Bill 140]
Read 2° * *July* 5
Bill withdrawn * *July* 15

Game Law Prosecutions
Question, Colonel Sykes ; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 11, [176] 1324

Gaols, Discipline and Dietary in
Question, Mr. Buxton ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 10, [173] 1754 ; Question, Sir John Pakington ; Answer, Sir George Grey, [174] 1083 ; Question, Mr. Bazley ; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 2, [175] 1063 ; Question, Sir John Pakington ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 9, [173] 324

Gaols Bill (*Sir George Grey, Mr. Baring*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *May* 5 [Bill 93]
Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 20, [175] 2046 ; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Newdegate*), 2060 ; Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c."
After long debate, A. 116, N. 49 ; M. 67
Bill read 2° *June* 20
Committee * ; Report *June* 29
Bill withdrawn* *July* 14

Garibaldi, General, Departure of
Observations, The Earl of Clarendon *April* 19, [174] 1277 ; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith ; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *April* 19, 1290 ; Question, Mr. Kinnaird ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer ; short debate thereon *April* 21, 1422
Garibaldi Meeting at Primrose Hill, Address for "Copy of the Reports of the Superintendent and Inspector of the Police" (*Mr. P. A. Taylor*) *April* 26, [174] 1699 ; Motion agreed to (*Parl. P.* No. 252)
Meeting on Primrose Hill, Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis ; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 25, [174] 1549
General Garibaldi and Admiral Mundy, Explanation, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck *April* 25, [174] 1550

Gavin, Major G., *Limerick City*
Artillery—The Whitworth Gun, [173] 1334
Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [175] 2106

George, Mr. J., *Wexford Co.*
Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1378, 1593 ; 2R. [175] 1116 ; Comm. *cl.* 12, [176] 23 ; Res. 99, 297
Chief Rents (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1399 ; Comm. [175] 13 ; *cl.* 1, 15
Civil Bill Courts (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [174] 1558
Conveyancers, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [173] 596
County Courts (Ireland), Leave, [173] 482
Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [176] 301
Holyhead Harbour — Vessels Wrecked, &c. Return moved for, [173] 425
Lisburn Election, Res. [174] 857
Poor Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment, 2R. [176] 463
Watching of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1715

Gibson, Rt. Hon. T. M. (President of the Board of Trade), *Ashton-under-Lyne*
Agricultural Statistics, Res. [175] 1376, 1377
Austria and the Zollverein, [173] 1459
Chain Cables and Anchors, Select Comm. moved for, [173] 1360 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, [174] 504 ; *cl.* 2, 509, 510 ; *cl.* 8, 513 ; *cl.* 9, 515
Copyright, Law of, [173] 563
Coventry, Trade of, [176] 509, 510
Denmark—War in, [173] 173 ;—Baltic Coast Lights, 858
Discriminating Duties, Papers moved for, Amendt. [175] 1359
Egham Railway Accident, [176] 335
Fees to Parliamentary Counsel, [173] 1252, 1253, 1254, 1654
Fitzroy's, Admiral, Weather Predictions, [173] 1818
Fog Signals at Cape Race, [173] 321
Foreign Office and the Board of Trade, Comm. moved for, [174] 1110, 1119
France—Fisheries Convention, [175] 458
Government Annuities, [174] 343 ; Nomination of Comm. 1479
Harbours of Refuge, [173] 1821 ; Res. [174] 1682
Holyhead Harbour — Vessels Wrecked, &c. Return moved for, [173] 425 ; [174] 1681 ; —Lighthouse at, 1501
Ireland—Daunt's Rock, [173] 1817, 1818 ; [174] 871, 872 ; [175] 1837
Land Clauses Act, [173] 1249
London, &c. Docks Amalgamation, 2R. [175] 1388
Merchant Seamen's Act, [174] 967, 968
Metropolitan Railways, [174] 17
Oyster Dredging at Beachy Head, [175] 1457, 1458
Partnership Law Amendment, Comm. [174] 2124 ; *cl.* 3, 2128 ; [175] 243
Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation, Leave, [175] 16, 17
Portpatrick Harbour, [175] 719
Private Bills, Res. 1, [173] 645, 653 ; Res. 2, 663 ; Res. 3, 664, 668 ; Res. 5, 672 ; Res. 6, 676 ; Res. 7, 677, 680 ;—Standing Order, [175] 1141 ;—Committees on, Res. 1551
Rags, Duty on (Italy), [174] 1503
Railway Bills, Res. [174] 1623
Railway Encroachments (Dublin), [173] 562
Railway Guards, Communication with, [176] 1388, 1389, 1469
Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [173] 279, 500 ; Res. 1634, 1647
Railways Construction Facilities, Re-Comm. [175] 1336, 1528
Standing Orders (Parliamentary Deposits), Comm. moved for, [174] 1620
Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for, [176] 1458 ; Report, 2010, 2011, 2133, 2142, 2144, 2146, 2147, 2149 ; Amendt. 2150
Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 1028, 1029
Supply — Holyhead Harbour, &c. [175] 856, 857 ; — Lighthouses Abroad, 861 ; — Privy Council for Trade, 1602, 1603 ; — Customs (Salaries and Expenses), [176] 1608 ; — Superannuations, Customs, &c. 1609, 1610
Unclaimed Wreck, Proceeds of, [174] 1913
Weights and Measures, [174] 1772
Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [173] 1725, 1726, 1733 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, [175] 4, 7, 10, 11 ; *add. cl.* [176] 107, 109

Gilpin, Colonel R. T., *Bedfordshire*
Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. [175] 1464
Crawley, Colonel, Court Martial on, [173] 465; —Case of, Papers moved for, [174] 87
Highways Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 24, [176] 1373

Gilpin, Mr. C. (Secretary to the Poor Law Commissioners), *Northampton*
Death, Punishment of, Comm. moved for, [174] 2108, 2109

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., *see* **Chancellor** of the **Exchequer**

Goddard, Mr. A. L., *Cricklade*
Financial Statement, [173] 1254
Malt for Cattle, Comm. [173] 1043

Gold Coast, Forts on the
Question, Mr. C. P. Berkeley; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 19, [176] 1709

Goldsmid, Sir F. H., *Reading*
Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. *cl.* 2, [175] 1478
Election Petitions, 2R. [174] 161
Denmark and Germany—Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, [175] 160; —*Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1024
Election Petitions, Comm. Adj. moved, [175] 1914; [176] 449
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 615
Government Annuities, Comm. [174] 233, 234
Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, 2R. [173] 582
Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia), Comm. [176] 2062
Partnership Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, [174] 2128
Poland, Res. [175] 657
Private Bills, Res. 6, [173] 677
Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for, [176] 1464; Report, 2007
Vacating of Seats (House of Commons), [175] 594
Ways and Means—Fire Insurance Duty, Res. [174] 1456

Gore, Mr. J. R. **Ormsby**, *Shropshire, N.*
Convicts in County Gaols, [174] 630
Supply—Consular Establishments, [175] 1910

Gore, Mr. W. R. **Ormsby**, *Leitrim Co.*
Trespass (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1705; Comm. [174] 955, 1755; *cl.* 1, [176] 933, 934, 935, 936, 937; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 938, 939
Watching of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1719

Goschen, Mr. G. J., *London*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 80
Bank Notes (Scotland), 2R. [174] 1750
Bank of England Notes (Scotland), 2R. [176] 124

[*cont.*

Goschen, Mr. G. J.—*cont.*
Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension, 2R. [176] 1364
Government Annuities, Comm. [174] 242
India—Gold Currency for, Res. [175] 1590
Metropolitan District Railways, 3R. [176] 1618, 1619
Partnership Law Amendment, Comm. [174] 2126; *cl.* 3, 2127; [175] 241
Poor Relief Committee, [175] 19
Poor Relief (Metropolis), Comm. [176] 2053
Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [174] 154; Comm. [175] 1033

Government Annuities Bill
(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)
173] *c.* Ordered, after short debate, and read 1° *Feb* 11, 478 [Bill 11]
Read 2° * *Feb* 15
. Committee—Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Mar* 4, 1526; after debate, Debate adjourned
. Debate resumed *Mar* 7, 1548; after long debate, Debate further adjourned
174] Debate resumed *Mar* 17, 211
. Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "the Bill be committed to a Select Committee" (*Sir Minto Farquhar*), 211; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Debate further adjourned
Debate further adjourned * *Mar* 18
. Debate resumed *April* 11, 789; after long debate, Question put and negatived; Words added; Main Question, as amended, put and agreed to; Ordered, That the Bill be committed to a Select Committee
. Committee nominated *April* 21:—The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Chairman), Mr. Sotheron Estcourt, Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Henley, Sir Minto Farquhar, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Horsfall, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Charles Turner, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Hubbard, Mr. H. B. Sheridan, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Hodgkinson, and Mr. Paget, 1473
Motion, "That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records" (*Sir Minto Farquhar*) *April* 21
Question put, A. 104, N. 127; M. 23
Report of Select Committee *May* 23
Bill re-committed [Bill 114]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 6
Considered as amended * *June* 13
175] Read 3° after debate *June* 20, 2036
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 21
Read 2ª * *June* 30 (No. 145)
Committee *; Report *July* 4
Read 3ª * *July* 5
Royal Assent *July* 14 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 14]

Government Annuities Bill
Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Sir
173] George Grey *Feb* 18, 717; Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, The Chan-
. cellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 19, 796; Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, The Chancellor
. of the Exchequer *Mar* 3, 1369; Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, The
174] Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 17, 177; Question, Sir Minto Farquhar; Answer,
. Mr. Milner Gibson *Mar* 18, 343

Government Annuities Bill—(Mr. H. B. Sheridan)
British Provident Society—Personal Explana-
173] tion, Mr. H. B. Sheridan *Mar* 8, 1658; Per-
sonal Explanation, Mr. H. B. Sheridan
Mar 10, 1759; Personal Explanation, The
174] Chancellor of the Exchequer, 191; Mr. H.
B. Sheridan *Mar* 17, 198
Privilege, Question of Privilege, Sir John Hay; Personal Explanations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; long debate thereon *Mar* 18, 305
173] *The "Professional" and "European" Societies*—Explanation, Mr. Wickham, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 11, 1820

Government Manufacturing Establishments
Resolutions (*Mr. Cobden*); long debate thereon *July* 22, [176] 1907

Government Offices, New
Question, Lord Redesdale; Answer, Earl Granville *July* 14, [176] 1450

Gower, Hon. E. F. Leveson, *Bodmin*
Education (Inspectors' Reports), Nomination of Comm. [175] 1089
Highways Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 45, [176] 1376

Grand Juries (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Blake, Mr. M'Mahon, Mr. MacEvoy, Mr. Maguire*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 25 [Bill 35]
Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Blake*) *April* 20, [174] 1379; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Dawson*); after debate Question put, "That 'now,' &c." A. 27, N. 150; M. 123; words added
Bill put off for six months

Grand Juries Bill
Question, Colonel Forde; Answer, Mr. Blake *Mar* 4, [173] 1457

Granville, Earl (Lord President of the Council)
Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 68, 70
Agrarian Offences (Ireland), Paper moved for, [175] 357, 358, 359, 360
Borrowing Powers of Railway Companies, [173] 1317
Burial Service, Commission moved for, [176] 1310
China—Death of Lieut. Tinling, [173] 453
Church Services (Apocrypha), 2R. [175] 1933
Collegiate Schools, Facilities for Divine Worship in, 2R. [176] 149
Cornwall, Bishopric of, Papers moved for, [176] 1897
Denmark and Germany—Speech of M. Hall, [173] 1897;—Joint Action of European Powers, 1899; Res. [174] 781, 784;—The Conference, [176] 331;—Vote of Censure, Res. 1187;—Correspondence moved for relating to Treaties, 1984, 1985
Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Papers moved for, [173] 168 [*cont.*

Granville, Earl—*cont.*
Education, Committee of Council on—Resignation of Mr. Lowe, [174] 1182
Education, Middle Class, [175] 698
Education, National (Ireland), [176] 703
Elgin and Kincardine, Countess of, Address moved, [175] 1607
Elgin, Earl of, and Lord Canning, [175] 1699
English and Irish Courts of Common Law and Chancery, [174] 1487
Government Offices, The New, [176] 1451
Head, Sir F. B., Memorial of, [176] 1371
Hill, Sir Rowland, Address moved, [175] 1702
Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, 2R. [173] 1243
Ireland—The Constabulary, [174] 172;—Agrarian Outrages, Res. [176] 489;—Theresa Keenan—Alleged Misconduct of the Police in Leitrim, Paper moved for, 492
Irish Reproductive Loan Fund, [173] 1900
Land Securities Company, 2R. [174] 1281
Metropolitan Railways, [173] 160; [174] 448
Metropolitan Turnpikes, Abolition of, [176] 479
Middle Class Schools, [176] 1878
Mount St. Bernard's Reformatory, [176] 20; Explanation, 143
Needlewomen of London—Report of the Commission, [175] 1835
New Zealand, [175] 785
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1986, 1998
Park Lane, Crowded State of, [175] 1235
Patents, Museum and Library of, [173] 708
Peers' Robing Room—Mr. Herbert, Paper moved for, [176] 2004
Penal Servitude, Returns moved for, [173] 910
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, 2R. [175] 882, 883; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1341; *cl.* 4, 1348; Report, 1936, 1937; *cl.* 4, 1938; Commons Amendts. [176] 1445
Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2), 2R. [176] 2000
Police (Ireland), [176] 2100
Prisons (Ireland), Returns moved for, [176] 493
Public and Refreshment Houses, Comm. *add. cl.* [176] 822; Report, 1312; *cl.* 9, 1313, 1316; 3R. 1447
Public Schools, 2R. [175] 1243; Comm. 1625
Public Works (Manufacturing Districts), 2R. [176] 2001
Railway Carriages, Offences in, [176] 1439
Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [173] 454, 458, 460, 849; Report, 1243, 1540
Rape, Punishment of, 2R. [174] 860
Rate in Aid Act, [173] 493
Regius Professorship of Greek (Oxford), [175] 563, 565
Royal Academy, The, [176] 251
Royal Arcade, 2R. [173] 853
Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [175] 622
Sentences of Death, 2R. [175] 250
United States—Correspondence with the Federal Government, [173] 550, 1059; Explanation, 1160;—Federal Recruiting in Ireland, Papers moved for, 1330, 1332
Vaccination, [175] 779
West Hartlepool Railway Directors, [173] 1181
West Riding of Yorkshire Assizes, Address moved, [175] 1616

Great Eastern Northern Junction Railway Bill (by Order)

c. Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°," 710

Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months"—(*Colonel Packe*); after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Main Question agreed to

Bill read 2° and committed *Feb* 18

Great Northern Railway (No. 3) (Doncaster to Gainsborough) Bill (by Order)

173] c. Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°," 642

Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day six months" (*Lord Robert Montagu*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.," put, and agreed to; Main Question put and agreed to

Bill read 2° *Feb* 16

Greece

King of Greece, Annuity to the, Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "the Grant to the King of Greece of an Annuity of £4,000 out of monies belonging to the Consolidated Fund, by Treaty not made subject to the sanction of Parliament, is a violation of the Privileges of the House of Commons" (*Mr. Ayrton*) *June* 27, [176] 356; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendment, by leave, withdrawn

Claim of Dr. Payne on Greek Government, Question, Mr. O'Neill; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 18, [173] 715

Parl. Papers—

Treaty of Accession . . . . . . [3246]

Papers relating to . . . . No. 1 [3324]

" No. 2 [3346]

" No. 3 [3347]

Loan—Sums issued and repaid [No. 5]

Greek Loan (Consolidated Fund) Bill

(*Mr. Massey, Viscount Palmerston, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Layard*)

175] c. Resolution in Committee *June* 9, 1527

. Resolution reported; Bill ordered *June* 10, 1606

Read 1° * *June* 13; 2° * *June* 17 [Bill 144]

176] Bill considered in Committee *June* 27, 403

cl. 2 (Power for Treasury to relinquish £4,000 a year)

. Amendt. proposed, to add Proviso (*Colonel Dunne*); Motion, "That the Chairman do report Progress, &c." (*Lord Robert Cecil*); A. 48, N. 58; M. 10, 406

After debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Another Amendt. proposed (*Colonel Dunne*), withdrawn; *cl.* agreed to

Bill reported, without Amendt.

. Motion, "That the Bill be now read 3°," 567

. Amendt. To leave out from "That the" and add "said Order be discharged" (*Mr. Hennessy*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c." *June* 30, 569

After short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 3°

l. Read 1ª * (*Earl Russell*) *July* 1 (No. 171)

Read 2ª * *July* 4

Committee *; Report *July* 5

Read 3ª* *July* 7

Royal Assent *July* 14 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 40]

GREENALL, Mr. G., *Warrington*

Borough Franchise, 2R. [175] 347

Greenwich Hospital

Report of Sir R. Bromley, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Feb* 11, [173] 466; Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Mar* 7, 1545; Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *April* 18, [174] 1201

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 3, To leave out from "That" and add "it is desirable that the Admiralty adopt the recommendation of the Royal Commission of 1860, confirmed by the Report of Sir Richard Bromley, one of the present Commissioners, and by the letter of Admiral Sir James Gordon, the Governor of Greenwich Hospital, that the present system of double government be abolished" (*Sir John Hay*), [175] 1147; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Observations, The Earl of Hardwicke; after short debate, Reply, The Duke of Somerset, *June* 10, [175] 1535

Merchant Seamen, Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *July* 25, [176] 2016

Parl. Papers—

Reports on Organization of . . . No. 205

Memorandum by Duke of Somerset No. 356

GREGORY, Mr. W. H., *Galway Co.*

Army—Mr. Lynall Thomas's Gun, [175] 914

Galway (Western District), Papers moved for, [174] 1271, 1272

Ionian Islands—Demolition of the Fortresses, [173] 566; Papers moved for, [174] 343, 363, 389

Law Life Society, Return moved for, [174] 1481, 1482; [175] 759, 761, 763

National Gallery, [175] 1636

Patent Office Library and Museum, [174] 1952; Comm. moved for, [175] 245

Queen's Plates, Res. [176] 446

Royal Academy, [175] 21; [176] 1808

Scientific Institutions of Dublin, [174] 663, 677; Nomination of Comm. 1273, 1274

Supply—Repair of Furniture, [175] 415;—Houses of Parliament, 425, 435;—Nelson's Column, 854;—Land, &c. Kensington Gore, 868;—New National Gallery at Burlington House, 1315;—Department of Science and Art, [176] 557, 564

United States—American Cruisers, [173] 566

GREGSON, Mr. S., *Lancaster*

China—Affairs of, [175] 544; Res. 960

East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [176] 1836, 1857

Elgin and Kincardine, Countess of, Res. Report, [175] 1605

Government Annuities, Comm. [174] 236; 3R. [175] 2040

Partnership Law Amendment, 2R. [174] 1567

GRENFELL, Mr. H. R., *Stoke-on-Trent*

Crawley, Colonel, Case of, Papers moved for, [174] 25, 33

Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [175] 1721

India—Claims of Azeem Jah, Comm. moved for, [175] 1655, 1656, 1657

Greville, Col. F. S., *Longford Co.*
- Lunatic Asylums (Ireland), [173] 1250; [174] 187

Grey, Earl
- Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 59, 71
- Agrarian Offences (Ireland), Papers moved for, [175] 359
- Chimney Sweepers, Comm. *cl.* 7, [175] 1133; *cl.* 8, Amendt. *ib.*; Report, *add. cl.* 1439
- China—Death of Lieut. Tinling, [173] 447, 451
- Collegiate Schools, Facilities for Divine Worship in, 2R. [176] 147
- Convict George Hall, Papers moved for, [174] 869
- Denmark and Germany—Austrian Fleet in the Baltic, [173] 1630;—Affairs of, [174] 533; Res. 739, 758, 783;—The Prussians in Jutland, [175] 616;—Vote of Censure, Res. [176] 1179
- Education, Committee of Council on—Resignation of Mr. Lowe, [174] 1192
- Improvement of Land, Comm. [175] 1827
- Japan, Res. [176] 573, 605, 607, 611
- Land Securities Company, 2R. [174] 1280
- Malt for Animals, 2R. [174] 4
- Metropolitan Railways—Working Class Trains, Res. [174] 1491
- Mortgage Debentures, Comm. [175] 1048
- New Zealand, [175] 791
- Penal Servitude, Returns moved for, [173] 926
- Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, 2R. [175] 883, 897; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1341; *cl.* 4, 1346, 1348; Report, 1936
- Poland, Res. [175] 187
- Rape, Punishment of, 2R. [174] 860; Report, 1280, 1282; 3R. 1759
- Regius Professorship of Greek (Oxford), 2R. [174] 1766; Comm. [175] 451
- Royal Arcade, 2R. [173] 858
- Sentences of Death, 2R. [175] 252, 256

Grey de Wilton, Viscount, *Weymouth*
- Executions, Public, Papers moved for, [173] 955

Grey, Right Hon. Sir G. (Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Morpeth*
- Address in Answer to the Speech, Report, [173] 210
- Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. Previous Question moved, [176] 90, 92
- Agricultural Statistics, Res. [175] 1381
- Assaults with Knives, [173] 1366
- Assize Town for the West Riding Circuit, Address moved, [173] 805, 814, 817, 1906; [174] 1080; [176] 613, 1598
- Austrian Squadron and the Channel Fleet, [174] 2051
- Beer Houses (Ireland), 2R. [175] 600
- Bewicke, Mr., Case of, [173] 464; Comm. moved for, [174] 1918, 1923, 1934, 1935; Amendt. 1937, 1938; [175] 23
- Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Amendment, 2R. [176] 1364
- Bradford, &c. Reservoirs, [174] 12, 185, 321, 631, 1502, 1773, 1774; [175] 719; Papers moved for, [176] 1325, 1706, 1707, 1793, 2102
- Burial Grounds, [174] 873

[*cont.*

Grey, Right Hon. Sir G.—*cont.*
- Business of the House, [173] 1825; [174] 1777;—Whitsuntide Recess, [175] 104; [176] 2106
- Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Comm. [176] 298 299
- Chancery Fund Commissioners, [174] 183
- Channel Islands, The, [175] 151
- Chimney Sweepers, [174] 1943
- Circuits of the Judges, [173] 795
- City of London Bye-Laws, [174] 966
- City Traffic Regulations, [175] 1836
- Collegiate Schools, Facilities for Divine Service in, 2R. [176] 1779
- Condemned Pirates, Execution of the, [173] 497
- Convicts—Remission of Penal Servitude, [173] 1908;—in County Gaols, [174] 630
- Cornwall, Proposed Bishopric of, [173] 681
- County Bridges, 2R. [175] 352
- County Franchise, Leave, [173] 941
- Criminal Returns, [175] 102
- Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [174] 1554
- Death, Punishment of, Comm. moved for, [174] 2082, 2085
- Denmark and Germany—Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 879;—The Conference, [174] 1915; [175] 26, 101, 192, 2032; [176] 707;—H. M. S. "Aurora," [175] 103, 104;—The Armistice, 192, 198;—Action off Heligoland, 197;—Prussian Exactions in Jutland, 458;—The Austrian Squadron, 517
- Diseased Cattle, [173] 495
- Diseased Meat, Conviction for Sale of, [176] 1792
- Ecclesiastical Commission, [174] 1198
- Ecclesiastical Courts, [173] 1784
- Ecclesiastical Registry, [175] 1296
- Education—Reports of Inspectors of Schools, Res. [174] 912; [175] 191; Comm. moved for, 368, 369, 398; Nomination of Comm. 998, 1000, 1092
- Education, National (Ireland), Res. [176] 234
- Election Petitions, 2R. [174] 161
- Emigration from Ireland, [175] 99
- Endowed Schools, [176] 2191
- Executions, Public, Papers moved for, [173] 946
- Factories, Sub-Inspectors of, [173] 1756; [174] 187, 632;—Reports of Inspectors, 1501, 1502
- Factory Act—Scutch Mills, [174] 301;—Children in Paper Tube Factories, 1775
- Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [175] 1726, 1727; Comm. 1940, 1944
- Financial Statement, [173] 1254
- Flogging Garotters, [176] 2105, 2190, 2191
- Forfeiture of Lands and Goods, 2R. [175] 1810
- Galway (Western District), Papers moved for, [174] 1272
- Game Law Prosecutions, [176] 1327
- Gaols, 2R. [175] 2046, 2071, 2087
- Gaols, Discipline and Dietary in, [173] 1755; [175] 1063
- Garibaldi, General—Meeting on Primrose Hill, [174] 1549
- Government Annuities, [173] 717
- Herring Fisheries (Scotland), [173] 561
- Highway Act, [173] 712, 713, 1183; [174] 786, 966, 1083
- Highways Act Amendment, Leave, [175] 520; 2R. 692, 693; Comm. *cl.* 24, [176] 1373, 1374; *cl.* 32, 1375; *cl.* 45, 1376

[*cont.*

- Grey, Right Hon. Sir G.—*cont.*
  - Highways District Act, [176] 257
  - Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, Leave, [173] 243, 261, 266; 2R. 590; Comm. *cl.* 2, 836, 842, 847
  - Intoxicating Liquors, 2R. [175] 1414
  - Ionian Islands—Affairs of the, [176] 35
  - Jersey Court, 2R. [174] 518, 524, 528, 1772, 2052, 2053; Comm. [176] 135
  - Jersey—Laws of, [173] 1069; [176] 279
  - Judgments, &c. Law Amendment, 2R. [174] 101
  - Lambeth Medical Diplomas, [175] 461
  - Licensed Houses in the Metropolis, [174] 874
  - Lisburn Election, [174] 394, 395, 469; Res. 857
  - Magisterial Convictions in Cornwall, [175] 193; Explanation, 461
  - Marriage Law, Scotch and Irish, [176] 2194
  - Medical Officers in Unions (Ireland), Res. [175] 155
  - Merthyr Tydvil Writ, [174] 1197
  - Metropolis — Protection against Fire, [173] 563
  - Middlesex Sessions—Mr. Serjeant Payne, [175] 1061
  - Murder on the North London Line, [176] 1390
  - Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia), Comm. [176] 2061, 2067
  - Navy Estimates, [174] 1473
  - O'Malley Irwin, Mr., Case of, 2021; Address moved, 2126
  - Park Lane, South Entrance to, [175] 364
  - Parks, Public Meetings in the, [175] 366, 771, 773, 776
  - Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Leave, [173] 723, 761, 762, 774, 791; 2R. 1520, 1758; [174] 1077; Comm. 1254, 1259; *cl.* 2, 1256, 1257; *cl.* 3, 1258; *cl.* 4, 1258, 1261; Schedule A. 1269; Consid. *add. cl.* 1965; [176] 161; Lords Amendt. 567
  - Police Force and Mr. Arnold, [176] 824; Explanation, 1625, 1626, 1707
  - Police in the Parks, [176] 255
  - Police Spy System — Report of Inspectors, [173] 139
  - Prison Discipline, [173] 324; [174] 1083
  - Prison Ministers Act, Papers moved for, [176] 2197
  - Privilege, [174] 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960
  - Prosecutions, Cost of, [174] 968
  - Public and Refreshment Houses (Metropolis), Leave, [174] 2116; 2R. [175] 777
  - Royal Academy, [176] 1808
  - St. Bernard's Reformatory, [176] 1648, 2193
  - St. Mary's Burial Ground, Sydenham, [173] 1827; Comm. moved for, [174] 647, 649
  - Salmon Fisheries, [173] 324
  - Schools, Public, 2R. [176] 818
  - Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, Consid. [176] 1699
  - Sheffield, Inundation at, [173] 1909
  - Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2014
  - Starvation in the Metropolis, Cases of, [173] 1758
  - Street Music (Metropolis), 2R. [175] 1531; Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 467, 471, 474; Amendt. 477, 478, 681; *add. cl.* 682, 683
  - Supply—Government Prisons, &c. at Home, [175] 1689; Report, 1913
  - Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [174] 157; Comm. [175] 1039; 3R. [176] 672

[*cont.*

- Grey, Right Hon. Sir G.—*cont.*
  - Theatres—Precautions against Fire, [173] 494, 535
  - Tickets of Leave—Penal Servitude, [173] 1073
  - Townley, The Convict, [173] 219, 328, 1185
  - Traffic of the City of London, [176] 1623
  - Trespass (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 935, 937; *cl.* 3, 938, 939
  - Under Secretaries Indemnity, 2R. [175] 83
  - Under Secretaries of State — Privilege, Res. [174] 1247; Nomination of Comm. 1481, 1980
  - United States — Vessels "El Tousson" and "El Monassia," Papers moved for, [173] 1021; — Conference on American Affairs, [174] 1775
  - Vacating of Seats (House of Commons), 2R. [175] 594
  - Volunteer Review, The, [175] 808
  - Wakefield Prison, Dietary in, [174] 16
  - Whitecross Street Prison, [173] 1826
  - Wine Licenses, [176] 1794, 1906

- Griffith, Mr. C. Darby, *Devizes*
  - Army Estimates—Volunteers, [175] 46, 50
  - Austrian Squadron and the Channel Fleet, [174] 2051
  - Denmark and Germany — Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 880, 1068, 1939;—The Proposed Conference, 1071;—The Correspondence, 1335, 1336;—H.M.S "Aurora," [175] 103, 104;—The Armistice, 192, 1543; [176] 1522, 2194;—The Austrian Squadron, [175] 466;—Prussian Exactions in Jutland, 593, 720; — The Conference, 1262, 1290, 1458, 1730, 2031; — War in, [176] 1328, 1329
  - Egypt—The Suez Canal, [174] 302, 870
  - Flogging at Sunderland, Case of, [176] 2191
  - Garibaldi, Gen., Departure of, [174] 1290
  - Greco Conspiracy, The — M. Mazzini — Mr. Stansfeld, [174] 339
  - Ionian Islands—Papers moved for, [174] 389
  - Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers), Leave, [174] 914; Comm. [176] 103
  - Passports in France, [176] 2017
  - Postmaster General, Office of, Res. [176] 1390
  - Private Bills, Res. 7, [173] 680
  - Stamp on Proxy Papers, Res. [173] 1459, 1462; [174] 971
  - Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for, [176] 1466; Report, 2006, 2140; Amendt. 2143; Amendt. 2144; Proviso, 2145, 2147, 2149
  - Supply — Architectural Designs for Public Buildings, [175] 851;—Foreign Office, 1332, 1333;—Sir Rowland Hill, 1601;—County Roads, South Wales, 1675; — Postage of Public Departments, 1681;—Consular Establishments, 1908; Adj. moved, 1911
  - Telegraphic Despatches, [173] 1254, 1337, 1652, 1653
  - Turkey—Prince Couza and the Porte, [176] 1905
  - Weights and Measures (Metric System), Comm. [175] 4; *cl.* 2, 12

- Grogan, Sir E., *Dublin City*
  - Army Estimates—Military Education, [175] 226
  - Beer Houses (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [175] 693, 694

[*cont.*

GROGAN, Sir E.—*cont.*
Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 12, [176] 29
Chief Rents (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [174] 1399; Comm. 14; *cl.* 1, Amendt. [175] 15
County Courts (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1231
Education, National (Ireland), [175] 1729
Hudson's Bay Company's Territory, [174] 301
India—Covenanted Servants, [175] 167
Ireland—Taxation of, Comm. moved for, [173] 1209
Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, Comm. [176] 1435
Scientific Institutions of Dublin, [174] 675
Supply—Queen's Colleges (Ireland), [176] 1355
Vestry Cess Abolition (Ireland), 2R. [173] 720

GROSVENOR, Lord RICHARD de A., *Flintshire*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 74; Report, 173

Hackney Carriages (Metropolis) Bill
(*Mr. Locke, Sir Morton Peto, Mr. Alderman Salomons, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 15 [Bill 216]

HADFIELD, Mr. G., *Sheffield*
Address in Answer to the Speech, Report, [173] 209, 211
Assize Town for the West Riding Circuit, Address moved, [173] 817
Bradford Reservoirs, Papers moved for, [176] 1328
Church and Schools at Brompton, [173] 1279
Church Building and New Parishes Act Amendment, Leave, [174] 853
Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [174] 1700
Collection of Taxes, Leave, [173] 241
Counsel's Fees in Parliament, [173] 1253
Customs and Inland Revenue, Consid. *cl.* 12, [174] 1985
Education, Res. [173] 1684
Executions, Public, Papers moved for, [173] 945
Flogging Garotters, [176] 2105
Forfeiture of Lands and Goods, 2R. [175] 1807
Indemnity, 2R. Amendt. [176] 663, 665
Jersey Court, 2R. [174] 525
Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers), Leave, [174] 915
Judgments, &c. Law Amendment, 2R. [174] 101
O'Malley Irwin, Mr., Case of, Address moved, [176] 2125
Petty Offences Law Amendment, 2R. [176] 1434
Private Bills, Res. 2, Amendt. [173] 663
Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [176] 1429
Stamp on Proxy Papers, Res. [173] 1461
Standing Orders (Parliamentary Deposits), Comm. moved for, [174] 1621
Supply—Probate Court Registries, [175] 846, 847;—Printing and Stationery, 1680;—Registration of Judgments (Ireland), 1688, 1689;—Zambesi Expedition, 1897;—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers in Ireland, Amendt. [176] 399, 400;—Public Education, 537;—Ecclesiastical Commissioners, 656, 657
Ways and Means—Fire Insurance Duty, [174] 1446

HALIBURTON, Mr. T. C., *Launceston*
Greco Conspiracy, The—M. Mazzini—Mr. Stansfeld, [174] 329
United States—Capture of a Confederate Vessel in a British Harbour, [173] 823;—Island of San Juan, 1217, 1495

Halifax and Quebec Railway
Question, Mr. Aytoun; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 6, [175] 99

HAMILTON, Right Hon. Lord C., *Tyrone Co.*
Beer Houses (Ireland), 2R. [175] 602
Casual Poor (Metropolis), [176] 1801
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1378
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 608*a*
Indictable Offences (Ireland), Returns moved for, [174] 1134
Mazzini M.—The Greco Conspiracy, [173] 1259
Navy Estimates—Naval Establishments, [174] 2033
Poor Relief in the Metropolis, [176] 1796
Spirit Duties, Res. [175] 835
Stansfeld, Mr., and the Greco Conspiracy, Res. [174] 259, 282
Supply—Public Education (Ireland), [176] 1351

HAMILTON, Major W. F., *Linlithgowshire*
Administration of Trusts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [176] 423
Bank of England Notes (Scotland), 2R. [176] 124
Cattle Diseases Prevention, 2R. [173] 1752
Greek Loan, Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 404
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), Comm. [176] 1688
Scotch Affairs, Administration of, Comm. moved for, [175] 1175, 1198
Supply—Holyhead Harbour, &c. [175] 856
Writs Registration (Scotland), 2R. Adj. moved, [175] 877

HANBURY, Mr. R., *Middlesex*
De Burgh, Captain, Case of, [176] 1467
Taxes, Collection of, [174] 17

HANKEY, Mr. T., *Peterborough*
Bank of England Notes (Scotland), 2R. [176] 116
Beckenham, Lewes, and Brighton Railway, 2R. Amendt. [173] 637
Chain Cables and Anchors, Comm. *cl.* 1, [174] 508; *cl.* 2, 509; Amendt. 511; *cl.* 8, 513
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [174] 1555; Consid. *cl.* 12, 1986
Fire Insurance, [174] 1174
Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1526; [174] 177, 249, 799; Nomination of Comm. 1478
Metropolitan District Railways, 3R. [176] 1621
National Gallery—The, [175] 261
Naval Reserve, Ensign for the, [176] 257
Navy—Masters in the, Res. [175] 1215
Public Lands and Buildings (Local Rates), Res. [174] 486
[*cont.*

HANKEY, Mr. T.—*cont.*
Richard Cœur de Lion, Statue of, [174] 1771
Street Music (Metropolis), 2R. Amendt. [175] 1529; Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 467, 473; Proviso, 683
Supply—Lighthouses Abroad, [175] 861;—Rates for Government Property, 865;—Consular Establishments, 1906
Thames Conservancy, Comm. *cl.* 75, [176] 416
Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [173] 1734; Comm. *cl.* 2 [176] 107

Harbours of Refuge
Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Reply, Mr. Lindsay *Mar* 1, [173] 1359; Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Mar* 11, 1820
Motion, "That, in the opinion of this House, Her Majesty's Government should now adopt measures for the construction of Harbours of Refuge on the coast of Great Britain and Ireland, recommended by a Committee of this House in 1858, by a Royal Commission in 1859, and by a Resolution of this House in 1860" (*Mr. Lindsay*), [174] 1660; Amendment at the end of the Question, to add "and should make provision for wholly or in part defraying the expense of such Harbours as it may be thought right to construct, by means of tolls upon shipping, as recommended by the Committee of this House" (*Sir Stafford Northcote*) *April* 26, [174] 1674; Question proposed, "That those words be there added"
After long debate, Question put, A. 39, N. 191; M. 152
Main Question put, A. 84, N. 142; M. 58

HARDCASTLE, Mr. J. A., *Bury St. Edmunds*
Brazil—Slave Trade, [176] 1377
Collegiate Schools, Facilities for Divine Service in, 2R. Amendt. [176] 1776

HARDINGE, Viscount
Army—Ten Years Enlistment Men, [174] 164
Royal Academy—The, [176] 249

HARDWICKE, Earl of
Army—Ten Years Enlistment Men, [174] 165, 166;—Artillery—Mackay's Gun, 1179, 1181
Chain Cables and Anchors, 2R. [175] 1534
China—Death of Lieut. Tinling, [173] 449
Crawley, Colonel, Court Martial on—Deputy Judge Advocate, [173] 1173
Curtis's Steering Screw, [173] 1621
Greenwich Hospital, [175] 1535, 1541
Head, Sir F. B., Memorial of, [176] 1370
Kertch and Yenikale Prize Money, [173] 1539
Malt for Animals, 2R. [174] 6
Navy—Marine Artillery, [173] 311, 318; Retirement of Naval Captains, [174] 1490;—Naval Gunnery, [175] 1824;—Armour-plated Vessels, the "Kearsarge" and the "Alabama," [176] 685
Ships of War—Petition of Mr. J. Chalmers, [174] 962
United States—The Law of Prize, [174] 1616
Beer Houses (Ireland), 2R. [175] 597; Comm. *cl.* 3, 695

HARDY, Mr. G., *Leominster*
Bewicke, Mr., Case of, Comm. moved for, [174] 1934
Denmark and Germany—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 999, 1001, 1003, 1006
Education, Res. [173] 1696
Education, National (Ireland), Res. [176] 207, 209
Highways Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 692; Comm. *cl.* 45, [176] 1375
Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, 2R. [173] 567; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 833, 840, 847
Lisburn Election, [174] 465
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, 2R. [173] 1506
Private Bills, Committees on, Res. [175] 1562
Training Colleges, [173] 1184

HARDY, Mr. J., *Dartmouth*
Police in the Parks, [176] 255

HARROWBY, Earl of
Crawley, Colonel, Court Martial on—Deputy Judge Advocate, [173] 1173
Denmark and Germany—Austrian Fleet in the Baltic, [173] 1631
Factory Acts Extension, [176] 1449
Greenwich Hospital, [175] 1541
Navy—Retirement of Naval Captains, [174] 1499
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1998
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, 2R. [175] 910
Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2), 2R. [176] 2000
Public and Refreshment Houses, Report, *cl.* 9, [176] 1315
Public Schools, 2R. [175] 1250
Rape, Punishment of, Report, [174] 1281
Regius Professorship of Greek (Oxford), 2R. [174] 1765
Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [175] 631
Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [176] 1785

HARTINGTON, Marquess of (Under Secretary for War), *Lancashire, N.*
Army Estimates, [173] 1337;—Land Forces, 1416, 1442, 1448, 1451;—Supplemental Estimate, 1795, 1797; [174] 788, 799;—General Staff, &c. 819, 821, 828, 829;—Commissariat, 830, 831;—Clothing, 834, 835;—Barracks, 836;—Martial Law, 848; [175] 28;—Medical Establishment, 36, 40;—Disembodied Militia, 41;—Yeomanry Cavalry, 45;—Volunteers, 50;—Enrolled Pensioners, 51, 52, 53, 54;—Manufacturing Departments, 59, 70, 72, 78;—Warlike Stores, 79, 80;—Works, Buildings, &c. 81, 209;—Military Education, 223, 228, 231;—Surveys, 235, 236;—Administration of the Army, 238, 239;—Pensions and Allowances to Wounded Officers, 240
Army—Receipt and Expenditure, [173] 712;—Appointment of Lt. Gen. Gough to the 2nd Dragoons, 821;—Whitworth Gun, 1334;—New Brigade of Horse Artillery, 1649;—Storekeeper's Department, Pimlico, 1757;—Rates and Taxes on Officers occupying Public Buildings 1762;—Dis-

[*cont.*

HARTINGTON, Marquess of—*cont.*

charge of Soldiers in 1864-5, 1905;—Soldiers' Gardens, 1906; [174] 875;—Thomas's Rifled Cannon, 14; [175] 914;—Prussian Breech Loading Rifles, [174] 536; [175] 436;—Volunteer Artillery, [174] 625;—Trial of Armstrong Guns, 1079, 1080; [175] 1838; — Officers' Allowances at Bermuda, 258;—The Enfield Rifle, 456, 457;—The Guards in Canada, 522, 633; — Captain Grant's System of Cooking, Address moved, 526;—Percussion Caps for Military Practice, 1064;—Married Soldiers' Quarters, Aldershot, 1544; — Regimental Quartermasters, Address moved, [176] 94;—Engineer Officers at South Kensington, 151;—Rifle Practice near the New Croydon Railway, *ib.*;—Marchwood Powder Magazine, 152;—Field Allowance to Troops on the Gold Coast, *ib.*;—Requisition from the War Office to the Admiralty, 153;—Trial of Heavy Rifled Guns, 157;—Sanitary Regulations for Field Service, 258;—Recruiting for the, 390;—Barrack Masters, 494;—Forage Money of Cavalry Officers, 1330;—Experiments with Rifled Ordnance, 1624;—Armstrong Guns in New Zealand, 1904;—Stamp Duty on Commissions, 2020;—Armstrong Gun Factory at Woolwich, 2021

Artillery—Commissioners to United States and Denmark, [173] 564

Ashantee—War in, [175] 1728, 1840; Res. 1963;—Officers at Cape Coast Castle, [176] 159

Business of the House, [174] 1776

Crawley, Colonel, Court Martial on, [173] 170, 465, 564, 1367, 1368, 1656;—Case of, Papers moved for, [174] 44, 51, 56

De Burgh, Captain, Case of, [176] 1467

Fortifications and Works, Comm. [176] 1437, 1533, 1534

Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. [176] 1871; *cl.* 2, 1873; 3R. 2027

Government Manufacturing Establishments, Res. [176] 1955

India—Indian Artillery, [176] 1570

Japan—The 20th Regiment, [174] 624;—Troops for, [176] 1710

Mhow Court Martial—Case of Paymaster Smales, [173] 1651

Militia Regiments, [175] 913

Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [173] 1801, 1806

New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), Comm. [176] 1692

New Zealand—War in, [176] 1195

Norfolk Rifle Volunteers, [173] 1755

Payment of Rates, &c. by Officers in Government Houses, [174] 2050

Plymouth Sound, Accident in, [175] 1063

Supply—Civil Establishments on the West Coast of Africa, [176] 1679, 1981

Volunteer Drill Instructors, [174] 969

War Department Clerks—Medical Assistance, [174] 478

Yeomanry Cavalry, Res. [173] 1383

Harwich Corporation Bill (by Order)

c. Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Captain Jervis*), [173] 643; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" *Mr. Crawford*); after short debate, Question put, "That 'now' &c."—A. 141, N. 68; M. 74; Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2° *Feb* 16

Harwich Harbour Act Amendment Bill

c. Resolution in Committee*; Bill ordered (*Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Hutt*)

Read 1° * *June* 23 [Bill 171]
Read 2° * *July* 13
Committee *; Report *July* 14
Read 3° * *July* 15

l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *July* 18
Read 2ª * *July* 22 (No. 210)
Committee *; Report *July* 26
Read 3ª * *July* 27
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 102]

HASSARD, Mr. M. D., *Waterford City*

Bankruptcy Act, Nomination of Comm. [174] 1569

Beer Houses (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [175] 694

Chain Cables and Anchors, 2R. [173] 695

Charitable Bequests (Ireland), [173] 496; [175] 192

Chief Rents (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1400; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [175] 16

Greek Loan, 3R. [176] 571

Lisburn Election, Res. [174] 858

Navy—Armament of the, [176] 825

New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), Comm. Res. [175] 1697

Private Bills, Res. 7, Amendt. [173] 680

Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [175] 2106

Railways Construction Facilities, Re-Comm. [175] 1336

Registration of Titles in Ireland, Address moved, [175] 745

Supply — Lighthouses abroad, [175] 861; — Land, &c. Kensington Gore, 868;—Department of Science and Art, [176] 564;—Public Education (Ireland), 1351

United States — Seizure of the Barque "Science," [173] 1334; [174] 874

HAY, Sir J. C. D., *Wakefield*

Ashantee—War in, [175] 257, 552, 1728, 1839; *Res. 1950, 1998, 2007

Assize Town for the West Riding Circuit, Address moved, [173] 800, 1906

Bank Notes (Scotland), 2R. [174] 1727, 1757

Bank of England Notes (Scotland), Leave, [175] 602, 603; 2R. [176] 109, 125

Brazil—Slave Trade, [176] 1386

Coffer Dam, Capt. McKillop's, [173] 1251

Controller of the Navy—Devonport Election, [173] 1399, 1401, 1402

Court of Justiciary (Scotland), Comm. Adj. moved, [173] 1704

Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. [176] 1872; *cl.* 2, 1873; Schedule, Amendt. 1874

Government Annuities—Mr. H. B. Sheridan—Privilege, Res. [174] 305, 317

Greenwich Hospital, [173] 466, 1545; [174] 1201; Res. [175] 1147, 1167

Income Tax, Res. [175] 1750

India—Affairs of Siam and Tringanu, [175] 17

Japan—Bombardment of Kagosima, Res. [173] 357

Kertch Prize Money, [173] 1182; Return moved for, 1231, 1234

Malt for Cattle, Comm. *cl.* 6, Amendt. [173] 1219

Malta—Dock at, Res. [173] 900, 1186, 1826

[*cont.*

HAY, Sir J. C. D.—*cont.*

- Naval Agency and Distribution, 2R. [174] 627
- Navy Estimates, [173] 875;—Men and Boys, 1128, 1138;—Wages, 1281, 1282, 1291;—Scientific Departments, 1313; —Wages of Artificers at Home, 1984;—Naval Establishments, [174] 2049;—Pay of Officers, [175] 677, 686
- Navy—Retirement in the Royal Marines, Res. [175] 147, 150;—The "Research" and the "Enterprise," 588, 1455, 1456; [176] 155; —Masters in the, Res. [175] 1221; Court Martial at Jamaica, [176] 83;—The Transport "Gladiator," 157;—Armament of the, 825; —Flag Ship for the Mediterranean, 1389; —Ships of War — Armour Plating, Commission moved for, 1762, 1763; —The "Lord Warden" Target, 1805
- New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1516; Comm. 1692
- Patent Offices—Fife House, [174] 182
- Supply—Civil Establishments on the West Coast of Africa, [175] 1888, 1889; Amendt. [176] 1661, 1678, 1681
- United States—Seizure of the "Tuscaloosa," Res. [174] 1818, 1835

Head, Sir Francis Bond—Memorial of

- Resolution, Sir William Jolliffe *July* 11, [176] 1331; Observations, The Earl of Hardwicke; Answer, Earl Granville *July* 12, 1370 *Parl. P.* [3410]

HEADLAM, Rt. Hon. T. E. (Judge Advocate General), *Newcastle-upon-Tyne*

- Army Estimates—Martial Law, [174] 853
- Court Martial Law, [173] 1824
- Crawley, Colonel, Court Martial on, [173] 1657, 1904;—Case of, Papers moved for, [174] 66, 69
- Merthyr Tydvil Writ, [174] 1195
- Mhow Court Martial — Case of Paymaster Smales, [173] 1650, 1819
- Mutiny, [173] 1648; Comm. *cl.* 26, 1808
- Thames Conservancy, Comm. *cl.* 75, [176] 416

HEATHCOTE, Sir W., *Oxford University*

- Forfeiture of Lands and Goods, 2R. [175] 1810
- Merthyr Tydvil Writ, Adj. moved, [174] 1194
- *Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [176] 1408; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1611; Consid. Amendt. 1699
- Supply—Police Counties and Boroughs, [175] 1684
- Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. Amendt. [174] 113; Comm. [175] 1021; 3R. Amendt. [176] 666

HENLEY, Lord, *Northampton*

- County Franchise, 2R. [174] 936
- Education, Res. [173] 1670
- Highways Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 24, [176] 1373

HENLEY, Rt. Hon. J. W., *Oxfordshire*

- Beer Houses (Ireland), 2R. [175] 601
- Cattle Diseases Prevention, 2R. [173] 1753
- Chain Cables and Anchors, Comm. *cl.* 1, [174] 505, 507, 508; *cl.* 2, 511; *cl.* 8, 513, 514

[*cont.*

HENLEY, Rt. Hon. J. W.—*cont.*

- Collection of Taxes, Leave, [173] 240; 2R. 616; Re-Comm. [175] 1476
- County Bridges, 2R. Amendt. [175] 351
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Consid. [174] 1981; *cl.* 12, 1985
- Denmark and Germany — Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 886
- Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 610
- Foreign Office and the Board of Trade, Comm. moved for, [174] 1106
- Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1605
- Greco Conspiracy, The—M. Mazzini — Mr. Stansfeld, [174] 332
- Harbours of Refuge, Res. [174] 1693
- Intoxicating Liquors, 2R. [175] 1420
- Lisburn Election, [174] 464
- Mails in the Provinces, Papers moved for, [174] 417
- Malt for Cattle, 2R. [173] 606; Comm. 1037; *add. cl.* 1226
- Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [174] 1256; *cl.* 4, 1267
- Poor's Rate, 2R. [173] 705
- Sewage, &c. (Metropolis) Committee, [175] 102
- Supply—Police Counties and Boroughs, [175] 1684
- Tests Abolition (Oxford), Comm. [175] 1037
- Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [173] 1730, 1734

HENNESSY, Mr. J. P., *King's Co.*

- Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 125, 132; Report, 204
- Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. [176] 47, 58, 89, 91, 92
- Beer Houses (Ireland), 2R. [175] 597, 601, 602; Comm. *cl.* 3, 693, 694
- Convent Schools (Ireland), [176] 1711
- Conveyancers, &c. (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [173] 1229
- County Courts (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1231
- Court of Chancery (Ireland), Leave, Adj. moved, [174] 1377, 1593
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. Schedule C, Amendt. [174] 1860
- Denmark and Germany—The Danish Papers, [173] 333; — Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1072, 1073
- Education, National (Ireland), Res. [176] 186; Amendt. 187, 234
- Education—School Inspectors' Reports, [175] 191; Nomination of Comm. Adj. moved, 997
- Elgin and Kincardine, Countess of, Res. [175] 1462
- Emigration (America), Papers moved for, [176] 2175
- Fortifications and Works, Comm. [176] 1534
- Greek Loan, Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 407; 3R. Amendt. 569, 572
- Holyhead Harbour—Vessels Wrecked, &c., Return moved for, [173] 425
- Home, Mr., and the Roman Government, [175] 843
- Indian Medical Service, Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 1702; Adj. moved, 1703; Amendt. 1704; Consid. Adj. moved, 1874; *add. cl.* 1899; 3R. Amendt. 2034
- Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties), Comm. [176] 281; *cl.* 9, 282; *cl.* 10, 283; Adj. moved, 284; Consid. Amendt. 400, 401, 817

cont.

HENNESSY, Mr. J. P.—*cont.*
Ireland—Taxation of, Comm. moved for, [173] 1208;—Condition of, Res. 1831, 1847, 1894
Marriage Law, Scotch and Irish, [176] 2194
Mazzini, M.—The Greco Conspiracy, [173] 1256, 1257, 1259, 1932
Medical Officers in Unions (Ireland), Res. [175] 152, 155
Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia), Comm. [176] 2057, 2060, 2065
Navy—Claims of Mr. J. Clare, Comm. moved for, [174] 1467;—Masters in the, Res. [175] 1222
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 3R. Amendt. [176] 1867
O'Malley Irwin, Case of, [176] 1977, 2020; Address moved, 2107, 2115, 2116, 2125, 2126
Poland—Despatch of September, 1863, [173] 537, 1101, 1103; Res. [175] 636, 661, 662;—Affairs of, 915
Polish Refugees in Austria, [174] 1200
Poor Law (Ireland) Act Amendment, Leave, [174] 99; 2R. [176] 449, 466
Poor Rates (Ireland), Res. [175] 145, 146
Prison Ministers Act, Papers moved for, [176] 2195
Private Bills, Res. 5, [173] 674
Queen's College, Cork, [173] 716
Russia—Emigration of the Circassians, [175] 517
Supply—Sir Rowland Hill, [175] 1600;—Paymaster General, Adj. moved, 1604;—Public Works (Ireland), Adj. moved, 1672, 1673;—Landed Estates Record Offices, 1676;—Printing and Stationery, 1678;—Convict Establishment, Colonies, 1690;—Indian Department, Canada, 1882, 1883;—Governors, &c. West Indies, &c. Amendt. 1886, 1887;—Department of Science and Art, [176] 563;—Public Education (Ireland), 1345;—Queen's Colleges (Ireland), 1353;—Royal Academy of Music, 1608
Under Secretaries Indemnity, 2R. [175] 82, 83
United States—Outrages by the Sioux Indians, [174] 2053
Vestry Cess Abolition (Ireland), 2R. [173] 723; Comm. *add. cl.* 1316; Lords Amendts. Amendt. [175] 84

HERBERT, Rt. Hon. H. A., *Kerry Co.*
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1392
Ireland—State of, Res. [173] 1860
Vestry Cess Abolition (Ireland), 2R. [173] 723
Watching of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1713

Herne Bay, Hampton, and Reculver Fishery Bill (Lords)
c. Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2° *June* 13, [175] 1634; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Sir Edward Dering*); Question, "That 'now' &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; read 2° *June* 13

Herring Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Sir George Grey, Sir William Dunbar*)
c. Ordered * *June* 17

Herring Fisheries (*Scotland*)
Question, Mr. Caird; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 15, [173] 561

Herrings, British Cured
Question, Mr. W. Miller; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 14, [173] 1904

HEYGATE, Sir W. F., *Londonderry Co.*
Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. [176] 84
Ireland—The Church, [173] 462;—State of, Res. 1848
Watching of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1714

HEYGATE, Mr. W. U., *Leicester*
Agricultural Statistics, Res. [175] 1380
County Bridges, 2R. [175] 351, 352
Foreign Office and the Board of Trade, Comm. moved for, [174] 1092
National Gallery, [174] 1775
St. Bernard's Reformatory, [176] 1650
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [175] 434

HIBBERT, Mr. J. T., *Oldham*
County Franchise, 2R. [174] 952
Death, Punishment of, Comm. moved for, [174] 2114
Executions, Public, Papers moved for, [173] 941, 955
Gaols, 2R. [175] 2084
Government Annuities, [173] 1592
National Gallery, [175] 260, 1336, 1636
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [174] 1258; Schedule A, Amendt. 1269
Poor Law, Consolidation of the, [173] 1333
Supply—Postage of Public Departments, [175] 1681;—Police Counties and Boroughs, 1685;—Emigration, 1896

High Court at Bombay Bill
(*Sir Charles Wood, Mr. Baring*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 14 [Bill 67]
Read 2°* *April* 18
Committee*; Report *April* 19
Read 3°* *April* 21
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Wodehouse*) *April* 22 (No. 57)
Read 2ª* *April* 29
Committee*; Report *May* 2
Read 3ª* *May* 3
Royal Assent *May* 13 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 16]

Highways Act
Questions, Mr. Long, Mr. Rogers; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 18, [173] 712; Question, Colonel Wilson Patten; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 26, 1183; Question, Mr. Richard Long; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 14, [174] 966; Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 15, 1083; Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 11, 786; Question, Mr. Dodson; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 24, [176] 257

[*cont.*

Highways Act Amendment Bill
(*Sir George Grey, Mr. Baring*)
175] *c.* Ordered; read 1° after short debate *May* 19, 520 [Bill 113]
, Bill read 2° after debate, and committed to a Select Committee *May* 26, 692
Committee nominated *May* 30:—Sir George Grey (Chairman), Mr. Henley, Mr. Walter, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Sir William Jolliffe, Mr. Dodson, Sir Baldwin Leighton, Mr. Scourfield, Mr. Algernon Egerton, Mr. Buller, Sir Matthew White Ridley, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Howes, Mr. W. E. Forster, and Colonel Barttelot
As amended by Select Committee [Bill 177]
176] Bill considered in Committee *July* 12, 1372
Bill reported with Amendts.
Considered as amended * *July* 13
Read 3° * *July* 14
With Lords Amendts. . . . No. 234
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *July* 15
Read 2ª * *July* 21 (No. 207)
Select Committee appointed and nominated * *July* 21
Committee:—M. Salisbury, Lord Steward, E. Romney, E. Powis, E. De Grey, E. Eversley, L. Wodehouse, L. Hatherton, L. Stanley of Alderley, L. Egerton, L. Llanover
Report of Select Committee * *July* 22 (No. 227)
Report *July* 22; re-committed (No. 228)
Committee * *July* 23; Report *July* 25
Read 3ª * *July* 26
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 101]

Hill, Resignation of Sir Rowland
Question, Lord Truro; Answer, Lord Stanley of Alderley *Mar* 8, [173] 1626; Notice, Viscount Palmerston *Mar* 11, [173] 1827

Hill, Sir Rowland
LORDS—
Message from The QUEEN *June* 6, [175] 1224
Moved, "That an humble Address, &c." (*The Lord President*) *June* 14, [175] 1702
Address Ordered, *Nemine Dissentiente*
The QUEEN's Answer to the Address reported *June* 17
COMMONS—
Message from HER MAJESTY *June* 6, [175] 1263
Referred to the Committee of Supply
See SUPPLY
Parl Papers—
Treasury Minute . . . . . . No. 120
Letter and Mem. from Sir R. Hill No. 146

HODGKINSON, Mr. G., *Newark*
Chain Cables and Anchors, Comm. *cl.* 2, [174] 512
Government Annuities, Comm. [174] 226
Law Life Society, Return moved for, [174] 1482
United States—Confederate Steam Rams, [175] 804, 912

HODGSON, Mr. K. R., *Bridport*
Bank Notes (Scotland), 2R. [174] 1746
Bank of England Notes (Scotland), 2R. [176] 113
Partnership Law Amendment, 2R. [174] 1565

HODGSON, Mr. R., *Tynemouth*
Business of the House, [176] 2105
Chain Cables and Anchors, Comm. *cl.* 1, [174] 506; *cl.* 2, 510; *cl.* 8, 513
Harbours of Refuge, Res. [174] 1677
Highways Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 24, [176] 1373
Navy—Wreck of H.M.S. "Lively," [173] 171
Private Bills, Res. 2, [173] 663; Res. 3, Amendt. 666;—Standing Order, [175] 1139;—Committees on, Res. 1565
Railway and Canal Bills, [175] 101
Railway Bills, Res. [174] 1621
Standing Orders (Parliamentary Deposits), Comm. moved for, [174] 1620
Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for, [176] 1460

HOLLAND, Mr. E., *Evesham*
Cattle Diseases Prevention, 2R. [173] 1751
Union Assessment Act, [173] 461

HOLMESDALE, Viscount, *Kent, W.*
Malt for Cattle, Comm. [173] 1045

Holy Alliance, Alleged Revival of the
Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Reply, Earl Russell *July* 4, [176] 684; Question and Notice of Motion (*Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe*) *July* 5, 819; Observations, Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe 1879; Reply, Earl Russell *July* 22, 1887
Statement with regard to Prussia, Viscount Palmerston *July* 4, [176] 708

Holyhead Harbour
Question, Mr. Stanley; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *April* 14, [174] 968

Holyhead Harbour—(Vessels Wrecked, &c.)
Motion for Returns (*Colonel Dunne*); after short debate, agreed to *Feb* 9, [173] 424 (*Parl. P.* No. 102)

Holyhead—Lighthouse at
Question, Mr. Stanley; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *April* 22, [174] 1501

Home, Mr., and the Roman Government
Question, Mr. Roebuck; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 30, [175] 839

HOPWOOD, Mr. J. T., *Clitheroe*
British American Provinces, Union of the, [175] 803
Colonial Governors, Allowance to retiring, [173] 562
Denmark and Germany—The Conference—The Armistice, [175] 192
Letters, Transmission of, on Sundays, [173] 1365
United States—Conference on American Affairs, [174] 1775;—Confederate Steam Rams, [175] 808

HORSFALL, Mr. T. B., *Liverpool*
- Assaults with Knives, [173] 1366
- Borough Franchise, 2R. [175] 318
- Chain Cables and Anchors, 2R. [173] 694
- Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. [175] 1470; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1478, 1480; 3R. 2093
- Government Annuities, Comm. [174] 219, 223, 224
- Insolvent Debtors, Comm. [176] 1432
- Intoxicating Liquors (Sale on Sundays), Leave, [175] 174
- Ireland—Daunt's Rock, [175] 1837
- Private Bills—Standing Order, [175] 1143
- Supply—Niger Expedition, [175] 1897
- United States — Vessels "El Tousson" and "El Monassia," Papers moved for, [173] 965, 974

HORSMAN, Right Hon. E., *Stroud*
- Bewicke, Mr., Case of, Comm. moved for, [174] 1935, 1938
- Denmark and Germany—The Conference, [174] 787, 788, 1915;—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 894, 919, 1001, 1006, 1023

HOTHAM, Lord, *Yorkshire, E. R.*
- Agricultural Statistics, Res. [175] 1369
- Army Estimates, [173] 1336, 1337; [174] 789;—General Staff, &c. 826;—Martial Law, 836, 849, 850;—Enrolled Pensioners, [175] 52
- Army—Stamp Duty on Commissions, [176] 2020
- Casual Poor (Metropolis), [176] 1803
- Crawley, Colonel, Court Martial on, [173] 564, 1368, 1819;—Case of, Papers moved for, [174] 55
- Greco Conspiracy, The — M. Mazzini — Mr. Stansfeld, [174] 332
- Highways Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 24, [176] 1374
- Law Courts, The, [176] 373
- Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2008

HOUGHTON, Lord
- Brazilian Slave Trade, [176] 414
- Convocation—Powers of—Essays and Reviews, [176] 1535
- Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, 2R. [175] 885; Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1342, 1349; Commons Amendts. [176] 1445
- Royal Academy, The, [176] 247
- West Riding of Yorkshire Assizes, Address moved, [175] 1615

HOWARD, Rt. Hon. Lord E. G. F., *Arundel*
- Cattle Diseases Prevention, Comm. *cl.* 6, [176] 1569
- Emigration (America), Papers moved for, [176] 2161, 2182
- Public Works (Manufacturing Districts), [Advances], Comm. Res. [176] 1698
- St. Mary's Burial Ground, Sydenham, [174] 650, 654, 661
- Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for, [176] 1462

HOWES, Mr. E., *Norfolk, E.*
- Education (Inspectors' Reports), Res. [176] 2070, 2079
- Police, Pay and Clothing of the, [176] 2017
- Union Assessment Committee Act Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [175] 520

HUBBARD, Mr. J. G., *Buckingham*
- Agricultural Statistics, Res. [175] 1372
- Bank Act, 1844, [175] 460
- Bank Acts (Scotland), Comm. Res. [173] 472
- Bank of England Notes (Scotland), 2R. [176] 120
- Collection of Taxes, Leave, [173] 240
- Corn Rent, [174] 1199
- Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 601
- Fire Insurances, [174] 11
- Government Annuities, Leave, [173] 479; Comm. [174] 798
- Income Tax, [174] 971; Res. [175] 1731, 1747, 1749, 1761
- Income Tax Deductions, [176] 514, 516
- London, &c. Docks Amalgamation, 2R. [175] 1389
- Malt for Cattle, Comm. *cl.* 6, [173] 1220
- Partnership Law Amendment, 2R. Amendt. [174] 1560; Comm. 2125; *cl.* 3, 2128
- Union Assessment Committees, [176] 1583
- Ways and Means—Fire Insurance Duty, [174] 1449; Res. 1456, 1459
- Weighing of Grain (Port of London), 2R. [176] 176
- Weights and Measures (Metric System), Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 104; *add. cl.* 107

Hudson's Bay Company — Telegraphic Communications
- Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Mr. Arthur Mills *June* 2, [175] 1060

Hudson's Bay Territory
- Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 1, [176] To leave out from "That" and add "Address for Copies of all Correspondence which has taken place between the Imperial and Canadian Governments respecting the Western Boundaries of Canada, and of any memorials forwarded to the Colonial Office from the inhabitants of the Red River Settlement" (*Mr. Arthur Mills*), 616; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Hudson's Bay Company's Territory
- Question, Sir Edward Grogan; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 18, [174] 301

HUMBERSTON, Mr. P. S., *Chester*
- Army Estimates—Volunteers, [175] 49
- Chain Cables and Anchors, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [174] 503; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 512, 514
- Intoxicating Liquors, 2R. [175] 1419
- Privilege, [174] 1959
- Weights and Measures (Metric System), Comm. [175] 1

Hunt, Mr. G. W., *Northamptonshire, N.*

- Army Estimates—Commissariat, [174] 830; Adj. moved, 831;—Clothing, 835;—Martial Law, 852, 853
- Bewicke, Mr., Case of, Comm. moved for, [174] 1938
- Brazil—Diplomatic Relations with, [173] 716, 717
- Cattle Diseases Prevention, Comm. *cl.* 6, [176] 1569
- Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Comm. [176] 291, 298
- Chimney Sweepers, [174] 1940
- Church Building, &c. Acts Amendment, 2R. [175] 1520
- Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. [175] 1467; *cl.* 2, 1481; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1482, 1483
- County Voters, Registration of, Instruction, [173] 682; 2R. [175] 1817
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Consid. *cl.* 5, [174] 1982; *cl.* 12, 1984
- Denmark and Germany—Answer of Prince Gortschakoff, [173] 1653;—The Conference, [176] 163
- Education—Inspectors' Reports, [176] 1798
- Forfeiture of Lands and Goods, 2R. Amendt. [175] 1802, 1807, 1811
- Government Annuities, [174] 343
- Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, 2R. [173] 575; Comm. *cl.* 2, 843, 847; Consid. 1021
- Lisburn Election, [174] 391, 395; Res. 854, 858; Comm. moved for, 1428
- Magisterial Convictions in Cornwall, [175] 193
- Merthyr Tydvil Writ, [174] 1195
- Penal Servitude Acts Amendment; Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [174] 1259, 1262, 1268; Schedule A, 1269; Consid. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1965; [176] 160; Lords Amendts. Amendt. 566
- Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, Comm. [176] 1436
- Private Bills, Res. 6, [173] 677
- Rape, Punishment of, Comm. [176] 945
- Street Music (Metropolis), 2R. [175] 1532; Comm. *add. cl.* [176] 683
- Taxes, Collection of, [174] 17
- United States—Confederate Steam Rams, [175] 807

Hutt, Rt. Hon. W. (Paymaster of the Forces and Vice President of the Board of Trade), *Gateshead*

- Ballast Heavers' Office, [174] 1503
- Chain Cables and Anchors, 2R. [173] 687
- Germany—Austria and the Zollverein, [173] 713
- Kertch Prize Money, [173] 858; [175] 364
- Thames Conservancy, 2R. [174] 1559; Comm. *cl.* 70, [176] 415; *cl.* 75, 416; Lords Amendts. 2154, 2155
- Thames, Impurities in the, [175] 459
- Unclaimed Wreck, [176] 155
- Volunteer Service, The, [176 2190

Hypothec, Law of

- Question, Mr. Carnegie; Answer, The Lord Advocate *May* 2, [174] 1978; Petition—Observations, Lord Brougham *May* 31, [175] 881

Improvement of Land Acts (1864) Bill
[H.L.] (*The Lord Chancellor*)

l. Read 1ª* *Mar* 18 (No. 36)
174] Read 2ª after short debate *April* 19, and referred to a Select Committee, 1283
Committee nominated *Mar* 21:—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. President, Ld. Privy Seal, D. Marlborough, M. Bath, E. Derby, E. Carnarvon, E. Malmesbury, E. Romney, E. Grey, V. Eversley, L. Redesdale, L. Portman, L. Stanley of Alderley, L. Overstone, L. Cranworth, L. Chelmsford, 1283; *April* 22, Earl of Bandon, Viscount Hutchinson, and Lord Ponsonby added
Report of Select Committee *June* 14 (No. 130)
175] Committee *June* 16, 1826; Bill, as amended by Select Committee, read, and agreed to; Report * *June* 17
Read 3ª* *June* 21 (No. 122)
c. Read 1°* *July* 1 [Bill 187]
Read 2°* *July* 5
Committee *July* 11, R.P.*
Committee * *July* 15, R.P.
Committee *; Report *July* 19
Considered as amended *July* 20
Read 3° * *July* 21
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 114]
Parl. Papers—*Lords* . . . . No. 36
Report of Select Comm. . . No. 130
As amended by Select Comm. No. 122
With Commons Amendts. . No. 249
Commons . . . Bill 187
Lords Reason . . . . . Bill 238

Inclosure Bill
(*Mr. Bruce, Sir George Grey*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 19 [Bill 26]
Read 2°* *Feb* 26
Committee *; Report *Mar* 4
Considered as amended * *Mar* 7
Read 3°* *Mar* 8
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *Mar* 10
Read 2ª* *Mar* 14 (No. 25)
Committee *; Report *Mar* 15
Read 3ª* *Mar* 16
Royal Assent *Mar* 18 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 1]

Inclosure (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Baring, Sir George Grey*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 23 [Bill 170]
Read 2°* *June* 27
Committee *; Report *June* 30
Read 3°* *July* 1
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *July* 4
Read 2ª* *July* 15 (No. 177)
Committee *; Report *July* 21
Read 3ª* *July* 22
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 66]

Income Tax

- *Collection by Parochial Officers*, Question, Mr. Warner; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 8, [173] 216
- *Income Tax*, Question, Mr. Hubbard; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 14, [174] 971
- *Income Tax Deductions*, Question, Mr. Hubbard; Answer, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 30, [176] 514

[*cont.*

Income Tax—cont.

The Income Tax Commissioners at Blything, Question, Sir FitzRoy Kelly; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 21, [176] 32

Income Tax, Moved, "That the inequalities and injustice attending the operation of the existing Property and Income Tax disqualify it for being continuously reimposed in its present form as one of the means of levying the National Revenue (*Mr. Hubbard*) *June* 14, [175] 1750; after long debate, Question put, A. 28, N. 67; M. 39

See *Ways and Means—Financial Statement*

Indemnity Bill

(*Mr. Peel, Mr. Baring*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 9 [Bill 97]

Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 1; Amendt. (*Mr. Hadfield*), [176] 663; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

Committee *; Report *July* 4

Considered as amended * *July* 5

Read 3° * *July* 7

l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *July* 8

Read 2ª * *July* 12 (No. 197)

Committee *; Report *July* 14

Read 3ª * *July* 15

Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 49]

INDIA

Army—

Brevet Rank, Question, Captain Jervis; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *July* 15, [176] 1571

Report of the Royal Commission, Question, Captain Jervis; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Feb* 5, [173] 172

The Royal Commission, Question, Captain Jervis; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Mar* 17, [174] 176

Report of Royal Commission, Parl. P. No. [3254]; Despatch relative to, No. 427

Claims of Indian Officers, Question, Captain Jervis; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Feb* 25, [173] 1065; Motion, "That this House, having by the Acts 21 & 22 *Vict.* c. 106, and 23 & 24 *Vict.* c. 100, guaranteed to the Officers of the late East India Company's Service that their advantages as to 'pay, pensions, allowances, privileges, promotions, and otherwise,' should be secured to them, has learnt with regret, from the Report of the Royal Commission on Memorials of Indian Officers, that in certain cases this assurance has been departed from, and is of opinion that full and speedy reparation should be made to those who have suffered by such departure" (*Captain Jervis*) *April* 12, [174] 876; after debate, Motion withdrawn; Question, Captain Jervis; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 9, [175] 189; Question, Lord Stanley; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 10, [175] 258; Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Vansittart *June* 6, 1264; Question, Sir Minto Farquhar; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 14, 1729; Question, Captain Jervis; Answer, Colonel Sykes *July* 1, [176] 613; Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *July* 28, [176] 2158

[*cont.*

INDIA—*Army—cont.*

Indian Artillery, Question, Mr. O'Neill; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *July* 15, [176] 1570

Azeem Jah, Claims of, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 13, "To leave out from "That" and add "A Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the claims of His Highness Azeem Jah to the title and dignity of the Nawab of the Carnatic; and further to report upon the circumstances under which the Treaty entered into between His Highness's father, Azeem ul Dowlah and the East India Company, dated the 31st day of July, 1801, has been declared void" (*Mr. Smollett*), [175] 1641; after long debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 62, N. 45; M. 17

Banda and Kirwee Booty, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 27, To leave out from "That" and add "An Address for distribution of the Banda and Kirwee Booty, upon the principle of actual capture, as recommended in the Report of the Royal Commission on Army Prize, &c." (*Sir Stafford Northcote*), [175] 721; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Question, General Peel; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *June* 23, [176] 154

Bhootan, The British Envoy to, Question, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 26, [175] 633

Budget, The Indian, Question, Mr. J. B. Smith; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 3, [175] 1146; *The Financial Statement—East India Revenue Accounts* considered in Committee, Resolution (*The Secretary of State for India*) *July* 21; after long debate, Resolutions agreed to, [176] 1808; *The Indian Finance Accounts,* Question, Mr. Torrens; Answer, Sir Charles Wood, 2191; Question, Mr. J. B. Smith; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Mar* 17, [174] 178; Question, Mr. J. B. Smith; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 3, [175] 1146; Question, Mr. Torrens; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *July* 29, [176] 2191;

Parl. Papers . . . . No. 309

Burmah, British, Question, Sir Andrew Agnew; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 17, [175] 194

Burning the Dead, Question, Lord Stanley; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *April* 22, [174] 1500; Question, The Earl of Ellenborough; Answer, Lord Wodehouse *April* 28, 1757

Calcutta, Gaol of, Question, Mr. Leslie; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *July* 4, 706

Central India Prize Money, Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Feb* 25, [173] 1071

Covenanted Civil Service, Question, Mr. P. B. Smollett; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Mar* 17, [174] 186; Observations, Sir Edward Grogan; Reply, Sir Charles Wood *May* 6, [175] 167

Dalhousie, The late Marquess of, Question, Sir James Fergusson; Answer, Mr. H. Baillie *June* 20, [175] 2035

Delhi Prize Money, Question, Sir Minto Farquhar; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 13, [175] 460; Question, Captain Clive; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *July* 4, 705

[*cont.*

INDIA—*cont.*

Dhar, The Rajah of, Question, Lord Stanley; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 17, [175] 1948; Question, Lord Stanley; Answer, Sir Charles Wood, *April* 22, [174] 1499

Gold Currency for India, Questions, Colonel Sykes, Mr. Vansittart; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Mar* 3, 1364; Question, Mr. Vansittart; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Mar* 14, [173] 1906

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 10, To leave out from "That" and add "the increasing trade and commerce of India, and the consequent increasing demand for a portable circulating medium, requires that a Gold Currency should be established in that empire" (*Mr. John Benjamin Smith*), [175] 1573; Question "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Hill Tribes, The, Question, Mr. Smollett; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Feb* 11, [173] 462

Lucknow Booty, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *July* 4, [176] 705

Medical Service, Question, Mr. Leslie; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Feb* 25, [173] 1067; Question, Mr. Bazley; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Mar* 17, [174] 184; Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *April* 28, 1770; *Candidates for,* Question, Mr. Bazley; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *April* 14, 966

Mhow Court Martial, Case of Paymaster Smales, Questions, Sir James Fergusson; Answers, Mr. Headlam, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 8, 1649; Opinion of the Judge Advocate; Question, Sir James Fergusson; Answer, Mr. Headlam *Mar* 11, [173] 1818; *Sir Wiliam Mansfield,* Notice of Motion (*Lord Chelmsford*) withdrawn, *Mar* 17, [174] 162

Pensions from Indian Revenue, Question, Mr. Arthur Mills; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 10, [175] 1544

Press, The Native, Question, Mr. Adam; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 17, [175] 1949

Seat of Government in, Question, The Earl of Ellenborough; Answer, Lord Wodehouse *April* 28, [174] 1756

India Medical Service Bill

(*Sir Charles Wood, The Marquess of Hartington*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 15 [Bill 213]
Read 2°* *July* 18

176] Bill considered in Committee *July* 19, 1702
cl. 2 (The Secretary of State for India in Council empowered to make regulations for the medical service of Her Majesty's forces in India, and to empower the authorities in India to make similar regulations); after debate, Committee report Progress
Motion, "That the Bill be now taken into consideration" *July* 21, 1874; after debate, Debate adjourned
Committee*; Report *July* 20
Debate resumed *July* 22
Question again put, and agreed to
Bill considered, 1899
new cl. (Any natural born subject of Her Majesty may be examined as a candidate)

[*cont.*

India Medical Service Bill—cont.

176] (*Mr. Hennessy*), read 1°; after short debate, Motion, "That the clause be now read a second time," A. 11, N. 31; M. 20

c. Motion, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Viscount Palmerston*) *July* 25, 2034
Amendt. to leave out from "That the," to add "said Order be discharged" (*Mr. Hennessy*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 44, N. 46; M. 2; words added; Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; Order for third reading discharged

India Office Bill

(*Mr. Cowper, Mr. Peel*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 22 [Bill 166]
Read 2°* *June* 30
Committee*; Report *July* 4
Read 3°* *July* 5
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Wodehouse*) *July* 7
Read 2ª* *July* 11 (No. 191)
Committee*; Report *July* 12
Read 3ª* *July* 14
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 51]

India Stocks Transfer Act Amendment Bill

(*Sir Charles Wood, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 30 [Bill 183]
Read 2°* *July* 4
Committee*; Report *July* 5
Read 3°* *July* 7
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Wodehouse*) *July* 8
Read 2ª* *July* 12 (No. 195)
Committee*; Report *July* 14
Read 3ª* *July* 15
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 50]

INGESTRE, Viscount, *Staffordshire, N.*
Denmark and Germany — Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 883
Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [175] 1720
Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 1006

INGHAM, Mr. R., *South Shields*
Bewicke, Mr., Case of, Comm. moved for, [174] 1929
Chain Cables and Anchors, Comm. *cl.* 2, [174] 512
Great Northern Railway (No. 3), 2R. [173] 643
Greenwich Hospital, Res. [175] 1164
Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers), Leave, [174] 915
Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2144, 2147, 2150

Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties) Bill

(*Mr. Massey, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)

c. Resolution in Committee* *June* 16
Resolution reported*; Bill ordered *June* 17

[*cont.*

Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties) Bill—cont.
c. Read 1° * *June* 17
Read 2° * *June* 23
176] Bill considered in Committee *June* 24, 281
Bill reported, with Amendments
. Motion, "That the Bill be taken into Consideration this day," 400
. Amendt. at end of Question, to add "week" (*Mr. Hennessy*) *June* 27, 401; Question proposed, "That the word 'week' be there added;" after further debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Main Question put, and agreed to
. Bill, as amended, considered *July* 4, 817
Read 3° * July 11
l. Read 1ª (*The Lord President*) *July* 12
Read 2ª * *July* 15 (No. 198)
Committee negatived *
Read 3ª * *July* 18
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 56]

Inns of Court Bill
(*Sir George Bowyer, Mr. William Ewart, Mr. Hennessy*)
c. Ordered *May* 10; read 1° * *May* 11 [Bill 104]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 20

Inns of Court
Amendt. To leave out from "That" and add "Address for a Copy of any Correspondence that may have passed between the Government and the Inns of Court, with regard to the Report of the Commission on the Inns of Court" (*Mr. Grant Duff*) *July* 1, [176] 639; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. negatived

Insane Prisoners Act Amendment Bill
(*Sir G. Grey, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Att. General*)
173] c. Bill ordered, after long debate; read 1° *Feb* 8, 243 [Bill 4]
. Read 2° after long debate *Feb* 15, 567
Considered in Committee *Feb* 19
cl. 1 (Repeal of 3 & 4 *Vict.* c. 54, s. 1) agreed to
. *cl.* 2 (Prisoners becoming insane, two Justices may inquire, with medical aid, respecting such insanity); Amendt. to leave out "death" (*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*), 833; after debate, Question put, "That the word 'death' stand part of the clause;" A. 32, N. 26; M. 6; Division List—Ayes and Noes, 846; *cl.* agreed to; remaining clauses agreed to
. *add. cl.* (Charge of maintenance of insane prisoners to be borne by the common fund of the Union) (*Mr. W. G. Langton*); *cl.* added
Bill reported
. Considered as amended, after short debate, *Feb* 23, 1021
Read 3° * and passed *Feb* 24
Lords Amendments [Bill 158]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *Feb* 25 (No. 14)
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Feb* 29, 1243; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill read 2ª
Order for Committee discharged; Bill referred to Select Committee *Mar* 15
[*cont.*

Insane Prisoners Act Amendment Bill—cont.
l. Committee nominated *April* 25:—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. President, D. Richmond, E. Carnarvon, E. Romney, E. Cathcart, V. Eversley, L. Wodehouse, L. Cranworth, L. Wensleydale, L. Chelmsford, L. Kingsdown
Report of Select Committee * (Nos. 110, 111)
Committee * *June* 7; Report * *June* 10
Read 3ª * *June* 13
Royal Assent *June* 23 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 29]

Insolvent Debtors Bill
(*Mr. Paull, Mr. John Locke, Mr. M'Mahon*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 15 [Bill 20]
174] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Paull*) *May* 3, 2119; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Paget*); after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Bill read 2° *May* 3
Committee *July* 6 R.P.
176] Bill considered in Committee, after short debate R.P. *July* 6, 948
. Considered in Committee *July* 13, 1431
Short debate [No Report]

Intoxicating Liquors Bill
173] c. Considered in Committee *Mar* 10, 1814
Motion, "That the Chairman be directed to move, &c." (*Mr. Lawson*); A. 70, N. 36; M. 34
Resolution reported; Bill ordered
(*Mr. Lawson, Mr. Bazley*)
Read 1° *Mar* 10 [Bill 44]
175] Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Lawson*) *June* 8, 1390; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Captain Jervis*), 1399; Question proposed, "That 'now' &c.;" after long debate, Question put, A. 35, N. 292; M. 257; words added; Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
. Second reading put off for three months
. List of the Ayes, 1423

Intoxicating Liquors (Sale on Sundays)
c. Motion for leave (*Mr. Somes*) *May* 6, [175] 168; after debate, Question put, A. 87, N. 123; M. 36

Ionian Islands
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 18, To leave out from "That" and add "Address for Copy of any Correspondence up to the Treaty of the 14th day of November, 1863, on the subject of the Annexation of the Ionian Islands to Greece, between the Foreign Office and the Governments of Austria, Prussia, Russia, France, and Greece" (*Mr. Gregory*), [174] 343; after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Cession of the, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 15, 566; Observations, Colonel Dunne; Reply, Mr. Chichester Fortescue; debate thereon *Feb* 25, [173] 1082
Annexation to Greece, Observations, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Reply, Mr. Layard *July* 15, [176] 1575
[*cont.*

Ionian Islands—cont.

Affairs of the, Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 3, [175] 1147; Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 21, [176] 35

Officials in the, Question, Mr. Roebuck; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 30, [175] 803

State of the, Question, Mr. Smollett; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 26, [175] 634

Order of St. Michael and St. George, Question, Lord Ernest Bruce; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 25, [176] 2019

Parl. Papers—
Return relative to . . . . . No. 54
Treaty relative to . . . . . [3247]
Convention respecting Claims . [3322]
Treaty of Union to Greece . . [3323]
Correspondence respecting Annexation . . . . [3347]
Correspondence respecting Cession [3373]

Ionian Islands Commissioners Act Repeal Bill—*Afterwards*—
Ionian States Acts of Parliament Repeal Bill

(*Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Mr. Secretary Cardwell*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 7 [Bill 197]
Read 2°* *July* 11
Committee*; Report *July* 14
Read 3°* *July* 15
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Wodehouse*) *July* 18
Read 2ª* *July* 21 (No. 212)
Committee*; Report *July* 22
Read 3ª* *July* 25
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 77]

IRELAND

Agricultural Population, Motion, "That this House observes with regret that the Agricultural Population of Ireland are rapidly leaving the Country" (*Mr. Hennessy*) *June* 21, [176] 47; after long debate, Previous Question put, (*Sir George Grey*); A. 52, N. 80; M. 28; Motion, "That this House trusts that Her Majesty's Government will devise some means by which the Irish Agricultural Population may be induced to devote their capital and labour to reproductive employment at home" (*Mr. Hennessy*) *June* 21, [176] 92; Whereupon Previous Question proposed (*Sir George Grey*); after short debate, original Motion and previous Question withdrawn

Belfast, Borough of, Motion, "That the Copy of the Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the state of the affairs of the Borough of Belfast, with the Minutes of the Evidence [presented 24th February, 1859] be referred to the Committee on the Belfast Improvement (No. 2) Bill (*Sir Hugh Cairns*) *April* 15, [174] 1074; after short debate, agreed to; (*Parl. P.* No. 348)

Brehon Laws, Question, Mr. M'Mahon; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *April* 22, [174] 1503

Charitable Bequests, Question, Mr. Hassard; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Feb* 12, [173] 496; Question, Mr. Hassard; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *May* 9, [175] 192

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

Church (Ireland)

Bishoprics, Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Mar* 15, [174] 16

Church Livings (Ireland), Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *June* 27, [176] 336

Irish Church, Questions, Mr. Dillwyn, Sir Frederick Heygate; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Feb* 11, [173] 462

Regium Donum, The, Question, Sir Hervey Bruce; Answer, Mr. Peel *July* 5, [176] 824

Condition of, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 11, "That this House is of opinion that it is just and expedient to extend to Ireland the beneficial provisions of the English Poor Laws" (*Mr. Hennessy*), [173] 1831; after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Cork Harbour, Question, Mr. Maguire, [174] 1463; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *April* 21 1464; *Naval Establishment at*, Question, Mr. Whiteside; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Feb* 9, [173] 325; *Daunt's Rock*, Question, Mr. Scully; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Mar* 11, [173] 1817; Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *April* 12, [174] 871; Question, Mr. Horsfall; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *June* 16, [175] 1837; Correspondence respecting (*Parl. P.* No. 245)

Emigration from, Question, Mr. Scully; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 6, [175] 99

Fisheries, the Irish, Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *June* 16, [175] 1837

Galway Packet Service, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Peel *Mar* 4, [173] 1455

Galway (Western Districts), after short debate, Copy ordered "Of the Report of Dr. Brodie, Poor Law Inspector in Ireland, dated the 21st day of November, 1861, on the condition of the Western Districts of Galway, and the Correspondence connected therewith" (*Mr. Gregory*) *April* 18, [174] 1271 (*Parl. P.* No. 237)

Irish Reproductive Loan Fund, Question, The Earl of Leitrim; Answer, Earl Granville *Mar* 14, [173] 1899

Land

Land Tenure, Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *May* 5, [175] 18

Land, Transfer of, Question, Mr. Scully; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *June* 20, [175] 2027

Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *May* 2, [174] 1976

Tenure and Improvement of Land Act (Ireland), Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *April* 28, [174] 1775

Law

Court of Admiralty (Ireland), Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *April* 25, [174] 1548; Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *June* 24, [176] 279

Bankruptcy Court, Dublin, Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, Mr. Peel *Mar* 18, [174] 303

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*Law*—cont.

Court of Chancery, Question, Colonel Dickson; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Feb* 23, [173] 932

Law and Equity Courts (*Ireland*), Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Mr. O'Hagan *April* 12, [174] 876

Registration of Titles, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 27, To leave out from "That" and add "Address for a Commission to inquire and report as to the best system for Registering Titles to Land in Ireland" (*Mr. Scully*), [175] 736; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Lisburn Election, after short debate, ordered "That the Minutes of the Proceedings of, and the Evidence taken before the Select Committee on the Lisburn Election Petitions be printed" (*Mr. Adair*) *April* 18, [174] 1272 (*Parl. P.* No. 182)

Lunatic Asylums (*Ireland*), Question, Colonel Greville; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Feb* 29, [173] 1250; Observations, Mr. Blake 628; Reply, Sir Robert Peel *July* 1, [176] 636; Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *July* 19, 1709; *District Lunatic Asylums*, Question, Colonel Greville; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Mar* 17, [174] 187

National Education

Question, Sir Hugh Cairns; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Mar* 15, [174] 12; Question, Sir Hugh Cairns; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *May* 5, [175] 25; Question, Sir Edward Grogan; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *June* 14, 1729;—Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the Rules sanctioned by the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland on the 21st day of November, 1863, are, so far as regards their operation on the aid afforded to Convent and Monastic Schools, at variance with the principles of the system of National Education" (*Sir Hugh Cairns*) *June* 14, [175] 1761; debate adjourned; debate resumed *June* 23; Amendt. To leave out the words "so far as regards their operation on the aid afforded to Convent and Monastic Schools" (*Mr. Hennessy*) [176] 184; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put, A. 112, N. 8; M. 104; Main Question put; A. 59, N. 91; M. 32

National Schools (*Ireland*), Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *April* 18, [174] 1198; Observations, The Earl of Clancarty, 686; Reply, Earl Granville *July* 4, [176] 703

Convent Schools (*Ireland*), Question, Mr. Hennessy; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *July* 19, [176] 1711

O'Connell, Inauguration of the Statue of, Question, Major Stuart Knox; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *July* 29, [176] 2192

Police

Lisburn, Additional, at, Question, Mr. Whiteside; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *April* 4, [174] 969

Administration of Justice (*Ireland*), Observations, Captain Archdall; Reply, Sir Robert Peel *July* 11, [176] 1340

IRELAND—*Police*—cont.

Agrarian Offences—Case of Michael Duigan and Others, Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Copy of any Memorial received by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland or the Irish Government praying for the release of Michael Duigan, Patrick Duigan, and Patrick Egan" (*The Marquess of Westmeath*), [175] 356; after short debate, Motion agreed to *May* 12

Agrarian Outrages (*Ireland*), Motion (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) *June* 30, [176] 482; Motion withdrawn (*Parl. P.* No. 63), 104, 161

Administration of Justice (*Ireland*)—*The Queen* v. *Duigan and Others*, after short debate, Copies "Of Informations and Indictment—the Queen *v.* Michael Duigan and others" (*Captain Archdall*); ordered *April* 18 (*Parl. P.* No. 278)

Constabulary, Question, The Earl of Donoughmore; Answer, Earl Granville; debate thereon *Mar* 17, [174] 166; Question, Sir Hervey Bruce; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Mar* 17, 184; Question, Captain Archdall; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *April* 14, 967; Question, Sir Hervey Bruce; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Mar* 18, 304

Convicts, Question, Captain Stacpoole; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *May* 23, [175] 588

Indictable Offences (*Ireland*), Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 15, To leave out from "That," and add "there be laid before this House, Copies of the Lists of all Indictable Offences laid before the Judges of Assize at the late Assizes for the counties of Roscommon, Cavan, Longford, Limerick, and Westmeath, and also for the names of the parties made amenable at said Assizes, and of the offences for which they were severally indicted, as appearing in the calendars of said counties" (*Mr. Whiteside*), [174] 1125; Question, "That the words, &c." put, and agreed to

Irish Constabulary, Question, Mr. Scully; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Mar* 11, [173] 1816

Keenan, Theresa—Alleged Misconduct of the Police in Leitrim, Moved, "Copy of the Information of Theresa Keenan, taken before J. Tyrell Byrne, Esquire, J.P., at Drumsna, in the County of Leitrim, on the 2nd day of April, 1864, relative to some Windows being broken at Eskeragh *alias* Esker South, in the Parish of Mohill, Barony of Mohill, and County of Leitrim, between the 24th and 30th days of March, 1864" (*The Earl of Leitrim*) *June* 30, [176] 492; after short debate, agreed to

Malicious Burnings, Question, Captain Archdall; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *May* 5, [175] 22

Outrages in, Question, Mr. Scully; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Mar* 14, [173] 1902; *Police* (*Ireland*), Question, The Earl of Leitrim; Answer, Earl Granville *July* 26, [176] 2100

Prison Returns (*Ireland*), Moved, "Return of the Names of Prisoners under Sentence and discharged, &c." (*The Earl of Leitrim*) *June* 30, [176] 493; after short debate, resolved in the negative

IRELAND—*cont.*

Poor Law

Medical Officers in Unions, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 6, To leave out from "That" and add "In the opinion of this House, Her Majesty's Government should now adopt the recommendation of the Select Committee of 1858, which 'recommended Her Majesty's Government to take into consideration the claims of Ireland to a grant of the half-cost of Medical Officers in Unions with the view of providing for the same in future as is now the practice in England and Scotland'" (*Mr. MacEvoy*), [175] 151; Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 73, N. 58; M. 15

Poor Rates, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 6, To leave out from "That" and add "It is not just to charge the Poor Rate in Ireland with the expenses connected with the Registry of Voters and Births and Deaths; and that it be an Instruction to the Committee appointed on the subject of Taxation in Ireland, to consider how said expenses may be more equitably charged" (*Sir Hervey Bruce*), 143; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Public Records (*Ireland*) *Commission*, Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, Mr. Peel *July* 26, [176] 2105

Quartermaster Acres— The North Tipperary Militia, Observations, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart; Reply, Sir Robert Peel *Mar* 14, [173] 1930

Queen's College, Cork, Questions, Lord Naas, Mr. Hennessy; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Feb* 18, [173] 715

Railway Encroachments (*Dublin*), Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Feb* 15, [173] 562

Dublin—Scientific Institutions, Observations, Mr. Gregory; Reply, Sir Robert Peel; long debate thereon *April* 8, [174] 663; Select Committee *April* 11—see title, *Scientific Institutions, Dublin*

Taxation of, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Feb* 26, "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the Taxation of Ireland, and how far it is in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty of Union, or just in reference to the resources of the Country" (*Colonel Dunne*), [173] 1199; after debate, Question, "That the words, &c." negatived; words added; Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; Select Committee appointed; Committee nominated *Mar* 8:—Colonel Dunne, Sir Edward Grogan, Sir Frederick Heygate, Mr. Longfield, Mr. Hennessy, Mr. Monsell, Lord John Browne, The O'Conor Don, Lord Stanley, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Howes, Mr. Finlay, Sir Robert Peel, and Mr. Lowe. Mr. Hankey added *Mar* 9. Mr. Monsell disch., Sir George Colthurst added *April* 19. Lord Stanley disch., Mr. Banks Stanhope added *April* 20

Report of Select Committee (*Parl. P.* 513)

Tobacco Cultivation in, Question, Mr. MacEvoy; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 16, [173] 562

Irwin, Mr. O'Malley, Case of

Observations, Sir FitzRoy Kelly; Reply, The Attorney General *July* 22, [176] 1976; Question, Mr. Hennessy; Answers, Sir Robert Peel, Sir George Grey *July* 25, [176] 2020

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to grant Her Fiat to the Petition of Right of George O'Malley Irwin, esquire, or to satisfy his claims without suit" (*Mr. Hennessy*) *July* 26, [176] 2107; after long debate, Question put, and negatived (*Parl. P.* No. 447)

Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment Bill (*Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Hutt*)

c. Resolution in Committee *; Report *June* 30
Ordered; read 1° * *June* 30 [Bill 185]
Read 2° * *July* 5
Committee *; Report *July* 11
Considered as amended * *July* 13
Read 3° * *July* 14
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *July* 15
Read 2ª * *July* 18 (No. 209)
Committee *; Report *July* 18
Read 3ª * *July* 21
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 62]

Isle of Man Harbours Act Amendment [*Deficiency of Dues*]

(Queen's *Recommendation* signified) *July* 5
Resolution in Committee * *July* 7
Report * *July* 8

JACKSON, Mr. W., *Newcastle-under-Lyme*

Chain Cables and Anchors, Select Comm. moved for, [173] 1361; Comm. *cl.* 1, [174] 506

Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. [175] 1471

Jamaica

Address for Copy of all Correspondence relating to Jamaica, &c. (*Lord Dunsany*) *June* 3, [175] 1119; Motion amended by inserting the words "or Extracts;" and Address agreed to (*Parl. P.* No. 254)

Japan

Kagosima, Bombardment of, Motion, "That this House, while only imputing to Admiral Kuper a misconception of the duty imposed on him, deeply regrets the burning of the town of Kagosima, as being contrary to those usages of War which prevail among civilized nations, and to which it is the duty and policy of this country to adhere" (*Mr. Buxton*) *Feb* 9, [173] 355; Amendt. to leave out "while only imputing to Admiral Kuper a misconception of the duty imposed on him" (*Mr. Longfield*), 354; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put, and negatived; Amendt. made; Main Question, as amended, proposed; Previous Question put (*Viscount Palmerston*); A. 85, N. 164, M. 79; Division List, 422

Debate on Kagosima—Admiral Lambert—Explanation, Mr. Buxton *Feb* 18, [173] 717; Explanation, Mr. Buxton *Mar* 3, 1370

[*cont.*

Japan—cont.

"The Illustrated London News," Explanation, Mr. Layard *Feb* 18, [173] 717

Colonel Neale—Admiral Kuper—Observations, Mr. Layard *Mar* 14, [173] 1910

Mr. Moss, Explanation, Mr. Aytoun *Feb* 19, [173] 798

Resolutions (*Earl Grey*) *July* 1, [176] 573; after long debate, on Question, whether to agree; Con. 11, Not-Con. 30; M. 19; resolved in the negative; List of Con. and Not-Con. 612

Despatch of Troops to, Question, Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *July* 19, [176] 1710; Question, Lord Naas; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *July* 21, [176] 1795; Questions, Lord R. Montagu, 1799, 1806; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *July* 21, [176] 1806

Parl. Papers—
  Despatch respecting additional Troops for . . . . No. 511
  Correspondence No. 1 . . . . [3242]
  „ No. 2 . . . . [3303]

Jersey,

Laws of, Question, Mr. Sclater-Booth; Answer, Sir G. Grey *Feb* 25, [173] 1069; Question, Mr. Paull; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 3, [174] 2052; Observations, Mr. Digby Seymour; Reply, Sir George Grey, 277

Royal Court of, Question, Mr. Sclater-Booth; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 28, [174] 1772

Reform of the Royal Court, Question, Mr. Paull; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 21, [176] 35

Parl. Papers—
  Correspondence . . . . . . No. 323
  Further Correspondence . . No. 364

Jersey Court Bill
(*Mr. Locke, Mr. Hadfield, Mr. Ayrton*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 15 [Bill 48]
Bill read 2°, after long debate, *April* 6, [174] 516
Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Locke*) *June* 22, [176] 126; debate adjourned
Order for resuming Adjourned Debate *July* 13; after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

Jervis, Capt. H. J. W., *Harwich*

Army Estimates—Medical Establishment, [175] 35;—Manufacturing Departments, 65, 77
Army—Rating of Officers of Chelsea Hospital, Address moved, [175] 199
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), 3R. [176] 2032, 2033
Government Manufacturing Establishments, Res. [176] 1970
Great Eastern Northern Junction Railway, 2R. [173] 710
Harwich Corporation, 2R. [173] 644
India — The Army — Report of Commission, [173] 172; — Claims of Officers, 1065; [175] 189, 259, 1271; [176] 613;—The Royal Commission, [174] 176; Res. 876, 896;—Army Brevet Rank, [176] 1571
Intoxicating Liquors, 2R. Amendt. [175] 1399
[*cont.*

Jervis, Captain H. J. W.—*cont.*

Ionian Islands, Papers moved for, [174] 351, 366, 369
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway, 2R. [173] 1633
Malta—Dock at, Res. [173] 900
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 26, [173] 1811
Navy Estimates—Scientific Departments, [173] 1309, 1311, 1312, 1314;—Naval Establishments, [174] 2032
Private Bills—Standing Order, [175] 1144
Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2010, 2013, 2138, 2142, 2144; Amendt. 2146, 2148
Supply—Emigration, [175] 1893, 1895;—Consular Establishments, 1906, 1908, 1911

Jervoise, Sir J. C., *Hampshire, S.*

Prosecutions, Cost of, [174] 968
Sheep, Vaccination of, [173] 931; [174] 1977; [175] 193
Supply—Privy Council Office, [175] 1334;—Civil Contingencies, [176] 658
Treasure Trove, Address moved, [175] 285

Johnstone, Mr. H. A. B., *Canterbury*

Denmark and Germany — Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 1939; — Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 860

Joint Stock Companies (Foreign Countries) Bill [H.L.] (*Lord Redesdale*)

l. Presented; read 1ª * *April* 14 (No. 45)
Read 2ª * *April* 21
Committee *; Report *April* 26
Read 3ª * *April* 28
c. Read 1° * *May* 2; read 2° * *May* 5 [Bill 87]
Committee *; Report *May* 9
Read 3° * and passed *May* 11
Royal Assent *May* 13 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 19]

Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers) Bill
(*Mr. Darby Griffith, Mr. Hadfield, Mr. Vance*)

c. Ordered, after short debate, *April* 12, [174] 914
Read 1° * *April* 13 [Bill 62]
Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 22, [176] 101
Amendt. To leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Craufurd*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Main Question put, and agreed to
Bill considered in Committee
After discussion, Motion, "That the Chairman do leave the Chair" (*Mr. Peacocke*); A. 76, N. 49; M. 27 [No Report]
Committee *June* 27, R.P.*
Committee *; Report *July* 5
Bill, as amended, considered *July* 7
new cl. (*Mr. Vance*)
Motion, "That the Clause be added to the Bill;" A. 32, N. 53; M. 21 [Bill 198]
Read 3° * *July* 11
Bill withdrawn * *July* 19

JOLLIFFE, Rt. Hon. Sir W. G. H., *Petersfield*
  Archway and Kentish Town Junction Road, 2R. [173] 1064
  Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [175] 82, 202;—Surveys, 232, 236
  Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [174] 1553; Consid. *cl. 5*, 1982
  Government Annuities, Nomination of Comm. [174] 1480
  Head, Sir F. B., Services of, Res. [176] 1331
  Highways Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 45, [176] 1376
  Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, 2R. [173] 582; Comm. *cl.* 2, 843, 849
  Intoxicating Liquors (Sale on Sundays), Leave, [175] 174
  Street Music (Metropolis), 3R. Amendt. [176] 1074
  Supply—National Gallery, [176] 1524
  Turnpike Gates removed, [176] 1570
  Union Assessment Committee Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 84; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. 518, 519

Journals, Sub-Committee for the
  Appointed * *Feb* 4

Judgments, &c. Law Amendment Bill
  (*Mr. Hadfield, Mr. Locke King, Mr. Powell*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 8 [Bill 3]
  Read 2°, after short debate, *Mar* 16, and committed to a Select Committee (*Mr. Hadfield*), [174] 101
  Committee nominated *April* 21: — Mr. Hadfield (Chairman), Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Selwyn, Mr. Hankey, Mr. Alderman Salomons, Mr. Henley, Mr. M'Mahon, Mr. John Joseph Powell, Mr. Locke King, Mr. Joseph Ewart, Mr. Humberston, Mr. Hodgkinson, Mr. Steel, Mr. Murray, and Mr. Remington Mills. *April* 26, Mr. Remington Mills disch., Mr. Malins added
  Report * *June* 17 (*Parl. P.* No. 396)
  Committee (on re-comm.)* Report *July* 4
  Considered as amended * *July* 6 [Bill 160]
  Read 3° * *July* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 8
  Read 2ª * *July* 15, and referred to Select Committee (No. 194)
  Select Committee nominated * *July* 18. The Lords following were named of the Committee; the Committee to meet on Friday next, at Eleven o'clock; and to appoint their own Chairman:—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. Steward, E. Shaftesbury, E. Romney, L. Wodehouse, L. Cranworth, L. St. Leonards, L. Wensleydale, L. Chelmsford, L. Kingsdown, L. Lyveden. Report of Select Committee *July* 25 (Nos. 250, 251)
  House in Committee, after short debate, *July* 26, [176] 2084
  An Amendment made; Standing Orders Nos. 37 and 38 considered, and dispensed with; Amendment reported
  Bill read 3ª *July* 26
  Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 112]

Juries in Criminal Cases Bill
  (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Longfield*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 27 [Bill 120]
  Bill withdrawn * *July* 11

Justices of the Peace Procedure Bill
  (*Mr. Paull, Mr. Richard Hodgson, Mr. Staniland*)
c. Ordered * *June* 7; read 1° * *June* 8 [Bill 138]
  Bill withdrawn * *July* 19

Justices Proceedings Confirmation (Sussex) Bill
  (*Mr. Dodson, Colonel Bartlelot, Mr. Cobbett*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 13 [Bill 203]
  Read 2° * *July* 14
  Committee *; Report *July* 15
  Read 3° * *July* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Chichester*) *July* 19
  Read 2ª * *July* 21 (No. 220)
  Committee *; Report *July* 22
  Read 3ª * *July* 23
  Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 100]

KEKEWICH, Mr. S. T., *Devonshire, S.*
  Poor Law—Casual Poor, [174] 15
  Supply—Government Prisons, &c. at Home, [175] 1689, 1690

KELLY, Sir FITZROY, *Suffolk, E.*
  Appeal in Criminal Cases Act Amendment, 2R. [176] 1773
  Forfeiture of Lands and Goods, 2R. [175] 1811
  Government Annuities, Comm. [174] 806
  Income Tax Commissioners of Blything, [176] 32, 33
  Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, 2R. [173] 583
  Malt for Cattle, Leave, [173] 226; 2R. 608; Comm. 1036
  New Law Courts, [174] 1420, 1421
  O'Malley Irwin, Mr., Case of, [176] 1976
  Townley, The Convict, [173] 328
  Under Secretaries of State—Privilege, Res. [174] 1249

KER, Mr. D. S., *Downpatrick*
  Ireland—Taxation of, Comm. moved for, [173] 1216
  Navy—The Channel Fleet, [173] 1759

Kertch Prize Money
  Question, Mr. J. Ewart; Answer, Mr. Hutt *Feb* 22, [173] 858; Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Feb* 26, 1182; Return ordered, after short debate, "of the names of the Flag Officers to whom the Kertch Grant has been distributed, with the proportions in which they share" (*Sir John Hay*) *Feb* 26, 1231; Question, Lord Chelmsford; Answer, The Duke of Somerset; Observations, thereon *Mar* 7, [173] 1530; Question, Mr. J. C. Ewart; Answer, Mr. Hutt *May* 12, [175] 364 (*Parl. P.* No. 100)

KING, Hon. P. J. L., *Surrey, E.*
  County Franchise, Leave, [173] 933; 2R. [174] 916, 924
  Thames Conservancy, Comm. *cl.* 75, [176] 416

Kinglake, Mr. A. W., *Bridgwater*
  Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 150
  China—Affairs of, Res. [175] 964
  Denmark and Germany—The Danish Succession—Warsaw Protocol, [173] 825 ;—Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, 881 ; [174] 288 ;—Bombardment of Sonderborg, 711 ;—Treaty of London, 1852, Res. 1372 :—The Conference, [175] 1290 ;—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 785, 921 ; Amendt. 1300
  Education (Inspectors' Reports), Nomination of Comm. [175] 990
  Garibaldi, General, Departure of, [174] 1422
  Ionian Islands—Cession of the, [173] 1088 ;—Annexation to Greece, [176] 1583
  Japan—Bombardment of Kagosima, Res. [173] 371
  Mexico—Affairs of, [176] 2159 ;—Relations with, Papers moved for, 2199
  Poland—Protocol of Warsaw and Treaty of London, Papers moved for, [173] 1699
  Privilege, [174] 1960
  United States—Neutrality in America, [173] 1928

Kingsdown, Lord
  Brokers Bonds and Rents, 2R. Amendt. [176] 408
  United States—Law of Prize, [174] 1611, 1614

Kinnaird, Lord
  Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [175] 628

Kinnaird, Hon. A. F., *Perth*
  Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [175] 80, 206
  Bank Act (Scotland), Comm. Res. [173] 471
  Bank Notes (Scotland), 2R. [174] 1749
  Bank of England Notes (Scotland), Leave, [175] 602
  China—Soochow, [173] 1475 ;—Affairs of, [175] 545 ; Res. 976, 977
  Circassians (Turkey), Papers moved for, [176] 2082
  Collegiate Schools, Facilities for Divine Service in, 2R. [176] 1777
  East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [176] 1831
  Education (Inspectors' Reports), Nomination of Comm. [175] 996
  Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 608*a*
  Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1528 ; 3R. [175] 2038
  Mails in the Provinces, Comm. moved for, [174] 414
  Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [173] 1152 ;—Wages of Artificers at Home, 1982
  Private Bills, Res. 1, [173] 662 ; Res. 2, 664
  Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. Amendt. [176] 1418, 1431 ; Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1611 ; 3R. Adj. moved, 1874, *1875
  Supply—Westminster Bridge Approaches, [175] 848 ;—Architectural Designs for Public Buildings, 850 ;—Special Missions, [176] 397
  Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans), Comm. Res. [176] 663
  Writs Registration (Scotland), 2R. [175] 1502

Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (*House of Commons*) *Committee*
  Standing Committee appointed *Feb* 5 : Colonel French, Mr. Bentinck, Lord R. Montagu, Mr. Dalglish, Colonel White, Mr. Onslow, and Mr. Alderman Rose (*Colonel French*)
  Report of Select Committee *April* 5
  Second Report *July* 12
  (*Parl. P.* Nos. 175, 480)

Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. E., *Sandwich*
  Street Music (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 467

Knight, Mr. F. W., *Worcestershire, W.*
  Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [175] 1482

Knightley, Mr. R., *Northamptonshire, S.*
  County Franchise, 2R. [174] 926

Knox, Hon. Major W. S., *Dungannon*
  Army—The Guards in Canada, [175] 522
  Education (Inspectors' Reports), Nomination of Comm. Adj. moved, [175] 1001
  Greco Conspiracy, The—M. Mazzini—Mr. Stansfeld, [174] 335
  Ireland—State of, Res. [173] 1891 ;—Inauguration of the O'Connell Statue, [176] 2192
  Police in the Dockyards, [173] 1931
  Supply—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers in Ireland, [176] 399
  Trespass (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [176] 940
  Volunteer Review, The, [175] 808

Knox, Col. B. W., *Marlow* (*Great*)
  Army Estimates—Yeomanry Cavalry, [175] 44, 45
  Army—The Enfield Rifle, [175] 457
  Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 26, [173] 1811

Lagos, Colony of
  Question, Mr. Arthur Mills ; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *June* 9, [175] 1456

Laird, Mr. J., *Birkenhead*
  Chain Cables and Anchors, 2R. [173] 682 ; Select Comm. moved for, 1361, 1662 ; [174] 302, 479 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, 505 ; *cl.* 8, 513, *cl.* 9, 515
  Chain Cables, Proof Certificate, [173] 1187 ;—Messrs. Brown, Lennox and Co. 1458
  Denmark and Germany—Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 885
  Government Manufacturing Establishments, Res. [176] 1972
  Holyhead Harbour—Vessels Wrecked, &c. Return moved for, [173] 425
  Navy—Armour-plated Ships, [173] 1757 ;—The "Agincourt," [174] 302 ;—Commission moved for, [176] 1767 ; Explanation, 1806
  Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [173] 1146 ;—Wages, 1298 ;—Wages of Artificers at Home, 1973 ;—Naval Stores, [174] 434, 438, 441
  Supply—Magnetic and Meteorological Observations, [176] 1600
  United States—Seizure of British Property in New York, [176] 1574

Lambeth Medical Diplomas
Question, Colonel French; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 13, 461

Land Drainage (Provisional Orders) Bill
(*Mr. Bruce, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 19 [Bill 25]
Read 2°* *Feb* 26
Committee*; Report *Mar* 7
Considered as amended * *Mar* 8
Read 3°* *Mar* 9
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *Mar* 10
Read 2ª* *April* 18 (No. 27)
Committee*; Report *April* 19
Read 3ª* *April* 21
Royal Assent *May* 13 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 14]

Land Securities Company Bill
(*The Duke of Marlborough*)
l. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª," [174] 1279; Amendt. to leave out "now," and insert "this day three months" (*Lord Redesdale*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Bill read 2ª *April* 19

Land Securities Company (*Stamp Duty on Mortgage Debentures*)
Considered in Committee* *Mar* 11
Resolution (*Sir J. Fergusson*) thereon

Land Transfer Act
Observations, Lord Chelmsford; Reply, The Lord Chancellor *April* 21, [174] 1401

Lands Clauses Act
Question, Mr. Alcock; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Feb* 29, [173] 1249

Landed Property Improvement (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Longfield, Mr. Leader, Sir C. O'Loghlen*)
c. Ordered* *Feb* 5; read 1°* *Feb* 8 [Bill 2]
Bill withdrawn* *April* 28

Langton, Mr. W. H. G., *Bristol*
Denmark and Germany — Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 785
Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [173] 847

Law Courts, New—see *Courts of Justice*

Law of Debtor and Creditor—see *County Courts Acts Amendment Bill*

Law Life Assurance Company—Civil Bill Ejectments
Return ordered, after debate (*Mr. Gregory*) *April* 21, [174] 1481 (*Parl. P.* No. 275)
Observations, Mr. Longfield; Reply, Lord John Browne; debate thereon *May* 27, [175] 746

Lawson, Mr. W., *Carlisle*
Army Estimates — Yeomanry Cavalry, [175] 42
Intoxicating Liquors, Leave, [173] 1814; 2R. [175] 1390, 1413, 1422
Street Music (Metropolis), 2R. [175] 1530

Layard, Mr. A. H. (Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs), *Southwark*
Abyssinia—Treatment of the British Consul, [175] 1145
Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 147
Brazil—Diplomatic Relations with, [173] 716, 717; [175] 19; [176] 706;—Case of Mr. Reeves, [175] 367, 913, 914;—Slave Trade, [176] 1388
British and Foreign State Papers, [176] 1791
British cured Herrings, [173] 1904
China—Capture of Soochow, [173] 215, 216; —Affairs of, 217, 1543;—Captain Osborn's Expedition, 860;—Mr. Lay, 1184;—Captain Gordon and the Footai of Shanghai, [174] 1199;—Civil War in, Res. 1523;—Policy of European Powers, [175] 460;—British Subjects in, 588;—Affairs of, 635; Res. 933, 947;—Major Gordon's Appointment, 1640; —Retirement of, [176] 1196;—Railways in, [175] 1836
Circassians (Turkey), Papers moved for, [176] 2082
Denmark and Germany—The Danish Papers, [173] 324, 330, 334, 335, 799, 861, 868, 1070, 1071, 1336;—Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, 466, 467;— Rumoured Armistice, 566;—Treaty of 1852—The Warsaw Protocol, 832; Res. [174] 1350; [175] 720;—Embargoes on Danish and German Shipping, [173] 859;— Blockade of the German Ports, 1070;—The Danish Blockade, 1826, 1907; [174] 1625;—The Conference, 876, 972; [176] 707;—The Austrian Fleet, [174] 1980; [175] 517;— — Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, 162; — Prussian Exactions in Jutland, 516, 592;—Alleged Massacre of Swedes, [176] 826, 1196; — Vote of Censure, Address moved, 922; Adj. moved, 930, 953, 956, 962, 971, 975, 1003, 1005, 1007; Explanation, 1197; — The Norwegian Mail Steamer "Viken," 1708
Egypt—Suez Canal, [173] 1066
Emigration (America), Papers moved for, [176] 2192
Foreign Office and the Board of Trade, Comm. moved for, [174] 1092
France and Cambodia, [174] 1287
Greco Conspiracy, The—M. Mazzini — Mr. Stansfeld, [174] 333, 334
Greek Loan, Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 403
Home, Mr., and the Roman Government, [175] 841
Ionian Islands—Demolition of the Fortresses, [173] 566; Papers moved for, [174] 356, 363, 375, 384;—Affairs of, [175] 1147;— Annexation to Greece, [176] 1578
Japan—Bombardment of Kagosima, Res. [173] 376, 401, 1910;—The "Illustrated London News," Explanation, 717;—Case of Mr. Moss, 798
Jews in Morocco, [173] 1454

[*cont*

Layard, Mr. A. H.—*cont.*
London, &c. Docks Amalgamation, 2R. [175] 1388, 1389
Mazzini, M.—The Greco Conspiracy, [173] 1932
Mexico—Affairs of, [173] 793 ; [176] 2159
Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia), Comm. [176] 2058, 2059
"Pampero," The, [173] 1544
Passports in Rome, [176] 1574 ;—In France, 1796, 2017
Payne, Rev. Dr.—Claim on the Greek Government, [173] 715
Peru—Seizure of the Chincha Islands, [175] 911 ; [176] 1575, 1903
Poland — Protocol of Warsaw and Treaty of London, Papers moved for, [173] 1702 ;— Res. [175] 661
Portugal—British Claims on, Papers moved for, [176] 1596
Rags, Export Duty on, [173] 794
Russia—Emigration of the Circassians, [175] 517 ;—Despatches from St. Petersburg, [176] 1389
Slave Trade on the East Coast of Africa, [173] 1902 ;—White Nile, Papers moved for, [175] 982
Sweden and Denmark—The Conference, [174] 189
Supply—Foreign Office, [175] 1333 ;—Zambesi Expedition, 1896 ;—Niger Expedition, 1897; —Captured Negroes, &c. 1898 ;—Suppression of Slave Trade, 1899 ;—Consular Establishments, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1904, 1905, 1908, 1910, 1911 ;—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [176] 393, 394, 396 ; — Special Missions, 397, 398
Telegraphic Despatches, [173] 1254, 1337, 1653
Tobacco, Exportation of, from the Southern States, [173] 932
Turkey—Prince Couza and the Porte, [176] 1904, 1905
United States—The "Alexandra" and "Alabama," [173] 323 ; — Correspondence with the Federal Government, 498 ;—American Cruisers, 566 ;—Seizure of the "Saxon"— Murder of Mr. Gray, 567, 797 ; [174] 477, 478 ; [175] 368, 1064;—Capture of the "Martaban," [173] 793 ;—Capture of the "Chesapeake," 829 ;— Vessels "El Tousson" and "El Monassia," Papers moved for, 977 ; [174] 1202 ; — Capture of the Barque "Science," [173] 1334 ; [174] 875 ; [175] 24 ; [176] 1622 ;—Island of San Juan, [173] 1496 ; — Compulsory Enlistment of British Subjects, [174] 628 ;—Outrage on a British Subject, 1504 ; — The Forged Despatch, 1978, 1979 ; — American Securities, [175] 260 ; — Our Relations with, 588 ; — Case of Mr. J. McHugh, [176] 159 ;—Clearance of British Ships at New York, 387 ; — Seizure of British Property in New York, 1574
War Steamer in the Clyde, [173] 1251
White, Captain Melville, Case of, [173] 495 ; [174] 1504 ; Paper moved for, [175] 604

Leases and Sales of Settled Estates Act Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Malmesbury*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª* *Mar* 11 (No. 30)
Bill withdrawn* *April* 14

Leatham, Mr. E. A., *Huddersfield*
Assize Town for the West Riding Circuit, Address moved, [173] 802
Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension, 2R. [176] 1364
Customs and Inland Revenue, Consid. Schedule A, [174] 1997
Tests Abolition (Oxford), Comm. [175] 1008

Lefevre, Mr. G. J. Shaw, *Reading*
Chain Cables and Anchors, 2R. [173] 694
United States—The "Alabama"—Capture of the "Martaban," [173] 793 ;—Confederate Cruisers, Papers moved for, 1475, 1495 ;— Seizure of the "Tuscaloosa," Res. [174] 1815, 1817 ;—Confederate Ship "Georgia," [175] 519

Lefroy, Mr. A., *Dublin University*
Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. [176] 90
Education, National (Ireland), Res. [176] 218
Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [175] 2106
Scientific Institutions of Dublin, [174] 678
Supply—Public Education (Ireland), [176] 1347
Vestry Cess Abolition (Ireland), 2R. [173] 722

Legal Process
Petition of Mayor, &c. of Carlisle (*Lord Chelmsford*) *Mar* 10, [173] 1754

Leighton, Sir B., *Shropshire, S.*
Collection of Taxes, Leave, [173] 241 ; 2R. 616; Re-Comm. [175] 1471
County Bridges, 2R. [175] 352
Customs and Inland Revenue, Consid. *cl.* 12, [174] 1986
Highways Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 24, [176] 1373 ; Amendt. 1374 ; *cl.* 45, 1376
Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, Leave, [173] 270
Malt for Cattle, Leave, [173] 229
Poor's Rate, Leave, [173] 701

Leinster, Duke of
Ireland—Agrarian Outrages, Res. [176] 491

Leitrim, Earl of
Civil Bill Courts (Ireland), 2R. [176] 332
Ireland — The Constabulary, [174] 175 ;— Agrarian Outrages, Res. [176] 491 ; — Theresa Keenan—Alleged Misconduct of the Police in Leitrim, Papers moved for, 492, 493
Irish Reproductive Loan Fund, [173] 1899
Police (Ireland), [176] 2100
Prisons (Ireland), Return moved for, [176] 493
Public Works (Manufacturing Districts), 2R. [176] 2001
Vestry Cess Abolition (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [174] 10

Lennox, Lord H. G. C. G., *Chichester*
Death, Punishment of, Comm. moved for, Amendt. [174] 2070
Denmark and Germany — The Conference, [175] 1276

[*cont.*

Lennox, Lord H. G. C. G.—*cont.*
Executions, Public, Papers moved for, [173] 951
Stansfeld, Mr., and the Greco Conspiracy, Res. [174] 264
Townley, The Convict, [173] 218

Leslie, Colonel C. P., *Monaghan Co.*
Navy—Guns of the "Royal Sovereign," [175] 521

Leslie, Mr. W., *Aberdeenshire*
Army (East India)—Medical Service, [173] 1067
China—Mr. Lay, [173] 1184
Courts of Justiciary (Scotland), Comm. [173] 1704
Education (Scotland), [173] 1067
India—Gaol of Calcutta, [176] 706, 707

Lewis, Mr. J. H., *Marylebone*
British Museum, [176] 1194
Casual Poor (Metropolis), [176] 1799
Collection of Taxes, 3R. [175] 2101
Garibaldi, General—Meeting on Primrose Hill, [174] 1549
Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1527, 1608
Poor Relief (Metropolis), Comm. [176] 2052
Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2146
Supply—Consular Establishments, [175] 1904; —British Museum, [176] 1360

Library of the House (Lords)
Select Committee to consider of certain matters relative to the Library of this House and to the Papers and Documents delivered for their Lordships' House, appointed *July* 11, [176]
Committee :—L. Abp. Canterbury, Ld. Chancellor, Ld. President, Ld. Privy Seal, D. Richmond, M. Lansdowne, M. Bath, E. Stanhope, E. Malmesbury, E. Russell, V. Eversley, L. Willoughby de Eresby, L. Colville of Culross, L. Ponsonby, L. Redesdale, L. Colchester, L. Somerhill, L. Brougham and Vaux, L. Monteagle of Brandon, L. Cranworth, L. St. Leonards, L. Wensleydale, L. Chelmsford, L. Kingsdown
Report of Select Committee *July* 29

Lichfield, Earl of
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, 2R. [175] 908; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1345; Report, *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1937; Commons Amendts. [176] 1445

Liddell, Hon. G. H., *Northumberland, S.*
Ashantee—War in, Res. [175] 1988
Bewicke, Mr., Case of, Comm. moved for, [174] 1929
Chain Cables and Anchors, Comm. *cl.* 1, [174] 506; *cl.* 8, 513
China—Affairs of, [173] 1359, 1543; [175] 537, Res. 957;—Civil War in, Res. [174] 1505;—Trial of George White at Shanghai, 1774;—Major Gordon's appointment, [175] 1639, 1640;— Retirement of, [176] 1195
Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. [175] 1470
[*cont.*

Liddell, Hon. G. H.—*cont.*
Denmark and Germany—Treaty of London, 1852, Res. [174] 1347;—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 873
Education—Reports of Inspectors of Schools, Res. [174] 911
Greenwich Hospital, Res. [175] 1151, 1167
Highways Act, [174] 736
Highways Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 692; Comm. *cl.* 45, Amendt. [176] 1375, 1376
Japan—Bombardment of Kagosima, Res. [173] 368
Mails in the Provinces, Comm. moved for, [174] 407
Supply—National Gallery, [176] 1531
Union Assessment Committee Act Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [175] 520

Life Annuities and Life Assurances Bill
(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 17 [Bill 56]
Read 2°, after debate, *April* 8, [174] 719
Committee*; Report *June* 2
Considered as amended* *June* 3
Read 3°* and passed *June* 6
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 7
Read 2ª* *July* 7 (No. 116)
Committee*; Report *July* 11
Read 3ª* *July* 12
Royal Assent *July* 14 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 46]

Life Annuities and Life Assurances (Deficiency of Assets, &c.) Bill
c. Resolution in Committee* *May* 26
Resolution reported; Bill ordered *May* 27

Limited Penalties Bill
(*Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Attorney General*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 5 [Bill 94]
Read 2°* *May* 19
Committee*; Report *May* 23
Read 3°, after short debate, *May* 26, [175] 696
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Chancellor*) *May* 27 (No. 97)
Read 2ª* *July* 26
Committee*; Report *July* 27
Read 3ª* and passed *July* 28
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 110]

Lindsay, Mr. W. S., *Sunderland*
Chain Cables and Anchors, 2R. 689; Select Comm. moved for, [173] 1361
Confederate States, The, [175] 912
Customs and Inland Revenue, Consid. Schedule A. [174] 2010
Discriminating Duties, Papers moved for, [175] 1353
Emigration (America), Papers moved for, [176] 2177
Harbours of Refuge, [173] 1359; Res. [174] 1660, 1697
Navy Estimates—Wages, [173] 1299, 1302;—Admiralty Office, 1302, 1303; Amendt. 1304, 1307;—Wages of Artificers Abroad, Adj. moved, 1785, 1788;—Wages of Artificers at Home, Amendt. 1958, 1978, 1981;—Naval Stores, [174] 423, 436, 440;—Naval Miscellaneous Services, 443;—Half Pay, 444;—Freight of Ships, 445;—Naval Establishments, 2026, 2029;—Pay of Officers, Adj. moved, [175] 690, 691
[*cont.*

Lindsay, Mr. W. S.—*cont.*
- Navy—Royal Commission on Dockyards, [173] 903, 904; The Report, Res. 1073, 1079; Adj. moved, 1157
- Partnership Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, [174] 2127
- Supply—Harbours of Refuge, [175] 854
- Thames Conservancy, Lords Amendts. [176] 2154
- United States—Confederate Steam Rams, [175] 808;—The Civil War, [176] 2018

Lisburn Election Petitions
- Select Committee *Mar* 9:—Hugh Edward Adair, esquire (Chairman); William Edward Forster, esquire; Frederick North, esquire (Hastings); Henry Paull, esquire; William Stirling, esquire
- Proceedings arising from the Absence of Mr. Stirling *April* 4, [174] 391
- Further Proceedings *April* 5, 461, 472
- Further Proceedings *April* 6, 530
- Motion, "That the Minutes of the Proceedings of, and the Evidence taken before, the Select Committee on the Lisburn Election Petition be laid before this House" (*Mr. Adair*) *April* 11, [174] 854
- Amendt. to leave out "and the Evidence taken before" (*Mr. Lygon*); Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 114, N. 22; M. 90; Main Question put, and agreed to (*Parl P.* No. 182)
- Petitions of Russell Kennedy, and Bryson Pelan, and Jonathan Joseph Richardson, considered
- Select Committee moved (*Mr. Butt*) *April* 21, [174] 1426; after short debate, Motion negatived

Local Government Act (1858) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Neate, Sir William Heathcote*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1°* *June* 16 [Bill 155]
- Read 2°* *June* 30
- Committee*; Report *July* 4
- Read 3°* *July* 5
- *l.* Read 1ª* (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *July* 7
- Read 2ª* *July* 19 (No. 190)
- Committee*; Report *July* 21
- Read 3ª* *July* 22
- Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 68]

Local Government Supplemental Bill
(*Mr. Baring, Sir George Grey*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1°* *April* 26 [Bill 80]
- Read 2°* *April* 28
- Committee*; Report *May* 5
- Read 3°* *May* 6
- *l.* Read 1ª* (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *May* 9
- Read 2ª* *May* 12 (No. 71)
- Committee* *May* 30; Report* *May* 31
- Read 3ª* *June* 2
- Royal Assent *June* 23 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 26]

Local Government Supplemental (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. Baring, Sir George Grey*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1°* *June* 13 [Bill 147]
- Read 2°* *June* 16
- Committee*; Report *June* 23
- Read 3°* *June* 30 [*cont.*

Local Government, &c. (No. 2) Bill—cont.
- *l.* Read 1ª (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *July* 1
- Read 2ª *July* 5 (No. 174)
- Select Committee* *July* 12
- Report of Select Committee *July* 25
- Committee, [176] 1206; Report* *July* 26
- Read 3ª* and passed *July* 27
- Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 83]

Locke, Mr. J., *Southwark*
- Ballot, The, Res. [176] 43
- Bankruptcy Act, Nomination of Comm. [174] 1569
- Collection of Taxes, 3R. [175] 2101
- Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [174] 1721, 1723
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 2, [174] 1860
- Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, Leave, [173] 266
- Insolvent Debtors, 2R. [174] 2121
- Jersey Court, 2R. [174] 516, 518, 524; Comm. [176] 126, 1435
- Lisburn Election, [174] 472
- London, &c. Docks Amalgamation, 2R. Amendt. [175] 1386, 1390
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 26, [173] 1807, 1808
- Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia), Comm. [176] 2064
- Open Spaces (Metropolis), Res. [176] 436
- Partnership Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, [175] 242
- Poor Relief (Metropolis), Comm. [176] 2049
- Public Lands and Buildings (Local Rates), Res. [174] 493
- Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [173] 298
- Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2147
- Street Music (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 476, 681
- Supply—Rates for Government Property, [175] 865;—Land, &c. Kensington Gore, 869;—British Museum, [176] 1359;—National Gallery, 1525
- Thames Conservancy, 2R. [174] 1558; Comm. *cl.* 75, [176] 416; Lords Amendts. Amendt. 2154, 2155
- Weights and Measures, [174] 1771
- Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [173] 1723, 1726; Comm. *cl.* 2, [175] 7; [176] 105

London, Bishop of
- Burial Service, Commission moved for, [176] 1308, 1311
- Church Services (Apocrypha), 2R. [175] 1931
- Collegiate Schools, Facilities for Divine Worship in, 2R. [176] 146
- Convocation, Powers of—Essays and Reviews, [176] 1553
- Cornwall, Bishopric of, Papers moved for, [176] 1896
- Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Papers moved for, [173] 165
- Public Schools, 2R. [175] 1251
- Regius Professorship of Greek (Oxford), 2R. [174] 1768
- Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [175] 628

London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway (Kemp Town Station and Lines) Bill (by Order)

Bill read 2°, after short debate, *Feb* 16, [173] 645

London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway (Additional Powers) Bill

c. Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 8, [173] 1633; Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Tite*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now' &c." put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°, and committed

London City Tithes Bill

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 30, [176] 480; after short debate, debate adjourned

Debate resumed; Bill read 2ª *July* 4

London Docks, St. Katharine's Dock, and Victoria (London) Dock Amalgamation Bill [Lords]

l. Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°," [175] 1386; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Locke*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Main Question put, and agreed to; read 2° *June* 8

London Main Trunk Underground Railway, Motion for an Instruction to Committee (*Mr. Ayrton*) *April* 15; after short debate, agreed to, [174] 1075

Long, Mr. R. P., *Chippenham*
- Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [174] 1720
- Denmark and Germany—Prussian Exactions in Jutland, [175] 458
- Diseased Cattle, [173] 495
- Highway Act, [173] 712; [174] 966
- Mails in the Provinces, Comm. moved for, [174] 402
- Malt for Cattle, 2R. [173] 604
- St. Mary's Burial Ground, Sydenham, Comm. moved for, [174] 659
- United States—Confederate Cruisers, [173] 1544

Longfield, Mr. R., *Mallow*
- Ashantee—War in—Officers at Cape Coast Castle, [176] 159
- Beer Houses (Ireland), 2R. [175] 600; Comm. *cl.* 3, 695
- Chancery, Court of (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [175] 1093, 1118; Res. [176] 95; Comm. Amendt. 285, 289, 297
- Chief Rents (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1397, 1400; Comm. [175] 13, 14; *cl.* 1, 15; *cl.* 3, 16
- Civil Bill Courts (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [174] 1556, 1557; Consid. *add. cl.* 1966
- Conveyancers, &c. (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [173] 1228
- County Courts (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1230
- Education—Inspectors' Reports, Comm. moved for, [175] 393

Longfield, Mr. R.—*cont.*
- Greek Loan, Comm. *cl.* 2, Adj. moved, [176] 407
- Indian Medical Service, Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 1703
- Ireland—Taxation of, Comm. moved for, [173] 1121
- Japan—Bombardment of Kagosima, Res. Amendt. [173] 354
- Law Life Assurance Company, [175] 746, 761
- Rents (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1024
- Street Music (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 682
- Supply—Public Works (Ireland), [175] 1673
- Trespass (Ireland), Comm. [174] 1754; *cl.* 1, [176] 934, 935, 937; *cl.* 3, 938, 939

Longford, Earl of
- Chimney Sweepers, &c. Report, *add. cl.* [175] 1439
- Crawley, Colonel, Court Martial on—Deputy Judge Advocate, [173] 1169
- Education, National (Ireland), [176] 704

Lopez, Sir M., *Westbury*
- Plymouth Sound, Accident in, [175] 1063

Lovaine, Lord, *Northumberland, N.*
- Army Estimates—Martial Law, [174] 852; [175] 27
- Crawley, Colonel, Case of, Papers moved for, [174] 31, 32, 50
- Highways Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 24, [176] 1373; *cl.* 45, 1375
- Navy—Case of Mr. Thomas, [173] 1782
- Supply—Police Counties and Boroughs, [175] 1682
- United States—Capture of British Ships, Papers moved for, [173] 531

Lowe, Right Hon. R. († Vice President of the Committee of the Privy Council for Education), *Calne*
- †Charitable Estates and Trusts Acts, Returns moved for, [173] 487, 488
- †Charity Commission—Salary of Secretary, [173] 794; Comm. moved for, [175] 1877
- Education, Res. [173] 1665, 1685; Report, 1823, 1824;—Reports of Inspectors of Schools, Res. [174] 903, 911;—Inspectors' Reports, [175] 462;—Endowed Schools, Res. 1065, 1066
- India—Claims of Azeem Jah, Comm. moved for, [175] 1667
- †Morell, Mr., Dismissal of, [174] 478
- †Night Schools, Inspection of, [173] 1824
- Private Bills, Committees on, Res. [175] 1562
- Resignation of, [174] 1203, 1211
- †Sheep, Vaccination of, [173] 931
- Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2140, 2144, 2152
- Supply—Public Education, [176] 541, 543, 550;—Department of Science and Art, 564
- †Training Colleges, [173] 1184
- †Vaccination, [173] 1457, 1908

Lucan, Earl of
- Army—Limited Enlistment and the Reserve Force, Return moved for, [174] 1064
- Park Lane, crowded State of, [175] 1230

[*cont.*

Lunacy (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Sir George Grey, Sir William Dunbar*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *June* 13 [Bill 146]
Read 2°* *June* 20
Committee *June* 28, [176] 422 ; Report
Considered as amended * *June* 29
Read 3°* *June* 30
l. Read 1ª* (*Duke of Argyll*) *July* 1 (No. 172)
Read 2ª* *July* 7
Committee* ; Report *July* 11
Read 3ª* *July* 12
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 59]

Lyall, Mr. G., *Whitehaven*
Casual Poor (Metropolis), [176] 1800
Ceylon—Military Expenditure, [175] 1261
Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. *cl.* 2, [175] 1478
Hudson's Bay Territory, Papers moved for, [176] 627
Poor Relief (Metropolis), Comm. [176] 2047

Lygon, Hon. F., *Worcestershire, W.*
Beer Houses (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [175] 695
Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Comm. Adj. moved, [176] 300
Courts of Justice Site, 2R. Amendt. [176] 1074
Greek Loan, Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 407 ; 3R. 569, 572
Lisburn Election, [174] 465 ; Res. Amendt. 857, 1273
Navy and Army Expenditure (1862-3), Comm. Res. [176] 1696
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, [173] 1307
Poor Relief Committee, Adj. moved, [173] 1313
Private Bills, Res. 6, [173] 677
Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2144, 2145
Supply—Royal Parks, &c. [175] 424 ;—Public Education, [176] 554
Warehousing of British Spirits, 2R. [173] 1022 ; Comm. Instruction, 1613

Lysley, Mr. W. J., *Chippenham*
Indian Medical Service, 3R. [176] 2038

Lyttelton, Lord
Church Services (Apocrypha), 2R. [175] 1933
New Zealand, [175] 780
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Comm. [175] 1340
Public Schools, 2R. [175] 1237
Regius Professorship of Greek (Oxford), Comm. [175] 442
Vaccination, [175] 779

Lyveden, Lord
County Courts Acts Amendment, 2R. [175] 581
Elgin, Earl of, and Lord Canning, [175] 1700
Head, Sir F. B., Memorial of, [176] 1371
New Zealand, [175] 786
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1990, 1993
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, [175] 1346

Macaulay, Mr. K., *Cambridge*
Brazil—Relations with, [175] 18

McCann, Mr. J., *Drogheda*
Trespass (Ireland), Comm. [174] 957, 1754 ; *cl.* 1, [176] 932, 936 ; *cl* 3, 939

Macdonogh, Mr. F., *Sligo Bo.*
Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, Leave, [173] 259, 261 ; 2R. 571 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, 836
Lisburn Election, [174] 466 ; Res. 855

MacEvoy, Mr. E., *Meath Co.*
Denmark and Germany—The Danish Papers, [173] 1070, 1071
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1396
Medical Officers in Unions (Ireland), Res. [175] 151
Tobacco Cultivation in Ireland, [173] 562

Mackie, Mr. J., *Kirkcudbright*
Army Estimates—Enrolled Pensioners, Amendt. [175] 54
Valuation of Lands, &c. (Scotland) Act Amendment, 2R. Amendt. [175] 1427

McMahon, Mr. P., *Wexford Co.*
Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. [176] 75
Civil Bill Courts (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [174] 1557, 1558
Conveyancers, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [173] 595 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1227, 1229 ; *cl.* 3, 1230
County Courts (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1231
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 608*c*
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1394
Indictable Offences (Ireland), Returns moved for, [174] 1132
Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, 2R. [173] 588
Ireland—Brehon Laws, [174] 1503
Trespass (Ireland), Comm. [174] 955 ; *cl.* 1, [176] 933, 935 ; *cl.* 3, 938, 939

Magisterial Convictions in Cornwall
Question, Mr. Hunt ; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 9, [175] 193 ; Explanation, Sir George Grey *May* 13, 461

Maguire, Mr. J. F., *Dungarvan*
Admiralty Court (Ireland), [174] 1548 ; [176] 279
Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. [176] 68
Army Estimates—Warlike Stores, [175] 79 ;—Military Education, 215, 222, 226
Beer Houses (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [175] 695
Belfast, Borough of, Paper moved for, [174] 1074
Death, Punishment of, Comm. moved for, [174] 2115
Education, National (Ireland), Res. Adj. moved, [175] 1799 ; [176] 207, 211
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 611
Gaols, 2R. [175] 2080

[*cont.*

MAGUIRE, Mr. J. F.—*cont.*
- Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1388
- Harbours of Refuge, Res. [174] 1696
- Ireland—Daunt's Rock, [173] 1818 ;—State of, Res. 1886 ; [174] 871, 872 ;—Cork Harbour, 1460
- Land Tenure (Ireland), [175] 18
- Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), [174] 1976
- Law Life Assurance Company, [175] 766, 769
- Paper Manufacture, Comm. moved for, [176] 1711, 1731, 1732, 1733, 1735, 1741, 1746
- Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, [174] 1077
- Poor Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment, 2R. [176] 465
- Spain and Peru—The Chincha Islands, [176] 1902
- Street Music (Metropolis), Leave, [174] 2117
- Supply—Houses of Parliament, [175] 434 ;—Department of Science and Art, [176] 561, 564 ;—Public Education (Ireland), 1350
- Trespass (Ireland), Comm. [174] 1754

MALINS, Mr. R., *Wallingford*
- Bankruptcy Act, [174] 689
- Bewicke, Mr., Case of, Comm. moved for, [174] 1934
- Business of the House, [176] 2106
- Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1377 ; 2R. [175] 1118
- Charitable Estates and Trusts Acts, Returns moved for, [173] 491
- Charity Commissioners, Comm. moved for, [175] 1881
- Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [174] 1553 ; Consid. *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1983, 1984
- Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Comm. Res. [174] 614
- Forfeiture of Lands and Goods, 2R. [175] 1809
- Governors of Colonies, Pensions to, [174] 1949 ; Papers moved for, [176] 430
- Insolvent Debtors, Comm. [176] 1432
- Law Courts, The, [176] 364, 366
- O'Malley Irwin, Mr., Case of, Address moved, [176] 2124
- Partnership Law Amendment, 2R. [174] 1563
- Street Music (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 476
- Supply — Royal Parks, &c. [175] 424 ; — Houses of Parliament, 434 ; — Sir Rowland Hill, 1599
- United States — Capture of British Ships, Papers moved for, [173] 533

MALMESBURY, Earl of
- Army—Artillery—Mackay's Gun, [174] 1181
- Artillery Practice in Plymouth Sound, [175] 1224
- Cuba Slave Trade, [176] 1615
- Denmark and Germany — Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 302, 1061 ;—Invasion of Jutland 1158 ; — Bombardment of Sonderborg, [174] 1275 ;—The Conference, 1418 ; —Vote of Censure, Res. [176] 1076, 1096, 1127, 1169
- Improvement of Land, Comm. [175] 1826
- Land Securities Company, 2R. [174] 1280
- Metropolitan Railways, [174] 447
- Mortgage Debentures, Report, *add. cl.* [175] 1706
- New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1989, 1993

[*cont.*

MALMESBURY, Earl of—*cont.*
- Park Lane, Crowded State of, [175] 1235
- Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2), 2R. [176] 2001
- Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, 2R. [176] 1787
- Public Schools, Comm. [175] 1631, 1632
- Rape, Punishment of, Comm. *cl.* 1, [174] 961
- Royal Arcade, 2R. [173] 855
- Settled Estates Act Amendment, 2R. [174] 535
- Street Music (Metropolis), 2R. [176] 1367

Malt for Cattle Bill (COMMONS) }
Malt for Animals Bill (LORDS) }
(*Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel, Mr. Hutt*)
- Acts considered in Committee *Feb* 8
- 173] *c.* Resolution, 225 ; after debate, agreed to Resolution reported *Feb* 9 ; Bill ordered * Read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 6]
- . Bill read 2°, after long debate, *Feb* 15, 596
- . Commitee ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Feb* 24, 1025 ; after long debate, Motion agreed to ; Bill considered in Committee ; Committee R.P.
- . Considered in Committee *Feb* 26, 1218
- . *cl.* 1 (Malt may be made and used, free of duty in the feeding of Animals) ; Amendt. (*Mr. Bentinck*) ; after short debate, withdrawn, 1218 ; Amendt. to insert "or with such other substances as may hereafter be approved by the said Commissioners" (*Mr. Caird*) agreed to ; *cl.* agreed to
- *cl.* 5 (Maltster to provide room for grinding and mixing malt) ; Amendt. (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) agreed to
- . *cl.* 6 (Malt to be mixed with linseed cake or meal, &c.) ; Amendt. "one-fifth" in lieu of "one-tenth" (*Sir John Hay*), 1219 ; Amendt. withdrawn ; *cl.* agreed to
- . *new cl.* (Permission to agriculturists to malt barley) (*Sir Edward Dering*), 1220 ; after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
- Bill reported *Feb* 26 [Bill 37]
- Considered as amended * *Feb* 29
- Read 3° * *Mar* 1
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *Mar* 8
- 174] Read 2ª, after debate, *Mar* 15, 3 (No. 16)
- Committee * *Mar* 18 ; Report * *April* 5
- Read 3ª * *April* 7
- Royal Assent *April* 28 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 9]

Malt, Duty on
- Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 24, To leave out from "That" and add "in case of any modification of the Indirect Taxation of this Country, the Excise on Malt requires consideration" (*Mr. Morritt*) [176] 262 ; Question, "That the words, &c. ;" after long debate, Question put, A. 166, N. 118 ; M. 48

Malta, Admiralty Dock at
- Question, Captain Talbot ; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Feb* 12, [173] 497 ; Observations, Captain Talbot ; Reply, Lord Clarence Paget ; debate thereon, *Feb* 22, 889 ; Question, Sir John Hay ; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Feb* 26, 1186 ; Question, Sir John Hay ; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Mar* 11, 1826 ; Question, Mr. Corry ; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *April* 4, [174] 395 ; Question, Sir John Pakington ; Answer,

[*cont.*

Malta, Admiralty Dock at—cont.
  Lord Clarence Paget *April* 18, [174] 1201; Question, Captain Talbot; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 23, [176] 158
  Parl. Papers, Nos. 144, 432, 432-I, 355, 220

Malta, Constitution of
  Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Feb* 5, [173] 172; Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Feb* 15, 565

MANNERS, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R., *Leicestershire, N.*
  Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 136, 139
  Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. [176] 92
  Army—Engineer Officers at South Kensington, [176] 150
  Ballast Heavers' Office, [174] 1503
  Beer Houses (Ireland), 2R. [175] 599
  Bewicke, Mr., Case of, Comm. moved for, [174] 1928
  Brazil—Slave Trade, [176] 1385, 1386
  Church Building, &c. Acts Amendment, 2R. [175] 1524
  Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [174] 1722
  Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. [175] 1477; *cl.* 2, 1480
  Controller of the Navy—Devonport Election, [173] 1411
  Denmark and Germany—The Danish Papers, [173] 333, 799;—The proposed Conference, 1072, 1190, 1548;—Prussian Exactions in Jutland, [175] 593;—The Conference, 2032; —Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1036, 1063
  Education—Minutes of Council on Endowed Schools, [175] 190
  Emigration (America), Papers moved for, [176] 2180
  Factories, Sub-Inspectors of, [173] 1756; [174] 632
  Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [175] 1727
  Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1550; Nomination of Comm. [174] 1479
  Governors of Colonies, Pensions to, [174] 1950
  Great Eastern Northern Junction Railway, 2R. [173] 711
  Ionian Islands, Papers moved for, [174] 382, 384
  London Main Trunk Underground Railway, [174] 1076
  Malt, Duty on, Res. [176] 269
  Malt for Cattle, Comm. [173] 1042; *add. cl.* 1226
  Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia), Comm. [176] 2064
  Navy Estimates, [174] 1473
  New South Wales—Import Duties, [174] 181, 182
  Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [173] 290
  St. Bernard's Reformatory, [176] 1650
  Supply—Public Buildings, [175] 413;—Repair of Furniture, 416;— Royal Parks, &c. 421, 425; — Architectural Designs for Public Buildings, 850, 851;—Nelson's Column, 853; —Public Works (Ireland), 859; — New National Gallery at Burlington House, Amendt. 1302; Report, 1913

[*cont.*

MANNERS, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R.—*cont.*
  Sweden and Denmark—The Conference, [174] 188
  Tests Abolition, 3R. [176] 673
  Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans), Comm. Res. [176] 661
  United States—Capture of British Ships, Papers moved for, [173] 526
  Westminster Bridge, Traffic on, [176] 495

Marine Mutiny Bill
(*Mr. Massey, Lord C. Paget, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Ordered *Mar* 1; read 1°* *Mar* 4
  Read 2°* *Mar* 7
  Committee*; Report *Mar* 10
  Read 3°* *Mar* 11
l. Read 1ª* (*Duke of Somerset*) *Mar* 14
  Read 2ª* *Mar* 15
  Committee*; Report *Mar* 16
  Read 3ª* *Mar* 17
  Royal Assent *Mar* 18 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 4]

MARLBOROUGH, Duke of
  Artillery Practice in Plymouth Sound, [175] 1223
  Convict George Hall, Papers moved for, [174] 868
  Land Securities Company, 2R. [174] 1279, 1281
  Mortgage Debentures, 2R. [174] 1594; Comm. [175] 1050
  Regius Professorship of Greek (Oxford), 2R. [174] 1769

Marriage Law, Scotch and Irish
  Questions, Captain Archdall, Mr. Hennessy; Answers, Viscount Palmerston, Sir George Grey *July* 29, [176] 2193

Married Women's Acknowledgments Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Sir R. Peel*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 27 [Bill 122]
  Read 2°* *June* 2
  Bill withdrawn* *July* 13

MARSH, Mr. M. H., *Salisbury*
  Borough Franchise, 2R. [175] 311
  Civil Service and Miscellaneous Estimates, Res. [173] 1338, 1359
  Forfeiture of Lands and Goods, 2R. [175] 1809
  Malt for Cattle, [173] 2R. 608
  Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Leave, [173] 784; Comm. *cl.* 4, [174] 1064
  Supply—Holyhead Harbour, &c. [175] 856;—Sir Rowland Hill, 1599

MARTIN, Mr. P. W., *Rochester*
  Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. *cl.* 12, [175] 1484
  Herne Bay, Hampton and Reculver Fishery, 2R. [175] 1635
  Intoxicating Liquors, 2R. [175] 1413
  Navy Estimates, [174] 1473;—Naval Establishments, Amendt. 2025, 2028
  New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), Comm. [176] 1691
  Privilege, [174] 1960
  Public Lands and Buildings (Local Rates), [174] 487
  Turnpike Trusts, Comm. moved for, [173] 1699

MASSEY, Mr. W. N. (Chairman of Committees), *Salford*
- Archway and Kentish Town Junction Road, 2R. [173] 1065
- Army Estimates—Medical Establishment, [175] 35;—Manufacturing Departments, 77
- Beckenham, Lewes, and Brighton Railway, 2R. [173] 639
- Caledonian, Edinburgh and Glasgow, &c. Railway Companies, 2R. [173] 642
- Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 12, [176] 27
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. *cl.* 20, [176] 1866
- Education (Inspectors' Reports), Nomination of Comm. [175] 993
- Great Eastern Northern Junction Railway, [173] 711
- Great Northern Railway (No. 3), 2R. [173] 643
- Harwich Corporation, 2R. [173] 645
- Herne Bay, Hampton and Reculver Fishery, 2R. [175] 1635
- Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties), Comm. *cl.* 10, [176] 284
- London Main Trunk Underground Railway, [174] 1076
- Metropolitan District Railway, 3R. [176] 1621
- Navy Estimates—Wages, [173] 1282;—Admiralty Office, 1305;—Wages of Artificers Abroad, 1785, 1786
- Private Bills, Res. 1, [173] 658
- Railway Companies Powers, Comm. moved for, [173] 300
- Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [173] 288
- Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for, [176] 1464; Report, Amendt. 2133, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2146, 2150, 2152, 2153
- Supply—Public Works (Ireland), [175] 1673;—Landed Estates Record Offices, 1677

Masters and Servants Bill
(*Mr. Cobbett, Mr. Cox*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *July* 21 [Bill 232]
- Bill withdrawn * *July* 26

Mazzini and the Greco Conspiracy
- *M. Mazzini—The Alien Act*, Question, The Marquess of Westmeath; Answer, Earl Russell *Feb* 29, [173] 1242
- *M. Mazzini—The Greco Conspiracy*, Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, Mr. Stansfeld *Feb* 29, [173] 1255; Question, Sir Lawrence Palk; Answer, Mr. Layard; debate thereon *Mar* 14, 1931
- See *Stansfeld, Mr.*

MELVILLE, Viscount
- Head, Sir F. B., Memorial of, [176] 1371
- Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2), 2R. [176] 2000

Merchant Seaman's Act
- Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *April* 14, [174] 967

Merchant Shipping Act (Provisional Order)
- Resolution in Committee; Bill ordered * *June* 1

Merthyr Tydvil Writ
- Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a New Writ for the electing of a Burgess to serve in this present Parliament for the Borough of Merthyr Tydvil, in the room of Henry Austin Bruce, esquire, who, since his election for the said Borough, hath accepted the Office of Vice President of the Committee of Privy Council on Education" (*Mr. Brand*) *April* 18, [174] 1194
- Motion, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir W. Heathcote*); after short debate, Motion, and original Question withdrawn
- See *Under Secretaries of State*
  - *Vacating of Seats*

Metropolis
- *Ballast Heavers' Office*, Question, Lord John Manners; Answer, Mr. Hutt *April* 22, [174] 1503
- *Bridge Street, Westminster*, Question, Sir John Shelley; Answer, Mr. Cowper *Feb* 26, [173] 1185
- *Licensed Houses*, Question, Sir John Shelley; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 12, [174] 874
- *Open Spaces* (*Metropolis*), Moved, "That it is the duty of Her Majesty's Government to provide for the preservation of open spaces in and around the Metropolis, within the limits assigned by the 14th section of the Inclosure Act of 1845" (*Mr. Doulton*) *June* 28, [176] 431; after short debate, Question put, A. 79, N. 40; M. 39
- *Police in the Parks*, Question, Mr. J. Hardy; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 24, [176] 255
- *Protection against Fire*, Question, Sir Minto Farquhar; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 15, [173] 564
- *City Traffic Regulations*, Question, Mr. Doulton; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 16, [175] 1836; Question, Lord Ernest Bruce; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 18, [176] 1623
- *Park Lane, South Entrance to*, Question, General Buckley; Answer, Mr. Cowper *May* 12, [175] 363; Observations, The Earl of Lucan; Reply, The Earl of St. Germans, 1230; Question, Sir John Shelley; Answer, Mr. Tite *June* 27, [176] 334; Question, Sir John Shelley; Answer, Mr. Cowper *July* 25, 2015
- *Cases of Starvation in the Metropolis*, Question, Lord R. Cecil; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 10, [173] 1758; Question, Lord R. Cecil; Answer, Mr. Villiers *Mar* 11, 1821
- *St. James's Park, Road round*, Observations, Sir W. Fraser; Reply, Mr. Cowper *Mar* 11, [173] 1894
- *City of London Bye-Laws*, Question, Mr. Alderman Salomons; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 14, [174] 966
- *Sewage* (*Metropolis*), *&c.* Select Committee appointed, after debate, "To inquire into any plans for dealing with the Sewage of the Metropolis and other large Towns, with a view to its utilization for agricultural purposes" (*Lord Robert Montagu*) *April* 26, [174] 1698
- Committee nominated *April* 29:—Lord Robert Montagu (Chairman), Mr. Cowper, Mr. Walpole, Mr. Bright, Mr. Adderley, Sir William Russell, Sir Frederic Smith, Lord Fermoy, Sir Joseph Paxton, Mr. Caird, Mr.

[*cont.*

Metropolis—cont.
Tite, Mr. Leader, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Sclater-Booth, and Dr. Brady. *May* 11, Mr. North and Mr. Ferrand added. Report *July* 14 (*Parl. P.* No. 487)
Sewage of the Metropolis, Question, Lord R. Montagu ; Answer, Mr. Cowper *May* 3, [174] 2051
Sewage, &c. (*Metropolis*) *Committee*, Question, Mr. Henley ; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 6, [175] 102
Westminster Bridge, Traffic on, Question, Sir John Shelley ; Answer, Mr. Cowper *June* 30, [176] 494
See *Railway Schemes* (*Metropolis*)
Metropolitan Subways
Sewage (*Metropolis*)
Poor Relief (*Metropolis*) *Bill*

Metropolis Management Act (1862) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Baring, Mr. Cowper, Mr. Tite*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *July* 15 [Bill 219]
Read 2° * *July* 18
Bill withdrawn * *July* 21

Metropolitan District Railways Bill
(Queen's *Consent* Signified)
c. Motion, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *July* 18, [176] 1617
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day month" (*Mr. Crawford*); Question proposed, "That the word 'now' &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
Main Question agreed to
Bill read 3°, and passed

Metropolitan Subways Bill
(*Mr. Tite, Mr. T. J. Miller, Mr. Doulton*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Mar* 3 [Bill 42]
Read 2° * *Mar* 16
Report from Select Committee [3 June] *June* 13 (No. 378)

Metropolitan Traffic Bill
(*Mr. Alderman Salomons, Mr. Locke, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Taverner Miller*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *May* 31 [Bill 129]

Mexico
Affairs of, Question, Mr. Somerset Beaumont ; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 19, [173] 793 ; Question, Mr. Kinglake ; Answer, Mr. Layard *July* 28, [176] 2159
Relations with, Motion, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copies of any Papers relating to the state of our relations with Mexico" (*Mr. Kinglake*) *July* 29, [176] 2199 ; after short debate—Message to attend the Lords Commissioners

Middlesex Sessions—Mr. Serjeant Payne
Question, Mr. Clay ; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 2, [175] 1061

Miles, Sir W., *Somersetshire, E.*
Cattle Diseases Prevention, 2R. [173] 1752 ; Re-Comm. *cl.* 6, [176] 1568
Counsel's Fees in Parliament, [173] 1252
Education (Inspectors' Reports), Report, [175] 1352
Highways Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 24, [176] 1374 ; *cl.* 36, 1375 ; *cl.* 45, 1376
Navy—Masters in the, Res. [175] 1214
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, 2R. [173] 1518
Speke, Captain, Services of, [173] 1453, 1454
Supply — Architectural Designs for Public Buildings, [175] 849, 850 ;—County Roads, South Wales, 1675 ;— Police Counties and Boroughs, Amendt. 1682, 1685
Yeomanry Cavalry, Res. [173] 1387, 1388

Militia Ballots Suspension Bill
(*The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Baring*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *July* 1
Read 2° * *July* 11
Committee * ; Report *July* 13
Read 3° * *July* 14
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl de Grey*) *July* 15
Committee * ; Report *July* 19
Read 3ª * *July* 21
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 63]

Militia Pay Bill
(*The Marquess of Hartington, The Judge Advocate*)
c. Ordered *May* 6 ; read 1° * *July* 1
Read 2° * *July* 11
Committee * ; Report *July* 14
Considered as amended * *July* 15
Read 3° * *July* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl de Grey*) *July* 19
Read 2ª * *July* 21
Read 3ª * *July* 22
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 69]

Miller, Mr. T. J., *Colchester*
Casual Poor (Metropolis), [176] 1800
Poor Relief (Metropolis), Consid. [176] 2101
Sewage (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [174] 1698
Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans), Comm. Res. [176] 662
Victoria Tower, Improvements near the, [174] 183

Miller, Mr. W., *Leith*
British cured Herrings, [173] 1904
New South Wales—Import Duties, [174] 180

Mills, Mr. A., *Taunton*
Army Estimates—Commissariat, [174] 831
Cape of Good Hope—Kaffir War, [176] 1906 ; —British Kaffraria, 2018
Courts of Justice, Concentration of, [173] 1756 ; [174] 1142, 2052 ; [176] 368
Courts of Justice (Money), [175] 24
Hudson's Bay Company, [175] 1060 ;—Territory, Papers moved for, [176] 616, 621
India—Pensions, [175] 1544
Lagos—Colony of, [175] 1456
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway, 2R. [173] 1634
[*cont.*

Mills, Mr. A.—*cont.*
  New Zealand — Loan, [173] 1187; — Correspondence, 1367;—War in, Papers moved for, [174] 1625, 1659; [175] 1263; [176] 1906, 2104
  New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. Amendt. [176] 1471, 1496, 1503; Comm. 1689; *cl.* 1, 1694
  Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2137
  Supply—Public Works Loan Commission, &c. [175] 1674;—Indian Department, Canada, 1884; — Governors, &c. West Indies, &c. 1885, 1887, 1888;—Emigration, 1891, 1892; —Civil Establishments West Coast of Africa, [176] 1676, 1680
  Vancouver's Island, [176] 1903

Mills, Mr. John Remington, *Wycombe (Chepping)*
  Church Building, &c. Acts Amendment, 2R. [175] 1527
  Collegiate Schools, Facilities for Divine Service in, 2R. [176] 1777
  Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1610

Miscellaneous Civil Service Estimates
  Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 26, "That the Miscellaneous Civil Service Estimates, Class 2, laid upon the table of the House, be referred to a Select Committee to examine the same in reference to the past expenditure for the Civil Services, and to report to the House any reductions, better arrangement, or other particulars connected with that branch of the Public Expenditure which in their opinion deserve the attention of the House when the said Estimates are under their consideration" (*Mr. Augustus Smith*) [175] 663
  Motion, being irregular, not put

Mitford, Mr. W. T., *Midhurst*
  Death, Punishment of, Comm. moved for, [174] 2077
  Education—Res. [173] 1672, 1676;—Minutes of Council on Endowed Schools, [175] 189, 190
  Gaols, 2R. [175] 2083
  Malt for Cattle, Comm. *cl.* 6, [173] 1219

Moffatt, Mr. G., *Honiton*
  Bankruptcy Act, [174] 680; Nomination of Comm. 1569
  Customs and Inland Revenue, Consid. Schedule A. [174] 2012

Moncreiff, Right Hon. J., *see* Advocate, The Lord

Monsell, Right Hon. W., *Limerick Co.*
  Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. [176] 72, 90
  Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [175] 201, 215
  Army—Trial of heavy Rifled Guns, [176] 157; —Armstrong Gun Factory at Woolwich, 2021
  Cattle Diseases Prevention, Comm. *cl.* 6, Adj. moved, [176] 1569

[*cont.*

Monsell, Right Hon. W.—*cont.*
  Denmark and Germany — Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1232
  Education, National (Ireland), Res. [176] 186, 187
  Government Manufacturing Establishments, Res. [176] 1934
  Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1396
  Indian Medical Service, 3R. [176] 2037
  Irish Fisheries, [175] 1837
  Medical Officers in Unions (Ireland), Res. [175] 153
  New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1508
  Poor Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment, 2R. [176] 464
  Public Records (Ireland) Commission, [176] 2105
  Registration of Titles in Ireland, Address moved, [175] 743
  Spirit Duties, Res. [175] 837
  Supply—Public Works (Ireland), [175] 1670, 1673;—Emigration, 1893;—Consular Establishments, 1907, 1911;—Public Education (Ireland), [176] 1348; — Civil Establishments West Coast of Africa, 1678
  Trespass (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 934
  Uniformity Act Amendment, 2R. [176] 1405, 1406

Montagu, Lord R., *Huntingdonshire*
  Civil Service Estimates, [174] 17
  County Franchise, 2R. [174] 933, 936
  Denmark and Germany—Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 881;—The proposed Conference, [174] 188;—Treaty of London, 1852, Res. 1323; — Alleged Massacre of Swedes, [176] 826, 1196;—Vote of Censure, Address moved, 878, 955
  Expenditure without Account, [174] 13
  Government Annuities—Mr. H. B. Sheridan—Privilege, Res. [174] 310
  Great Northern Railway (No. 3), 2R. Amendt. [173] 642
  Japan—Bombardment of Kagosima, Res. [173] 363; — Despatch of Troops, [176] 1799, 1806
  Malt for Cattle, 2R. [173] 604; Comm. 1043; *add. cl.* 1224
  Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [173] 1144; — Scientific Departments, 1308, 1310; — Civil Pensions, &c. [174] 444
  Paper Manufacture, Comm. moved for, [176] 1739
  Privilege, [174] 1958, 1960
  Sewage (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [174] 1698, 2051; Comm. [175] 102
  Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 999, 1004
  Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [174] 144
  Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans), Comm. Res. [176] 661, 662
  Treasury Regulations, [174] 186
  United States—Capture of the "Saxon," [173] 1365;—Confederate Cruisers, Papers moved for, 1484, 1487;—Confederate Ship "Georgia," [175] 507, 512

Montrose, Duke of
  Land Transfer Act, [174] 1416
  Public Schools, 2R. [175] 1242; Comm. 1629

MOOR, Mr. H., *Brighton*
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, [174] 1264; Lords Amendts. [176] 567
Supply—Emigration, [175] 1894
Tests Abolition (Oxford), Comm. [175] 1024

MOORE, Mr. J. B., *Lincoln*
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, 2R. [173] 1525

Morocco, The Jews in
Question, Mr. Alderman Salomons; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 4, [173] 1454

MORRISON, Mr. W., *Plymouth*
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [175] 82
Army—Percussion Caps for Military Practice, [175] 1064
Charity Commissioners, Comm. moved for, [175] 1864
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [176] 1693
Public Lands and Buildings (Local Rates), Res. [174] 484
Tests Abolition (Oxford), Comm. [175] 1016

MORRITT, Mr. W. J. S., *Yorkshire, North Riding*
Circuits of the Judges, [173] 795
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 607
Malt Duty, Res. [175] 414; [176] 258, 266
Malt for Cattle, 2R. [173] 602; Comm. 1045
Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 1052
Townley, The Convict, [173] 1185

Mortgage Debentures Bill
(*Lord Redesdale*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 21 (No. 55)
After short debate, Bill read 2ª *April* 26, and referred to the Select Committee on the Improvement of Land Act (1864) Bill, [174] 1594
Report of Select Committee *May* 26
Considered in Committee after short debate *June* 2, [175] 1048
cl. 32 (Investment of trust money on mortgage debentures), 1053; after short debate, *cl.* negatived
Report *June* 14, 1706; an Amendt. moved (*The Earl of Malmesbury*), and negatived
Read 3ª* *June* 16
c. Read 1°* *June* 23 [Bill 169]
Read 2°* *June* 27
Committee * *July* 11; debate adj.
Committee * *July* 14; debate adj.
Committee * *July* 19; debate adj.
Parl. Papers—
Lords . . . . No. 55
Report of Select Comm. . . . No. 107
As amended by Select Comm. . No. 99
Report of Select Comm. . . . No. 130

Mount St. Bernard's Reformatory
Question, Lord Berners; Answer, Earl Granville *June* 21, [176] 18; Explanation, Earl Granville *June* 23, 143; Observations, Lord Berners *June* 24, 235; Observations, Mr. Packe, and other hon. Members, 1646; Reply, Sir George Grey *July* 18, 1648; Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 29, 2193

MOWBRAY, Rt. Hon. J. R., *Durham City*
Crawley, Colonel, Case of, Papers moved for, [174] 75

MUNDY, Mr. W., *Derbyshire, South*
Education—Science Certificate, [175] 1837

Municipal Corporations (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. M'Mahon, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Blake*)
c. Ordered * *June* 7; read 1°* *June* 8 [Bill 139]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 6

MURE, Mr. D., *Buteshire*
Scotch Affairs, Administration of, Comm. moved for, [175] 1193
Writs Registration (Scotland), 2R. [175] 1491

MURRAY, Mr. W., *Newcastle-under-Lyme*
Bankruptcy Act, [174] 684
Chancery Fund Commissioners, [174] 183, 873
Law Life Assurance Company, [175] 760, 761

Mutiny Act
Question, Colonel North; Answer, Mr. Headlam *Mar* 8, [173] 1648

Mutiny Bill
(*Mr. Massey, The Marquess of Hartington, The Judge Advocate General*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 4
Read 2°* *Mar* 7
Considered in Committee *Mar* 10
cl. 1 to 21 agreed to
173] *cl.* 22 (Power to inflict corporal punishment), 1797; objected to (*Mr. Cox*); after debate, Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill;" A. 55, N. 42; M. 13; *cl.* agreed to
cl. 23 to 25 agreed to
cl. 26 (Branding), 1806; objected to (*Mr. Cox*); after debate, Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill;" A. 80, N. 50; M. 30; *cl.* agreed to, 1806
Remaining clauses and preamble agreed to
Bill reported
Considered as amended * *Mar* 11
Read 3° * and passed *Mar* 14
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl de Grey*) *Mar* 15
Read 2ª* *Mar* 16
Committee negatived
Read 3ª* *Mar* 17
Royal Assent *Mar* 18 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 3]

Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia) Bill [H.L.] (*Earl Russell*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *July* 15 (No. 204)
Read 2ª* *July* 18
176] Considered in Committee *July* 19, 1700
Bill reported without Amendt.
Read 3ª* *July* 21
c. Read 1°* *July* 21 [Bill 231]
Read 2°* *July* 22
Order for Committee read; Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 25, 2056; Amendt. To leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day month, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. James White*), 2058; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Debate adjourned
Committee put off; Bill withdrawn *July* 27
Convention with Prussia *Parl. P.* [1811

Naas, Rt. Hon. Lord, *Cockermouth*
Administration of Justice (Ireland) — The Queen *v.* Duigan and others, Papers moved for, [174] 1270
Agricultural Statistics, Res. [175] 1374
Army—Rating of Officers of Chelsea Hospital, Address moved, [175] 200
Beer Houses (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [175] 695
Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Extension, 2R. [176] 1365
Cattle Diseases Prevention, Re-Comm. *cl.* 6, [176] 1567
China—Affairs of, [173] 216; [175] 539; Res. 942, 965
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1377
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1391
Ireland—State of, Res. [173] 1891;—The Constabulary, [174] 305
Japan—Troops for, [176] 1710, 1795
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Leave, [173] 748; Comm. *cl.* 4, [174] 1268
Poor Law (Ireland) Act Amendment, Leave, [174] 99; 2R. Amendt. [176] 454
Queen's College Cork, [173] 715, 716
Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, Consid. Amendt. [176] 1611
Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [175] 2105
Spirit Duties, Res. [175] 838
Supply—Holyhead Harbour, &c. [175] 856;—Public Works (Ireland), 858, 859; Amendt. 860;—Rates for Government Property, 863;—Land, &c. Kensington Gore, 868; Report, 2023;— Queen's College (Ireland), [176] 1354
Trespass (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 935
Vestry Cess Abolition (Ireland), 2R. [173] 721; Lords Amendts. [175] 84
Watching of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1711

National Gallery
Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Cowper *April* 28, [174] 1775; Question, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Cowper *May* 10, [175] 260; Question, Mr. Hibbert; Answer, Mr. Gregory *June* 13, 1636 — see *Royal Academy*

National Portrait Gallery
Question, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 26, [174] 1623—see *Supply*

Naval Agency and Distribution Bill (*Lord Clarence Paget, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Ordered* *Mar* 1; read 1°* *Mar* 2 [Bill 39]
Read 2°, after short debate, *April* 7, [174] 626
Committee*; Report *April* 14
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 5
Considered as amended* *May* 9 [Bill 63]
Read 3°* *May* 11
l. Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Somerset*) *May* 12
Read 2ª* *May* 27 (No. 83)
Committee* *June* 3; Report* *June* 6
Read 3ª* *June* 7
Royal Assent *June* 23 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 24]

Naval and Victualling Stores Bill (*The Duke of Somerset*)
l. Read 1ª* *May* 5 (No. 151)
Read 2ª* *May* 6
Committee*; Report *May* 9 (No. 64)
Read 3ª* *May* 10
c. Read 1°* *June* 15 [Bill 151]
Read 2°, after debate, [175] 2108
Committee*; Report *July* 27
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 11
Read 3°* *July* 14
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 91]

Naval Discipline Bill [H.L.] (*The Duke of Somerset*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *July* 15 (No. 205)
Read 2ª *July* 19
Committee*; Report *July* 21
Read 3ª* *July* 22
c. Read 1°* *July* 22 [Bill 233]
Read 2°* *July* 25
Committee*; Report *July* 26
Considered as amended* *July* 27
Read 3°* *July* 27
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 119]

Naval Prize Acts Repeal Bill (*Lord Clarence Paget, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Ordered* *Mar* 1; read 1°* *Mar* 2 [Bill 40]
Read 2°* *April* 7
Committee*; Report *April* 14
Re-Comm.* and Report *April* 14
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 5
Read 3°* *May* 9 [Bill 64]
l. Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Somerset*) *May* 10
Read 2ª* *May* 27 (No. 78)
Committee*; Report *June* 3
Read 3ª* *June* 21
Royal Assent *June* 23 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 23]

Naval Prize Bill (*Lord Clarence Paget, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Ordered* *Mar* 1; read 1°* *Mar* 2 [Bill 41]
Read 2°* *April* 7
Committee*; Report *April* 14
Re-Comm.* and Report *April* 14 [Bill 65]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 5
Considered as amended* *May* 11
Read 3°* *May* 12
l. Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Somerset*) *May* 13
Read 2ª* *May* 27 (No. 87)
Committee* *June* 3; Report* *June* 6
Read 3ª* *June* 7
Royal Assent *June* 23 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 25]

NAVY

Armament of the

Question, The Earl of Hardwicke; Answer, The Duke of Somerset, debate thereon *Feb* 9, [173] 311; Observations, Mr. H. Berkeley, 1762; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Mar* 10, 1778; Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *July* 5, [176] 825; Question, Mr. Corry; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 27, 336

"*Royal Sovereign,*" *Guns of the,* Question, Colonel C. P. Leslie; Answer, Mr. Childers *May* 20, [175] 521

The "*Kearsarge*" *and the* "*Alabama,*" Observations, The Earl of Hardwicke; Reply, The Duke of Somerset *July* 4, [176] 685; Question, Mr. Corry; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 24, 256

Amour Plating Ships of War

Motion for a Commission "to consider the various systems now existing of constructing and Armour-plating Ships of War for the British Navy, as well as for the Navies of other Maritime Powers, and to report what, in the opinion of such Commission, should be the system to be now adopted for the British Navy" (*Sir Frederic Smith*) *July* 19, [176] 1749; after long debate, Motion withdrawn; Explanation, Mr. Laird; Reply, Lord C. Paget *July* 21, 1806

Iron Plate Committee, Question, Mr. Hanbury Tracy; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *May* 12, [175] 366

"*Research,*" *and* "*Enterprise*"—*their Armour,* Question, Mr. Laird; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Mar* 10, [173] 1757

Chain Cables — The "*Agincourt,*" Question, Mr. Laird; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Mar* 18, [174] 302

Chalmers—Petition of Mr. James (The Earl of Hardwicke); after short debate, Petition ordered to lie on the table *April* 14, [174] 962

Channel Fleet, The

Disposition of, Question, Mr. Ker; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Mar* 10, [173] 1759

Efficiency of, Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *April* 21, [174] 1469; Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *May* 2, 1979

Chaplain Generalship of the Navy, Question, Mr. Hanbury Tracy; Answer, Lord C. Paget *July* 14, [176] 1468

Clare, Claims of Mr. John, Motion for a Select Committee (*Colonel Dickson*) *April* 21, [174] 1464; Motion negatived—see title, *Clare, Claims of Mr. John*

Controller of the Navy and the Devonport Election, Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget; debate thereon *Mar* 3, [173] 1392

Cork, Naval Establishment at, Question, Mr. Whiteside; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Feb* 9, [173] 325

Curtis's Steering Screw—Propelling and Steering Steam Ships, Petition from Mr. W. J. Curtis, presented (*The Earl of Hardwicke*); Observations, The Duke of Somerset *Mar* 8, [173] 1622

[*cont.*

NAVY—*Dockyards*—cont.

Dockyard Patronage, Question, Sir James Elphinstone *Mar* 14, [173] 1914—see *Dockyards, Select Committee on — Dockyards Royal Commission,* 1860

Dockyards, Labourers in the, Questions, Sir Arthur Buller, Sir James Elphinstone; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *April* 15, [174] 1080

Dockyards, Police in the, Question, Major Knox *Mar* 14, [173] 1931

Dockyards, Superannuation in the, Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *May* 26, [175] 665

Flag Ship for the Mediterranean, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *July* 12, [176] 1389

"*Gladiator,*" *The,* Question, Sir James Elphinstone; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 20, [175] 2088; Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 23, [176] 157; Question, Lord Stanley; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 23, 161; Question, Mr. Dalglish; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 24, 256; Question, Sir J. Elphinstone; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *July* 1, 615—see *Ashantee, The War in—Army*

Gunboats, Contracts for, Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Mar* 3, [173] 1366

Greenwich Hospital—Merchant Seamen, Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *July* 25, [176] 2016—see title, *Greenwich Hospital*

Jamaica, Court Martial at, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 21, [176] 33

"*Lively,*" *Wreck of H.M. Gunboat,* Question, Mr. Richard Hodgson; Answer, Lord C. Paget *Feb* 5, [173] 171; Explanation, Lord Clarence Paget *Feb* 9, 325; "*Lively*" *and the* "*Prince Consort,*" Question, Sir James Elphinstone, 1767; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Mar* 10, 1776

"*Lord Warden,*" *Target, The,* Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *July* 21, [176] 1805

M'Killop's, Captain, Cofferdam, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Feb* 29, [173] 1251

Malta—Admiralty Dock at—see *Malta*

Masters in the, Amendt. on Committee of Supply, To leave out from "That" and add "this House will, upon Tuesday next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of an humble Address to be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions for putting the Staff Captains, Commanders, and Masters of the Royal Navy upon an equality in pay, rank, and eligibility for receiving marks of distinction, with any other class of Officers in that Service" (*Sir Lawrence Palk*) *June* 3, [175] 1209; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn.

Navy Estimates, Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Feb* 22, [173] 860

Navy Estimates—see *Supply*

Naval Captains, Retirement of, Observations, Lord Chelmsford; Reply, The Duke of Somerset; debate thereon *April* 22, [174] 1492

[*cont.*

NAVY—*cont.*

Naval Force — Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Feb* 25, to leave out from "That" and add "in the opinion of this House, the great changes in naval warfare, and the critical state of our foreign relations, require the most vigorous and immediate national efforts, on a scale calculated to maintain the maritime supremacy of England" (*Sir John Walsh*), [173] 1088; after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Naval Gunnery, Question, The Earl of Hardwicke; Answer, The Duke of Somerset *June* 16, [175] 1824

Naval Reserve—Ensign for the, Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 24, [176] 257

Naval Reserve, Returns of Effective Force, Question, Mr. H. Berkeley; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 7, [175] 1353

Pacific, Naval Stations in the, Question, Mr. Watkin; Answer, Mr. Childers *June* 13, [175] 1636

Pay and Allowances in the Royal Navy, Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 21, [176] 35; Question, Mr. C. P. Berkeley; Answer, Lord C. Paget *July* 21, 1790

"*Research*" *and* "*Enterprise*," *The*, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget; debate thereon *May* 23, [175] 588; Question, Sir Frederic Smith; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *May* 30, 801; Question, Sir James Elphinstone; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *May* 31, 914

"*Research*," *Inspection of the*, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 9, [175] 1455; Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 23, [176] 155; Question, Sir Frederic Smith; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *July* 21, 1795 (*Parl. P.* Nos. 381, 408.)

"*Research*" *and* "*Enterprise*"—*their Armour*, Question, Mr. Laird; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Mar* 10, [173] 1757

Royal Marines, Retirement in the, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 6, To leave out from "That" and add "this House would view with satisfaction the distribution of the full sum awarded by the Order in Council of 1854 for the retired Officers in the Royal Marines, as it would tend to expedite the necessary promotion in that valuable Corps" (*Sir John Hay*), [175] 147; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

School of Naval Architecture, Question, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 14, [173] 1914; Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 30, To leave out from "That" and add "the New School of Naval Architecture ought to be established in immediate connection with one of the chief Naval Arsenals, &c." (*Mr. Augustus Smith*), [176] 498; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to (*Parl. P.* No. 407)

Sir W. Snow Harris—Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 9, To leave out from "That" and add "there be laid before this House, Copy of a Communication made to the Admiralty by Sir W. Snow Harris on the organization of the proposed School of Naval Architecture" (*Mr. Augustus Smith*), [175] 194; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 10, To leave out from "That" and add "there be laid before this House, Copy of a Communication made to the Admiralty by Sir W. Snow Harris on the organization of the proposed School of Naval Architecture" (*Mr. Augustus Smith*), 1593; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Motion agreed to

Question, Mr. Augustus Smith, [174] 1460; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *April* 21, 1464

"*Science*," *The Barque*, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 5, [175] 24

Thomas, Case of Mr., Question, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 10, [173] 1770; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget, 1774

West Coast of Africa, The Squadron on the, Question, Sir James Elphinstone; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *July* 12, [176] 1390

Navy and Army Expenditure (1862-3)
Considered in Committee; Resolutions (*Lord Clarence Paget*), after short debate, agreed to *July* 18, [176] 1695—see *Army*

NEATE, Mr. C., *Oxford City*
- Army Estimates—Yeomanry Cavalry, [175] 44
- Collegiate Schools, Facilities for Divine Service in, 2R. [176] 1778
- Conveyancers, &c. (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [173] 1228
- County Franchise, 2R. [174] 946
- Crawley, Colonel, Case of, Papers moved for, [174] 89
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Consid. *cl.* 12, [174] 1986
- Death, Punishment of, Comm. moved for, [174] 2081; Commission moved for, 2115
- Denmark and Germany—Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 885
- Inns of Court, Papers moved for, [176] 646
- Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, Leave, [173] 263; Comm. *cl.* 2, 835, 839
- Malt, Duty on, Res. [176] 275
- Malt for Cattle, Comm. *add. cl.* [173] 1225
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 26, [173] 1812
- Parks, Public Meetings in the, [175] 776
- Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [174] 1255
- St. Mary's Burial Ground, Sydenham, Comm. moved for, [174] 656
- Supply—Sir Rowland Hill, [175] 1600
- Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [174] 108, 130; Comm. [175] 1025; 3R. [176] 675
- Uniformity Act Amendment, 2R. [176] 1407
- United States—Seizure of the "Tuscaloosa," Res. [174] 1819

Needlewomen of London — Report of the Commission
Question, The Earl of Carnarvon; Answer, Earl Granville *June* 16, [175] 1834

[*cont.*

NELSON, Earl
  Cornwall, Bishopric of, Papers moved for, [176] 1896, 1897
  Peers Robing Room—Mr. Herbert, Papers moved for, [176] 2004

NEWDEGATE, Mr. C. N., *Warwickshire, N.*
  Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 157
  Beer Houses (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [175] 695
  Borough Franchise, 2R. [175] 344
  Brazil—Case of Mr. Reeves, [175] 367, 913 ;—Relations with, [176] 1643
  Burial Grounds, [174] 872, 873
  Cattle Diseases Prevention, 2R. [173] 1751
  *Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [174] 1701, 1720
  Civil Service and Miscellaneous Estimates, Res. [173] 1357
  Collection of Taxes, 3R. [175] 2101
  Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. *cl.* 20, [176] 1866
  County Franchise, 2R. [174] 938
  Coventry, Trade of, [176] 511
  Death, Punishment of, Comm. moved for, [174] 2104
  Denmark and Germany—The Province of Jutland, [173] 799 ;—Treaty of London, 1852, [174] 1341 ;—The Conference, [175] 100, 101 ; [176] 656 ;—Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, [175] 166 ;—Vote of Censure, Address moved, Amendt. [176] 777, 827, 1199, 1299, 1300
  Factory Acts Extension, Comm. [175] 1945
  Foreign Office and the Board of Trade, Comm. moved for, [174] 1107
  Fortifications—Defence of the Bristol Channel, [174] 1502
  *Gaols, 2R. Amendt. [175] 2060, 2071, 2079, 2081
  Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1528, 1596
  Government Annuities—Mr. H. B. Sheridan—Privilege, Res. [174] 308
  Government Manufacturing Establishments, Res. [176] 1974
  Greco Conspiracy, The — M. Mazzini — Mr. Stansfeld, [174] 338
  Head, Sir F. B., Services of, [176] 1339
  Malt, Duty on, Res. [176] 277
  Malt for Cattle, Leave, [173] 230 ; 2R. 615 ; Comm. 1035
  Mount St. Bernard's Reformatory, [176] 1651, 2193
  Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Leave, [173] 779, 780
  Prison Ministers Act, Papers moved for, [176] 2196, 2199
  Queen's Plates, Res. [176] 441
  St. Mary's Burial Ground, Sydenham, [173] 1827 ; Comm. moved for, [174] 633, 649, 653, 654, 661
  Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [176] 1423
  Speke, Captain, Services of, [173] 1454
  Supply—Consular Establishments, [175] 1904, 1905
  Taxation and Expenditure, [173] 477
  Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [174] 121, 129 ; Comm. [175] 1040
  Union Assessment Committee Act Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [175] 519, 520

New Members Sworn
  Feb 4. Hon. Frederick Lygon, *Worcester County*
  Robert Bateson Harvey, esq., *Buckingham County*
  William Henry Humphery, esq., *Andover*
  John Peel, esq., *Tamworth*
  Thomas Lloyd, esq., *Barnstaple*
  Samuel Waterhouse, esq., *Pontefract*
  George John Shaw Lefevre, esq., *Reading*
  Colonel Richard Henry Richard Howard Vyse, *New Windsor*
  Charles Neate, esq., *Oxford City*
  Sir William Augustus Fraser, bart., *Ludlow*
  Hon. Charles Richard Douglas Hanbury Tracy, *Montgomery Borough*
  Sir Colman Michael O'Loghlen, bart., *Clare County*
  Feb 5. Sir Robert Porrett Collier, knight, *Plymouth*
  Sir Roundell Palmer, knight, *Richmond*
  Feb 11. John Reginald Yorke, esq., *Tewkesbury*
  Feb 12. Thomas Fleming, esq., *Winchester*
  John Henderson, esq., *Durham City*
  Feb 18. Henry Moor, esq., *Brighton*
  Mar 2. John Floyer, esq., *Dorset*
  Mar 16. Henry Edward Surtees, esq., *Hertford County*
  April 4. Morgan Treherne, esq., *Coventry*
  April 6. John Matthew Stronge, esq., *Armagh*
  April 11. The Right Hon. Edward Cardwell, *Oxford City*
  April 15. Edward Mathew Fenwick, esq., *Lancaster Borough*
  April 18. Richard Bremridge, esq., *Barnstaple*
  April 19. Sir Thomas Bateson, bart., *Devizes*
  April 21. Hugh Culling Eardley Childers, esq., *Pontefract*
  April 22. Sir Robert Anstruther, bart, *Fifeshire*
  April 27. Rt. Hon. Henry Austin Bruce, *Merthyr Tydvil*
  May 10. Edward William Watkin, esq., *Stockport*
  May 26. John Joseph Powell, esq., *Gloucester City*
  June 30. Sir Edward Williamson, bart., *Durham County* (*Northern Division*)
  July 14. Sir Michael Edward Hicks Beach, bart., *Gloucester County* (*Eastern Division*)

New South Wales Import Duties
  Question, Mr. William Miller; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 17, [174] 180

New Writs during the Recess
  For Montgomery Borough, *v.* John Samuel Willes Johnson, esquire, deceased
  For Ludlow, *v.* Beriah Botfield, esquire, deceased
  For Coventry, *v.* Right Hon. Edward Ellice, deceased
  For Tamworth, *v.* Viscount Raynham, now Marquess Townshend

[*cont.*

New Writs during the Recess—cont.
- *For* Plymouth, *v.* Robert Porrett Collier, esquire, Solicitor General
- *For* Richmond, *v.* Roundell Palmer, Attorney General
- *For* Reading, *v.* Gillery Pigott, esquire, one of the Barons of the Court of Exchequer
- *For* Barnstaple, *v.* George Potts, esquire, deceased
- *For* Worcester County (Western Division), *v.* Viscount Elmly, now Earl Beauchamp
- *For* New Windsor, *v.* George William Hope, esquire, deceased
- *For* Oxford City, *v.* James Haughton Langston, esquire, deceased
- *For* Andover, *v.* William Cubitt, esquire, deceased
- *For* Buckingham County, *v.* Hon. William George Cavendish, now Baron Chesham

New Writs ordered
- *Feb* 4—*For* Durham City, *v.* Sir William Atherton, deceased
- *Feb* 4—*For* Tewkesbury, *v.* The Hon. Frederick Lygon, Manor of Hempholme
- *Feb* 4—*For* Winchester, *v.* Sir James Buller East, bart., Chiltern Hundreds
- *Feb* 8—*For* Brighton, *v.* William Coningham, esquire, Manor of Northstead
- *Feb* 17—*For* Dorset, *v.* Henry Ker Seymer, esquire, Manor of Hempholme
- *Feb* 25—*For* Hertford County, *v.* C. W. Giles Puller
- *Mar* 14—*For* Armagh, *v.* Maxwell Charles Close, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds
- *April* 4—*For* Coventry, *v.* Rt. Hon. Edward Ellice, deceased
- *April* 4—*For* Oxford City, *v.* The Rt. Hon. Edward Cardwell, one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State
- *April* 6—*For* Lancaster Borough, *v.* William James Garnett, esquire, Manor of Northstead
- *April* 7—*For* Fifeshire, *v.* James Hay Erskine Wemyss, esquire, deceased
- *April* 12—*For* Devizes, *v.* The Hon. W. W. Addington, now Viscount Sidmouth
- *April* 15—*For* Pontefract, *v.* Hugh Culling Eardley Childers, esquire, Commissioner of the Admiralty
- *April* 18—*For* Merthyr Tydvil, *v.* Henry Austin Bruce, esquire, Vice-President of the Committee on Privy Council on Education
- *May* 4—*For* Stockport, *v.* James Kershaw, esquire, deceased
- *May* 20—*For* Gloucester City, *v.* John Joseph Powell, esquire, Recorder of Wolverhampton
- *June* 20—*For* Durham County (Northern Division), *v.* Lord Adolphus Vane Tempest deceased
- *July* 4—*For* Gloucester County (Eastern Division) *v.* Sir C. W. Codrington, bart. deceased
- *July* 29—*For* Exeter, *v.* Edward Divett, esquire, deceased

New Writ for Merthyr Tydvil, see *Under-Secretaries of State*

New Zealand
- *The "Native" Question*, Question, Lord Lyttelton; Answer, Earl Granville; long debate thereon *May* 30, [175] 779

cont.

New Zealand—cont.
- *Transfer of Seat of Government—Correspondence*, Question, Mr. Arthur Mills; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Mar* 3, [173] 1367
- *New Zealand Loan*, Question, Mr. Arthur Mills; Answer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue *Feb* 26, [173] 1187; *Parl. P.* Nos. 251 [3356]; Question, Mr. Aytoun; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *June* 6, [175] 1261
- *The War in*
  - Motion, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for 'Copy of all Correspondence that has taken place between Governor Sir George Grey and the Colonial Office relating to the policy of confiscation which has been adopted by the New Zealand Legislature'" (*Mr. Arthur Mills*) *April* 26, [174] 1625; after long debate, Motion agreed to; Question, Mr. Arthur Mills; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *June* 6, [175] 1263; Question, Sir Frederic Smith; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *July* 8, [176] 1195; Question, Sir Minto Farquhar; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 14, 1469; Question, Mr. Arthur Mills; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 22, 1906; Question, Mr. Arthur Mills; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 26, 2104
  - Parl. Papers—
    - Correspondence . . . . No. 326
    - Papers relating to [3277, 3355, 3380, 3386]

New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan) Bill
(*Mr. Massey, Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Fortescue*)
- *Loan, Guarantee of*, Papers referred to
- 175] *c.* Resolution in Committee, after debate *June* 13, 1690
- Resolution reported *; Bill ordered *June* 14
- Read 1° * *June* 14 [Bill 150]
- 176] Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 14, 1471
- . Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Arthur Mills*); Question, "That the word 'now' &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 92, N. 55; M. 37; Main Question put, and agreed to: Bill read 2°
- . Order for Committee read; Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 18
- . Amendt. proposed, To leave out from "That" and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire what is the relative financial position of Great Britain and New Zealand, with a view of a definite and final adjustment of any outstanding balance, and coming to an understanding as to the liabilities to be borne in future by the Government of either Country" (*Sir John Trelawny*), 1681; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 79, N. 32; M. 47; Main Question put, and agreed to
- . Bill considered in Committee, 1693; Bill reported *July* 18
- Considered as amended * *July* 19
- . Motion, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *July* 21, 1866
- Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day month" (*Mr. Hennessy*), 1867; after

[*cont.*

New Zealand (*Guarantee of Loan*) *Bill*—cont.
[176] short debate, Question put, "That 'now' &c.;" A. 75, N. 32; M. 43; Main Question put, and agreed to
Bill read 3º
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 22
Read 2ª *July* 25, 1986 (No. 233)
Committee *; Report *July* 26
Read 3ª * *July* 27
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 82]

Norris, Mr. J. T., *Abingdon*
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 2, [174] 1860
- Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 608*a*
- Paper Manufacture, Comm. moved for, [176] 1741

North, Colonel J. S., *Oxfordshire*
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, [173] 1445, 1450;—General Staff, &c. [174] 817, 821, 829;—Clothing, 833;—Barracks, 836;—Medical Establishment, [175] 29, 35, 36, 39;—Disembodied Militia, 41;—Enrolled Pensioners, 53, 54;—Works, Buildings, &c. 204, 207, 214;—Military Education, 223, 231, 232;—Forage Money of Cavalry Officers, [176] 1331
- Army—New Brigade of Horse Artillery, [173] 1649;—Rating of Officers of Chelsea Hospital, Address moved, [175] 198;—Captain Grant's System of Cooking, Address moved, 523
- Crawley, Colonel, Court Martial on, [173] 1368
- Indian Medical Service, Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 1703; Consid. *add. cl.* 1902; 3R. 2035
- Mutiny, [173] 1648; Comm. *cl.* 22, 1799, 1800, 1802, 1803, 1804, 1805, 1806; *cl.* 26, 1807, 1808
- Navy Estimates—Naval Establishments, [174] 2032
- Rates and Taxes on Officers occupying Public, Buildings, [173] 1761, 1762; [174] 2050, 2051
- Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 1003, 1004

North, Mr. F., *Hastings*
- Lisburn Election, Res. [174] 858

Northcote, Sir S. H., *Stamford*
- Army Estimates—Commissariat, [174] 832;—Clothing, 835
- Army—Rifle Practice near the New Croydon Railway, [176] 151
- China—Vote of Credit for, [175] 1352
- Collection of Taxes, 3R. [175] 2098
- Convicts—Remission of Penal Servitude, [173] 1907
- Cornwall, Proposed Bishopric of, [173] 680
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Consid. *cl.* 12, [174] 1986
- Denmark and Germany—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1257
- Fortifications and Works, Comm. [176] 1437

[*cont.*

Northcote, Sir S. H.—*cont.*
- Harbours of Refuge, [173] 1820; Res. Amendt. [174] 1669, 1698
- Herbert, Mr., Case of, [175] 466; Explanation, 515
- Hudson's Bay Territory, Papers moved for, [176] 621
- Income Tax, Res. [175] 1758
- India—Banda and Kirwee Booty, Address moved, [175] 721, 735; [176] 154;—Lucknow Booty, 705
- Navy—Dockyards, Nomination of Comm. [173] 1238
- New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), [176] 1486, 1497
- Public Schools Commission, Res. [175] 138
- Private Bills, Res. 7 [173] 680
- Rape, Punishment of, Comm. [176] 940, 942, 946
- South Kensington, New Museums at, [174] 1078
- Spirit Duties, Res. [175] 833, 834
- Supply—Consular Establishments, [175] 1906;—Public Education, [176] 537;—Department of Science and Art, 563;—Royal Academy of Music, 1605
- Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [174] 149; Comm. [175] 1008, 1018
- Ways and Means—Fire Insurance Duty [174] 1450; Report, [176] 1610

O'Brien, Sir P., *King's Co.*
- Address in Answer to the Speech, Report, [173] 207
- Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. [176] 74, 91
- Beer Houses (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [175] 694
- Court of Chancery (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1591
- Crawley, Colonel, Case of, Papers moved for, [174] 94
- Education (Inspectors' Reports), Nomination of Comm. [175] 997
- Ireland—State of, Res. [173] 1860
- Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [175] 2107
- St. Mary's Burial Ground, Sydenham, Comm. moved for, [174] 661
- Scientific Institutions (Dublin), Nomination of Comm. [174] 1274

O'Conor Don, The, *Roscommon Co.*
- Education, National (Ireland), Res. [176] 177, 181, 200
- Indictable Offences (Ireland), Returns moved for, [174] 1133
- Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, 2R. [173] 1514; Comm. *cl.* 4, [174] 1258

O'Donoghue, The, *Tipperary Co.*
- Denmark and Germany—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1247

Ogilvy, Sir J., *Dundee*
- Court of Justiciary (Scotland), Comm. [173] 1704
- Denmark—Embargoes on Danish and German Shipping, [173] 859
- Factory Acts Extension, Comm. [175] 1945

O'Hagan, Right Hon. T. (Attorney General for Ireland), *Tralee*

- Address in Answer to the Speech, Report, [173] 198
- Admiralty Court (Ireland), [174] 1548; [176] 280
- Beer Houses (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [175] 695
- Chancery, Court of (Ireland), [173] 933; Leave, [174] 1376, 1377, 1378, 1569, 1593; 2R. [175] 1099; Comm. *cl.* 12, [176] 23, 28; Res. 95, 98, 292, 299
- Charitable Bequests (Ireland), [173] 496; [175] 192
- Chief Rents (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1399; Comm. *cl.* 1, [175] 15
- Civil Bill Courts (Ireland), Comm. [174] 1555; *cl.* 3, 1556; *add. cl.* 1557, 1568; Consid. *cl.* 25, 1966
- Conveyancers, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [173] 595; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1228; Amendt. 1229; *cl.* 3, 1230
- County Courts (Ireland), Leave, [173] 480; 2R. 1231
- Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland), 2R. [176] 301
- Education, National (Ireland), [175] 25; Res. 1782; [176] 186, 233
- Indictable Offences (Ireland), Returns moved for, [174] 1138
- Irish Fisheries, [175] 1837
- Land Tenure (Ireland), [175] 18
- Land, Transfer of (Ireland), [175] 2028
- Law and Equity Courts (Ireland), [174] 876
- O'Malley Irwin, Mr., Case of, Address moved, [176] 2113
- Rape, Punishment of, Comm. [176] 945
- Registration of Titles in Ireland, Address moved, [175] 741, 745
- Registration of Voters (Ireland), 2R. [174] 530
- St. Mary's Burial Ground, Sydenham, Comm. moved for, [174] 656
- Superior Courts of Common Law (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1967
- Supply—Landed Estates Record Offices, [175] 1676;—Court of Chancery (Ireland), 1688; —Registration of Judgments (Ireland), 1688
- Trespass (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 934, 935; *cl.* 3, 939; *add. cl.* 940

O'Loghlen, Sir C., *Clare Co.*

- Bank of England Notes (Scotland), 2R. [176] 121
- Beer Houses (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [175] 693
- Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 12, Amendt. [176] 23; The Division, 30
- Chief Rents (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [175] 15
- Civil Bill Courts (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [174] 1557, 1558; Consid. *add. cl.* 1966
- Costs Security, 2R. [175] 1814
- Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties), Comm. [176] 281; *cl.* 10, 283
- Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, 2R. [173] 572; Comm. *cl.* 2, 845
- Poor Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment, 2R. [176] 465
- Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [175] 2102
- Rape, Punishment of, Comm. Amendt. [176] 941, 942
- Rule of the House — Questions to Private Members, [174] 1914

O'Loghlen, Sir C.—*cont.*

- Supply—Westminster Bridge Approaches, [175] 847; — Public Works (Ireland), 859, 1670, 1672; — Sheriff Court Houses (Scotland), 863; — Copyhold, &c. Commission, 1674; —Printing and Stationery, 1678; —Postage of Public Departments, 1681; — County Courts, 1685;—Governors, &c. West Indies, &c. 1885; Report, 1913;—Queen's Colleges (Ireland), [176] 1355; — National Gallery (Ireland), 1355
- Trespass (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 933; Amendt. 936; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 937

O'Neill, Mr. E., *Antrim Co.*

- India—Indian Artillery, [176] 1570
- Payne, Rev. Dr.—Claim on the Greek Government, [173] 715

O'Reilly, Mr. M. W., *Longford Co.*

- Army Estimates — General Staff, &c. [174] 812;—Clothing, 832; — Medical Establishment, [175] 31; — Military Education, 228; —Administration of the Army, 237, 238
- Church Livings (Ireland), [176] 336
- Court Martial Law, [173] 1824
- Crawley, Col., Case of, Papers moved for, [174] 57
- Indictable Offences (Ireland), Returns moved for, [174] 1136, 1138
- Ireland—State of, Res. [173] 1854
- National Schools (Ireland), [174] 1198
- Poor Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment, 2R. [176] 463
- Post Office— Saturday Half Holiday, [174] 1976
- Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [175] 2106
- Saturday Half Holiday—Public Offices, [176] 1622
- Supply— County Roads, South Wales, [175] 1675; — Public Education (Ireland), [176] 1349;—University of London, 1352
- Taxation, Comm. moved for, [175] 281
- Trespass (Ireland), Comm. [174] 1755

Onslow, Mr. G., *Guildford*

- Army—Prussian Breech-loading Rifles, [174] 536
- Denmark and Germany — Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1071

Osborne, Mr. R. B., *Liskeard*

- Army—Appointment of Lieut.-Gen. Gough to the 2nd Dragoons, [173] 820; —Instruction and Employment of Soldiers, Res. [174] 624;—The Armstrong Guns in New Zealand, [176] 1904
- Brazil—Political Relations with, [176] 1572, 1626, 1633, 1637, 1638, 1643
- Charity Commissioners, Comm. moved for, [175] 1873, 1876
- Controller of the Navy—Devonport Election, [173] 1412
- Denmark and Germany — Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 861, 862, 873, 877; —Postponement of Notice, [174] 286, 289; — Order of Succession in Holstein and Schleswig, 303, 304;—The Conference, 395, 396, 876, 971, 972; [175] 1262, 1277, 1730, 2030, 2033;—Bombardment of Sonderborg, [174] 699, 709, 710; — Treaty of London,

[*cont.*

OSBORNE, Mr. R. B.—*cont.*
1852, Res. 1292, 1353, 1375, 1376 ; —Naval Action off Heligoland, [175] 197 ; — The Armistice, 198 ; —Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1005 ; Adj. moved, 1071, 1198, 1199
Education—Inspectors' Reports, Comm. moved for, [175] 391 ; Amendt. 393
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), 3R. [176] 2022, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033
Fortifications — The Spithead Forts, [174] 1502
Greco Conspiracy, The — M. Mazzini — Mr. Stansfeld, [174] 335
Indictable Offences (Ireland), Return moved for, [174] 1137, 1141
Navy Estimates, Adj. moved, [173] 873, 877
Privilege, [174] 1957, 1958, 1960
Supply—New National Gallery at Burlington House, [175] 1330 ;—National Gallery, [176] 1530 ; — Royal Academy of Music, 1600 ; Amendt. 1601, 1607

Outlawries Bill
Read 1° * *Feb* 4

OVERSTONE, Lord
Land Transfer Act, [174] 1416
Mortgage Debentures, Comm. [175] 1049
Royal Academy, The, [176] 250

OXFORD, Bishop of
Church Services (Apocrypha), 2R. [175] 1932
Collegiate Schools, Facilities for Divine worship in, 2R. [176] 143, 147, 149, 150 ; Comm. *add. cl.* 822 ; 3R. 1369
Convocation, Powers of—Essays and Reviews, [176] 1559
Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries, Comm. [175] 1706
Japan, Res. [176] 599
Scotch Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [175] 631

Oyster Dredging at Beachy Head
Question, Mr. Cave ; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *June* 9, [175] 1457

Oyster Fisheries (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. M'Mahon, Mr. Blake*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *April* 20 [Bill 75]

Oyster Fishery (England and Wales) Bill
[H. L.] (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *June* 2 (No. 108)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 30, [176] 480 ; after debate, Motion withdrawn
Bill withdrawn

PACKE, Colonel G. H., *Lincolnshire, S.*
Great Eastern Northern Junction Railway, 2R. Amendt. [173] 710, 712

PACKE, Mr. C. W., *Leicestershire, S.*
Agricultural Statistics, Res. [175] 1368
Cattle Diseases Prevention, 2R. [173] 1749
Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. [175] 1467 ; 3R. 2091
Forfeiture of Lands and Goods, 2R. [175] 1810
Great Northern Railway (No. 3), 2R. [173] 642
Intoxicating Liquors (Sale on Sundays), Leave, [175] 175
Malt for Cattle, 2R. [173] 597 ; Comm. 1026, 1032 ; *add. cl.* 1225
Poor's Rate, Leave, [173] 701
Rape, Punishment of, Comm. [176] 947
St. Bernard's Reformatory, [176] 1646, 1649
Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 1009
Weights and Measures (Metric System), Comm. *cl.* 2, [175] 6
Westminster Palace Clock, [173] 1068

PAGET, Rear-Admiral Lord C. E. (Secretary of the Admiralty), *Sandwich*
Army Estimates—Manufacturing Departments, [175] 76
Army—Sanitary Measures (Camps, &c.), Comm. moved for, [175] 1914
Ashantee—War in, [175] 1839, 1840, 1841 ; Res. 2004, 2007 ; [176] 34
Brazil—Slave Trade, [176] 1387
Chain Cables and Anchors, [174] 303, 479
Chain Cables Proof Certificate, [173] 1187 ;— Messrs. Brown, Lennox & Co. 1458
China—Anglo-Chinese Fleet, [173] 1182, 1183
Church and Schools at Brompton, [173] 1279
Coffer Dam, Capt. McKillop's, [173] 1251
Confederate Steam Rams, [175] 912
Controller of the Navy—Devonport Election, [173] 1404, 1406
Denmark and Germany — Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 875 ; — H.M.S. "Aurora," [175] 103, 104 ;—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1291
Dockyards Commission—The Report, Res. [173] 1076, 1079, 1081
Dockyards, Comm. moved for, [173] 1157, 1158 ; Nomination of Comm. 1236
Fortifications and Works, Comm. [176] 1534
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 1872, 1873
Government Manufacturing Establishments, Res. [176] 1968
Greenwich Hospital, [173] 466, 1545 ; [174] 1201 ; Res. [175] 1165, 1167 ; [176] 2017
Gunnery Instructors, [173] 1757
Ireland—Cork Harbour, [174] 1464
Japan—Armstrong Guns at Kagosima, [173] 1905 ;—Troops for, [176] 1711, 1795
Kertch Prize Money, [173] 1182 ; Return moved for, 1233
Malta—Dock at, [173] 497 ; Res. 895, 898, 1186, 1826 ; [174] 395, 1201 ; [176] 159
Naval Agency and Distribution, 2R. [174] 626
Naval and Victualling Stores, 2R. [175] 2108
Naval Establishment at Cork, [173] 325
Naval Force, Res. [173] 1100
Naval Reserve, Ensign for the, [176] 258
Navy and Army Expenditure (1862-3), Comm. Res. [176] 1695
Navy Estimates, [173] 860, 875 ;—Men and Boys, 1103, 1135, 1137, 1138, 1139, 1150 [*cont.*

Paget, Rear-Admiral Lord C. E.—*cont.*
1157;—Wages, 1286, 1294, 1296, 1301;—Admiralty Office, 1302, 1303, 1305;—Coast Guard Service, 1307;—Scientific Departments, 1308, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1313, 1314;—Naval Establishments at Home, 1315;—Wages of Artificers Abroad, 1789;—Explanation, 1911, 1913;—Wages of Artificers at Home, 1974, 1975, 1982;—Naval Stores, [174] 431, 440, 441;—Steam Machinery, 442;—Naval Miscellaneous Services, 442, 443;—Half Pay, 444;—Civil Pensions, &c. *ib.*;—Freight of Ships, &c. *ib.* 444, 445, 446; Report, 501, 1473;—Naval Establishments, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033; Amendt. 2034, 2047, 2048, 2049;—Pay of Officers, [175] 667, 676, 679, 686, 688, 690, 691;—Retirement of Officers, 692
Navy—Wreck of the "Lively," [173] 171, 325, 1776;—Contracts for Gun Boats, 1366;—Armour-plated Ships, 1757;—The Channel Fleet, 1759; [174] 1471, 1979;—French Breech Loading Cannon, [173] 1774;—Case of Mr. Thomas, 1774;—The "Prince Consort," 1776;—Armament of the Royal Navy, 1778;—The "Agincourt," [174] 303;—Labourers in the Dockyards, 1080, 1081;—Claims of Mr. J. Clare, Comm. moved for, 1465, 1466;—Armstrong Guns at Kagosima, 1624;—Retirement in the Royal Marines, Res. [175] 148;—Iron Plate Committee, 366;—The "Research," and the "Enterprise," 589, 590, 591, 802, 914, 1455, 1456; [176] 156, 1795;—Superannuation in the Dockyards, [175] 666;—Masters in the Navy, Res. 1215;—Royal Naval Reserve, 1353;—The "Gladiator," 2029; [176] 157, 161, 162, 256, 616;—Court Martial at Jamaica, 33;—Pay and Allowance, 35;—Guns for the Navy, 337;—Flag Ship for the Mediterranean, 1389;—Squadron on the West Coast of Africa, 1390;—Chaplain Generalship of the Navy, 1468;—Ships of War—Armour-plating, Commission moved for, 1751, 1757, 1758, 1762, 1763, 1765, 1766, 1767, 1768, 1770, 1771, 1807;—Payment of Officers, 1790;—The "Lord Warden" Target, 1805
School of Naval Architecture, [174] 1464;—Sir W. S. Harris, Papers moved for, [175] 195, 1593; Res. [176] 504, 505
Slave Trade—The "Castilla," &c. [175] 2027
Supply—Postage of Public Departments, [175] 1681;—Magnetic and Meteorological Observations, [176] 1599;—Civil Establishments West Coast of Africa, 1677, 1678;—Iron-clad Ships "El Tousson" and "El Monassia," 1681
United States—The "Kearsarge," [176] 256
Welsh Steam Coal, [175] 103

Paget, Mr. C., *Nottingham*
Agricultural Statistics, Res. [175] 1368
Cattle Diseases Prevention, 2R. [173] 1752
Insolvent Debtors, 2R. Amendt. [174] 2120; Comm. [176] 948

Pakington, Right Hon. Sir J., *Droitwich*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 146
Ashantee—War in, [175] 545, 1840; Res. 1994, 1999, 2001

[*cont.*

Pakington, Right Hon. Sir J.—*cont.*
Assize Town for the West Riding Circuit, Address moved, [173] 817
Brazil—Slave Trade, [176] 1387, 1388
Business of the House, [174] 1777
Controller of the Navy—Devonport Election, [173] 1406, 1407, 1409
Denmark and Germany—H. M. S. "Aurora," [175] 103;—The Austrian Squadron, 517;—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 970, 1004;—Treaty of 1852, 1625
Dockyards, Nomination of Comm. [173] 1236
Education—School Inspectors' Reports, [173] 1823, 1824; [175] 191; Comm. moved for, Amendt. 371; Nomination of Comm, 991, 998, 999, 1092, 1544
Endowed Schools, Grants to, [176] 497, 498
Gaols, 2R. [175] 2075
Governors of Colonies, Pensions to, [174] 1948; Papers moved for, [176] 430
Greenwich Hospital, Res. [175] 1163
Harbours of Refuge, Res. [174] 1679, 1682
Head, Sir F. B., Services of, Res. [176] 1337
Highway Act, [174] 1083
Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, Leave, [173] 275
Japan—Troops for, [176] 1710
Kertch Prize Money, Return moved for, [173] 1234
Malta—Dock at, Res. [173] 897, 900; [174] 1201
Naval Architecture, School of, [173] 1914
Navy—Case of Mr. Thomas, [173] 1770, 1775;—Claims of Mr. J. Clare, Comm. moved for, [174] 1468;—The Channel Fleet, 1469, 1472, 1979;—Masters in the Navy, Res. [175] 1211;—Pay and Allowances, [176] 35;—Ships of War—Armour-plating, Commission moved for, 1769, 1770, 1771
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [173] 1132, 1135, 1137, 1138, 1139;—Wages, 1291, 1296;—Scientific Departments, 1308, 1313;—Wages of Artificers Abroad, 1786;—Wages of Artificers at Home, 1981; [174] 1473;—Naval Establishments, 2046, 2047, 2049
New Zealand—War in, Papers moved for, [174] 1656
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Leave, [173] 769, 774, 1758; Comm. *cl.* 4, [174] 1265
Poor Relief (Metropolis), Comm. [176] 2050
Prison Discipline, [173] 324; [174] 1083
School of Naval Architecture—Sir W. S. Harris, Papers moved for, [175] 196; Res. [176] 502
Stansfeld, Mr., and the Greco Conspiracy, Res. [174] 267
Street Music (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 470
Supply—Public Education, [176] 546;—Royal Academy of Music, 1607
Vaccination Act, [175] 1640
Ways and Means, Res. [174] 1550

Palk, Sir L., *Devonshire, S.*
Cattle Diseases Prevention, Re-Comm. *cl.* 6, [176] 1568
County Bridges, 2R. [175] 352
Denmark—War in, [173] 172;—The Conference, [175] 1262; [176] 707
Mazzini, M.—The Greco Conspiracy, [173] 193, 1932

[*cont.*

PALK, Sir L.—*cont.*
- Navy Estimates, Supplementary—Pay of Officers, [175] 674
- Navy—Masters in the, Res. [175] 1209, 1217
- Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, Comm. [176] 1435
- Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for, [176] 1457
- United States—Steam Rams at Birkenhead, [174] 690, 695

PALMER, Sir R., *see* ATTORNEY GENERAL, The

PALMERSTON, Right Hon. Viscount (First Lord of the Treasury), *Tiverton*
- Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 101, 138
- Adjournment of the House, [175] 591
- Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. [176] 85, 92
- Agricultural Statistics, Res. Previous Question moved, [175] 1383
- Army Estimates—Commissariat, [174] 831
- Army—Reduction of the, [173] 1370 ;—Instruction and Employment of Soldiers, Res. [174] 626
- Ashantee—War in, Res. [175] 2015, 2020, 2022
- Ash Wednesday, Adjournment of the House, [173] 328
- Ballot, The, Res. [176] 43
- Brazil—Slave Trade, [176] 1377, 1379, 1383, 1386 ;—Relations with, 1572, 1633, 1636, 1639, 1640, 1643
- Business of the Evening, [173] 1189
- Casual Poor (Metropolis), [176] 1802
- Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1378 ; Comm. [176] 300
- China — Soochow, [173] 1472 ; — Affairs of, 1544 ; [175] 531, 532, 533, 534 ; Res. 967
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. [176] 1864
- County Franchise, 2R. [174] 952
- Denmark and Germany—Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 217, 499, 500, 1069, 1547, 1548 ;—Riots at Copenhagen, 322 ;—Treaty of 1852, 326, 327 ; Res. [174] 1368 ; [176] 1625 ;—The Danish Papers, [173] 332, 1657 ; —Invasion of the Province of Jutland, 799, 1546 ;—Prussian Exactions in, [175] 552, 593, 721 ;—The Proposed Conference, [173] 1071, 1072, 1190, 1191, 1829, 1831 ; [174] 188, 286, 287, 288 ;—Relations with the European Powers, [173] 1270 ;—Answer of the Prince Gortschakoff, 1654 ;—Order of Succession in Holstein and Schleswig, [174] 303, 304 ; [176] 2189 ; The Conference, [174] 396, 631, 787, 788 ; [175] 1262, 1265, 1286, 1458, 1730, 2033, 2034 ; [176] 162, 163 ;—Ministerial Statement, 337, 353, 655, 656 ; —Bombardment of Sonderborg, [174] 707 ; —The Armistice, [175] 1542, 1543 ; [176] 1522, 1523, 2194 ;—Vote of Censure, Address moved, 1003, 1073, 1272, 1299 ;—War in Denmark, 1329
- Dockyards, Nomination of Comm. [173] 1239
- Easter Recess, The, [173] 1658
- Education — Reports of the Inspectors of Schools—Resignation of Mr. Lowe, [174] 1213 ;—Nomination of Comm. [175] 982, 996, 999, 1001 ;—Res. [176] 2067
- Egypt—The Suez Canal, [174] 302, 870

[*cont.*

PALMERSTON, Right Hon. Viscount—*cont.*
- Elgin and Kincardine, Countess of, Res. [175] 1458
- Fortifications—Defence of the Bristol Channel, [174] 1502 ;—The Spithead Forts, 1502, 1503
- Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 1873
- Garibaldi, General, Departure of, [174] 1290
- Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1528, 1550 ;—Mr. H. B. Sheridan—Privilege, Res. [174] 306, 316 ; Nomination of Comm. 1480
- Hill, Sir Rowland, [173] 1827
- Holy Alliance, The Alleged, [176] 708
- India — Banda and Kirwee Booty, Address moved, [175] 732, 736 ; [176] 154
- Indictable Offences (Ireland), Returns moved for, [174] 1141
- Ireland—Inauguration of the O'Connell Statue, [176] 2193
- Japan—Bombardment of Kagosima, Res. Previous Question moved, [173] 416 ;—Despatch of Troops to, [176] 1806
- Marriage Laws, Scotch and Irish, [176] 2194
- Mexico—Relations with, Papers moved for, [176] 2202
- Military Establishments, The, [173] 221
- Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia), Comm. [176] 2063, 2064, 2067
- Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [173] 1157 ; [174] 1473 ;—Pay of Officers, [175] 691
- New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1520
- Poland—Despatch of September, 1863, [173] 540, 1103 ; — Polish Refugees in Austria, [174] 1200, 1201 ;—Res. [175] 651, 657, 658 ; —Affairs of, 915, 916
- Queen's Plates, Res. [176] 447
- Saturday Half Holiday—Public Offices, [176] 1622
- School of Naval Architecture, Papers moved for, [175] 1594
- Slave Trade, [173] 1196
- Speke, Capt., Services of, [173] 1453, 1454
- Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2141
- Stansfeld, Mr., and the Greco Conspiracy, Res. [174] 189, 190, 268 ;— M. Mazzini, 324, 329 ;—Resignation of Mr. Stansfeld, 401
- Supply—New National Gallery at Burlington House, [175] 1329 ;—Sir Rowland Hill, 1595, 1600 ;—Paymaster General, 1604 ;—Public Works (Ireland), 1673 ;—Consular Establishments, 1906, 1909, 1911, 1912 ;—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [176] 395, 396 ; — Nonconforming, &c. Ministers in Ireland, 400 ;—National Gallery, 1524, 1531
- Treaty of Vienna and Prussia, [176] 1623
- Turkey—Prince Couza and the Porte, [176] 2189
- Under Secretaries of State, [174] 1082 ;— Privilege, Res. 1231, 1250
- United States—Capture of British Ships, Papers moved for, [173] 530 ; — Seizure of the "Tuscaloosa," 1069, 1185 ; [174] 184 ;— Neutrality in America, [173] 1919 ; —The Civil War, [176] 2018
- Yeomanry Cavalry, Res. [173] 1387

Paper Manufacture
- Motion, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the present position of the Paper Manufacture of Great Britain and Ireland, with respect to Foreign Taxation" (*Mr. Maguire*) *July* 19, [176] 1711 ; after long debate, Motion withdrawn

Parliament, Meeting of the

The Session of Parliament opened by Commission *Feb* 4

LORDS—

Speech of the Lords Commissioners *Feb* 4, [173] 1

Address to Her Majesty moved thereon by The Marquess of Sligo, seconded by The Lord Abercromby, and, after long debate, agreed to *Feb* 4

Her Majesty's Answer to the Address reported *Feb* 9, 301

Roll of Lords—Garter King of Arms delivered a List of the Lords Temporal in the Sixth Session of the Eighteenth Parliament of the United Kingdom *Feb* 4 (*Parl. P.* No. 4)

Chairman of Committees—The Lord Redesdale appointed, *Nemine Dissentiente*, to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session *Feb* 4

Committee for Privileges—appointed *Feb* 4

Sub-Committee for the Journals — appointed *Feb* 4

Appeal Committee—appointed *Feb* 4

Standing Orders — Resolved, That Samuel Smith, esquire, and Charles Frere, esquire, be appointed Examiners for this Session *Feb* 4

Standing Order Committee on Private Bills—appointed *Feb* 9; List of the Committee, 320

The Prorogation, Question, Lord Chelmsford; Answer, The Lord Chancellor *July* 28, [176] 2156

The Parliament Prorogued, by Commission, to Thursday, 13th October *July* 29

COMMONS—

Speech of the Lords Commissioners

The Lords Commissioners' Speech reported; Resolution for an Address thereon moved by Lord Richard Grosvenor, seconded by Mr. Goschen; after long debate, resolved accordingly, and Committee appointed to draw up the same; Lords Commissioners' Speech referred *Feb* 4, [173] 74

Report of Address brought up, and, after long debate, agreed to *Feb* 5, 173

Her Majesty's Answer to the Address reported *Feb* 9, 321

Printing Committee appointed and nominated *Feb* 5, 213

Sub-Committee for the Journals — appointed *Feb* 4

Controverted Elections, General Committee of Elections (*by Mr. Speaker's Warrant*), List of the Committee, 301

Chairman's Panel reported *Feb* 18, 709

Standing Orders—Select Committee on, nominated *Feb* 11, 461

Committee of Selection nominated *Feb* 11, 461

The Parliament Prorogued, by Commission, to Thursday, 13th October *July* 29

The Easter Recess

Lords—

Ordered *Mar* 18, "That the House at its rising do adjourn till Tuesday, the 5th of April next."

[*cont.*

Parliament—*The Easter Recess*—cont.

The Whitsuntide Recess—Ordered *May* 13, "That the House at its rising do adjourn till Thursday, the 23rd inst."

See *Private Bills—Public Bills*
Standing Orders
Sat First — Took the Oath — Writs and Returns
Clerk of the Parliaments — Select Committee

Commons—

The Easter Recess, Notice, Viscount Palmerston, *Mar* 3, [173] 1658

Public Business, *Business of the House*, Question, Mr. Walpole; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 11, 1825

House at its rising to adjourn till Monday, 4th April (*Viscount Palmerston*) *Mar* 18

The Whitsuntide Recess, *May* 13, House at its rising to adjourn till Thursday next

See *New Writs — New Members Sworn*
Private Bills—Standing Orders

Parliament—New Palace of, Westminster

The Wall Paintings — Peers' Robing Room —Mr. Herbert, R.A.—Motion for, Copy of the Report of the Commissioners lately appointed on the Fresco Paintings in the Palace of Westminster, and of a Letter addressed by Lord Redesdale to those Commissioners in relation to the continued Occupation of the Peers' Robing Room for the purpose of such Paintings by which the Peers attending certain Committees have been so long subjected to great Inconvenience (*Lord Redesdale*) *July* 25, [176] 2002; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Wall Paintings in Peers' Robing Room—Mr. Dyce, R.A.—Question, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Cowper *May* 19, [175] 517

Mr. Herbert, R.A., Observations, Sir Stafford Northcote *May* 13, [175] 466; Personal Explanation, Sir Stafford Northcote; Reply, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck *May* 19, [175] 515; Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, Mr. Cowper *May* 31, 912

Parl. Papers—
Report of Commissioners . . [3410]
Letter of Lord Redesdale . . No. 256

Victoria Tower — Improvements near the, Question, Mr. T. Miller; Answer, Mr. Cowper *Mar* 17, [174] 183

The Palace Clock, Question, Mr. Packe; Answer, Mr. Cowper *Feb* 25, [173] 1068

The Ladies' Gallery, Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answer, Mr. Cowper *June* 30, 496

Partnership Law Amendment Bill

(*Mr. Scholefield, Mr. Murray, Mr. Stansfeld*)

174] *c.* Considered in Committee* *April* 14

Resolution reported; Bill ordered* *April* 14

Read 1°* *April* 14 [Bill 68]

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Scholefield*) *April* 25, 1559; Amendt. to leave out, "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Hubbard*); after debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c." put, and agreed to; Bill read 2° *April* 25

[*cont.*

Partnership Law Amendment Bill—cont.

174] *c.* Order for Committee read *May* 3; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair;" Amendt. to leave out "That" and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Thomas Baring*), &c. 2121; after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Bill considered in Committee *May* 3
cl. 1 and 2 agreed to
cl. 3 (A limited partnership may be formed) Amendt. at end of clause, to add "and all such partnership shall be distinguished by the addition of the word 'registered' to the name of the firm, in all its dealings and transactions" (*Mr. Thomas Baring*); Question put, "That those words be there added;" A. 12, N. 20; M. 8 (*Count out*)
175] Considered in Committee *May* 9, 240
  cl. 3 (A limited partnership may be formed) Amendt. again proposed; after short debate, Question put, "That those words be there added," A. 58, N. 43; M. 15
  cl. 4 (Any person lending money to general partners on certain terms to be a limited partner), 242; Amendt. in line 40, to leave out "or contract to lend" (*Mr. Buchanan*); after short debate, Question put, "That those words stand part of the clause," A. 39, N. 46; M. 7
Committee report Progress
Bill withdrawn * *July* 28

Patent Law Commission
Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 28, [174] 1773
Report of the Commissioners *Parl. P.* [3419]

Patent Office Library and Museum
Question, The Earl of Powis; Answer, Earl Granville *Feb* 18, [173] 706; Observations, Mr. Dillwyn; Reply, Mr. Cowper *April* 29, [174] 1950
Museum and Library, Observation, Mr. Dillwyn *April* 12, [174] 915
Fife House, Question, Lord Alfred Churchill; Answer, Mr. Cowper *Mar* 17, [174] 182
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire as to the most suitable arrangements to be made respecting the Patent Office Library and Museum" (*Mr. Dillwyn*), A. 21, N. 16; M. 5 *May* 9, [175] 245
Committee nominated as follows *May* 23:—Mr. Dillwyn (Chairman), Mr. Cowper, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Knight, Lord Robert Cecil, Lord Henry Lennox, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Augustus Smith, Lord Elcho, Mr. Waldron, Mr. Adderley, Mr. Walter, Mr. Calthorpe, Mr. Holford, and Mr. Francis Sharp Powell. *May* 27, Mr. Holford disch., and Mr. Humphery added
Report of Select Committee *July* 19 (*Parl. P.* No. 504)

Patriotic Fund Commission
Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Corry *May* 27, [175] 720

PATTEN, Col. J. W., *Lancashire, N.*
Belfast, Borough of, Paper moved for, [174] 1075
Business of the House, [176] 2106, 2107
Denmark and Germany—Treaty of London, 1852, Res. [174] 1375
Fees to Parliamentary Counsel, [173] 1654
Great Eastern Northern Junction Railway, 2R. [173] 712
Highway Act, [173] 1183
London Main Trunk Underground Railway, [174] 1075, 1076
Private Bills, Res. 1, [173] 657; Res. 3, 670; Res. 5, 675; Res. 7, 679;—Standing Order, [175] 1144;—Committees on, Res. 1555
Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for, [176] 1453, 1458, 1466; Instruction, 1467; Report, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2011; Amendt. 2012, 2013, 2014, 2131, 2133, 2134, 2139, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149; Amendt. 2150; Amendt. 2151, 2152
Weighing of Grain (Port of London), 2R. [176] 171

PAULL, Mr. H., *St. Ives*
Beckenham, Lewes and Brighton Railway, 2R. [173] 637
Insolvent Debtors, 2R. [174] 2119; Comm. [176] 948, 1432
Jersey, Laws of, [174] 2052, 2053;—Reform in the Royal Court, [176] 35
Lisburn Election, [174] 469
Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, Comm. [176] 1435
Private Bills, Committees on, Res. [175] 1566
Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for, [176] 1466; Report, 2009, 2012
Supply—Zambesi Expedition, [175] 1897
Volunteer Review, The, [175] 809

PAXTON, Sir J., *Coventry*
Coventry, Trade of, [176] 508
Discriminating Duties, Papers moved for, [175] 1359
Ladies' Gallery, The, [176] 496
Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Res. Amendt. [173] 1641
Sewage (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [174] 1698
Supply—Civil Service Estimates, [175] 405;—Royal Parks, &c. 421
Westminster Bridge, Traffic on, [176] 495

Payne, Rev. Dr.—Claim on the Greek Government
Question, Mr. O'Neill; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 18, [173] 715

PEACOCKE, Mr. G. M. W., *Maldon*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 139
Bank of England Notes (Scotland), 2R. [176] 124
Beer Houses (Ireland), 2R. [175] 602
Denmark and Germany—Riots at Copenhagen, [173] 322;—Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, 499;—Bombardment of Sonderborg, [174] 717;—Treaty of London, 1852, Res. Amendt. 1315, 1356, 1376;—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1041
Epping Forest, Papers moved for, [175] 1203
Forests, Royal, in Essex, [176] 652, 653

[cont.

Peacocke, Mr. G. M. W.—*cont.*
Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers), Comm. *cl.* 1, Adj. moved, [176] 103
Street Music (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 475 ; *add. cl.* 683
Supply—Royal Palaces, Amendt. [175] 411, 412
United States—The "Alexandra" and "Alabama," [173] 323 ;—Capture of the "Tuscaloosa," 1069, 1185, 1462 ; [174] 183 ; Res. 1777 ; — Cruisers of the Belligerents, 2055

Pease, Mr. H., *Durham, S.*
County Franchise, 2R. [174] 948
Harbours of Refuge, Res. [174] 1677
Intoxicating Liquors (Sale on Sundays), Leave, [175] 170 ; 2R. 1421

Peel, Right Hon. Sir R. (Chief Secretary for Ireland) *Tamworth*
Address in Answer to the Speech, Report, [173] 187
Administration of Justice (Ireland) — The Queen *v.* Duigan and others, Papers moved for, [174] 1270 ; [176] 1340
Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. [176] 57
Beer Houses (Ireland), 2R. [175] 597, 601, 602 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, 693, 694, 695
Bishoprics in Ireland, [174] 16
Church Livings (Ireland), [176] 336
Convent Schools (Ireland), [176] 1711
Convicts (Ireland), [175] 588
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1377 ; Comm. *cl.* 12, [176] 27
Education, National (Ireland), [174] 13 ; [175] 1729 ; Res. [176] 187, 199, 200, 208, 209, 232
Emigration (America), Papers moved for, [176] 2178
Galway (West District), Papers moved for, [174] 1271
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1394
Indictable Offences (Ireland), Returns moved for, [174] 1123, 1125, 1126, 1129
Ireland—The Church, [173] 462 ;—The Constabulary, 1816, 1817 ; [174] 184, 305, 967 ; —State of, Res. [173] 1862, 1867 ;—Outrages in, 1902 ; — Quartermaster Acres—North Tipperary Militia, 1930 ; — District Lunatic Asylum, [174] 187 ; — Additional Constabulary at Lisburn, 970, 971 ;—Brehon Laws, 1503
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), [174] 1976
Law Life Assurance Company, [175] 763, 766
Lunatic Asylums (Ireland), [173] 1250 ; [176] 636, 637, 1709
Malicious Burnings (Ireland), [175] 22
Medical Officers in Unions (Ireland), Res. [175] 153
National Schools (Ireland), [174] 1199
O'Malley Irwin, Mr., Case of, [176] 2021
Poor Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment, 2R. [176] 460
Poor Rates (Ireland), Res. [175] 145
Queen's College, Cork, [173] 716
Queen's Plates, Res. [176] 443
Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [175] 2107
Scientific Institutions of Dublin, [174] 674, 677

[*cont.*

Peel, Right Hon. Sir R.—*cont.*
Street Music (Metropolis), 2R. [175] 1533
Supply — Public Works (Ireland), [175] 859, 860 ; Report, 1913 ;—Public Education (Ireland), [176] 1340, 1345, 1347, 1350, 1351, 1352 ; — Queen's Colleges (Ireland), 1353, 1354
Tenure and Improvement of Land Act (Ireland), [174] 1775
Trespass (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1706 ; Comm. [174] 957, 1753, 1754
Vestry Cess Abolition (Ireland), 2R. [173] 718 ; Comm. *add. cl.* 1316 ; Lords Amendts. [175] 84
Watching of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1708, 1713, 1714

Peel, Right Hon. Lt.-Gen. J., *Huntingdon*
Army—Discharge of Soldiers in 1864-5, [173] 1905 ;—Instruction and Employment of Soldiers, Res. [174] 626 ;—Field Allowance to Troops on the Gold Coast, [176] 152 ;—Requisition from the War Office to the Admiralty, 153
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [173] 1435 ;—General Staff, &c. [174] 809, 826 ;—Clothing, 834 ;—Medical Establishment, [175] 30, 33 ; —Enrolled Pensioners, 51, 52, 54 ; —Works, Buildings, &c. 206
Ashantee—War in, Res. [175] 2008
Business of the House, [174] 1776
Crawley, Colonel, Court Martial on, Papers moved for, [173] 215 ; — Case of, Papers moved for, Amendt. [174] 36, 69
Denmark and Germany — Bombardment of Sonderborg, [174] 714 ;—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 793, 1197
Government Manufacturing Establishments, Res. [176] 1939, 1966
India—Banda and Kirwee Booty, [176] 154
Navy—Armament of the, [173] 1781
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), Comm. [176] 1682
Queen's Plates, Res. [176] 444
Yeomanry Cavalry, [173] 1386

Peel, Right Hon. F. (Joint Secretary to the Treasury), *Bury*
Army—Rating of Officers of Chelsea Hospital, Address moved, [175] 198
Australian Postage, [176] 36, 1573
Bankruptcy Court (Dublin), [174] 303
Chigwell, Recreation Grounds at, [174] 2024
China—Vote of Credit for, [175] 1352
Civil Service and Miscellaneous Estimates, Res. [173] 1348 ; [174] 17 ; Res. [175] 664
Customs Gaugers, [175] 459
Customs Officers, Complaints of, [176] 1706
Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland), 2R. [176] 301
Epping Forest, Papers moved for, [175] 1200
Forests, Royal, [176] 154, 649
Galway Packet Service, [173] 1456
Indemnity, 2R. [176] 664
Ireland—The Regium Donum, [176] 824
Letters, Transmission of, on Sundays, [173] 1365
Mails in the Provinces, Comm. moved for, [174] 409 ;—from Southampton, 477
Medical Officers in Unions (Ireland), Res. [175] 154

[*cont.*

PEEL, Right Hon. F.—*cont.*

Open Spaces (Metropolis), Res. [176] 434

Ordnance Survey—Civil Assistants, [173] 1250

Police, Pay and Clothing of the, [176] 2017

Post Office—Saturday Half Holiday, [174] 1977

Public Lands and Buildings (Local Rates), Res. [174] 488

Public Records (Ireland) Commission, [176] 2105

Silver Coin, Supply of, [175] 802

Standard of Weight and Measure, [176] 2016

Supply, 219 ;—The Scheldt Toll, [173] 1789 ;—Civil Service Estimates, [174] 289 ; [175] 406 ;—Harbours of Refuge, 854 ;—Public Works (Ireland), 859, 1670, 1671;—Lighthouses Abroad, 861 ;—Lunatic Asylum, Isle of Man, 862 ;—Sheriff Court Houses (Scotland), 863 ;—Rates for Government Property, 864 ;—Privy Council Office, 1333; —Privy Council for Trade, 1603 ;—Copyhold, &c. Commission, 1674 ;—County Roads, South Wales, 1675 ;—Landed Estates Record Offices, 1676, 1677 ;—Printing and Stationery, 1678, 1680; —Postage of Public Departments, 1682 ;—Police Counties and Boroughs, 1683 ;—County Courts, 1685 ;—Treasury Chest, 1896 ; Report, 2024 :—Ecclesiastical Commissioners, [176] 657 ;—Temporary Commissions, *ib.* ;—Malta and Alexandra Telegraph, *ib.* ;—Civil Contingencies, 658, 659 ;—University of London, 1353 ;—Queen's Colleges (Ireland), 1355 ;—National Gallery (Ireland), 1356 ;—Royal Academy of Music, 1600 ;—Customs (Salaries and Expenses), 1609 ;—Post Office Packet Service, 1657 ; Report, 1702

Treasury Regulations, [174] 186

West India Mails, [174] 1421, 1549

PEEL, Mr. J., *Tamworth*

Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 986

Union Assessment Committee Act Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [175] 519

Penal Discipline

Assaults with Knives—Question, Mr. Horsfall; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 3, [173] 1366

Corporal Punishment, Question, Mr. Hadfield ; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 26, [176] 2105 ; Questions, Colonel Sykes, Mr. Darby Griffith ; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 29, 2190

Convicts — Remission of Penal Servitude — Question, Sir Stafford Northcote ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 14, [173] 1907

Convicts in County Gaols—Question, Mr. J. R. Ormsby Gore ; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 8, [174] 630

Costs of Prosecutions, Question, Sir Jervoise Jervoise ; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 14, [174] 968

Criminal Returns, Question, Mr. Denman ; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 6, [175] 102

Execution of the Pirates of the "Flowery Land," Question, Sir George Bowyer ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 12, [173] 497

Game Law Prosecutions, Question, Colonel Sykes ; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 11, [176] 1324

[*cont.*

Penal Discipline—cont.

Gaols, Discipline and Dietary in, Question, Mr. Buxton ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 10, [173] 1754 ; Question, Sir John Pakington ; Answer Sir George Grey, [174] 1083 ; Question, Mr. Bazley ; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 2, [175] 1063 ; Question, Sir John Pakington ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 9, [173] 324

Hall, Convict George — The Prerogative of Mercy, Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Copy of Correspondence relative to George Hall, convicted of Murder at the Warwick Assizes, and respited on the 13th of March" (*The Earl of Carnarvon*) *April* 12, [174] 861 ; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Penal Servitude, Returns of Sentences to 1862 *and* 1863 (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) *Feb* 28, [173] 919 ; after debate, Motion agreed to

Public Executions, Motion for Papers (*Mr. Hibbert*) *Feb* 23, [173] 941 ; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Tickets-of-Leave and Sentences of Penal Servitude, Question, Mr. Cave ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 25, [173] 1073

Townley, the Convict, Motion (*The Earl of*
173] *Carnarvon*) postponed *Feb* 5, 169 ; Question, Lord Henry Lennox ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 8, 218 ; Question, Sir FitzRoy Kelly ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 9, 328 ; Question, Mr. William John S. Morritt ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 26, 1185 ; Parl. Papers respecting, (L) No. 11, (C) No. 37

Victoria, Expulsion of Ticket-of-Leave Men from, Question, Mr. Blake ; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *June* 14, [175] 1729

Wakefield Prison, Dietary in, Question, Lord Fermoy ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 15, [174] 16

See—

Penal Servitude Acts Amendment Bill

Penal Servitude Acts Consolidation Bill

Punishment of Death

Penal Servitude Acts Amendment Bill

(*Sir George Grey, Mr. Bruce*)

173] *c.* Moved, "That leave, &c." (*Sir George Grey*), 723 ; after long debate, Motion agreed to ; Bill ordered ; read 1° *Feb* 18 [Bill 23]

Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir George Grey*) *Mar* 4, 1496 ; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Adderley*) ; after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn ; Main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill read 2° *Mar* 4

174] Order for Committee read ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *April* 18, 1250 ; Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "this House is of opinion that the system of discharge of prisoners from penal servitude on licence without police supervision should no longer be continued" (*Mr. Adderley*) ; after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Bill considered in Committee *April* 18, 1255

cl. 2 (Length of sentences of penal servitude), 1255 ; after debate, *cl.* agreed to

[*cont.*

Penal Servitude Acts Amendment Bill—cont.

174] *cl.* 3 (Punishment of offences in convict prisons), 1258; after short debate, *cl.* agreed to

. *cl.* 4 (Forfeiture of licence), 1258; Amendt. (Holder of licence to report himself to police) (*Mr. Hunt*), 1259; after long debate, Question put, "That those words be there added," A. 148, N. 120; M. 28; *cl.* as amended, agreed to

. Remaining clauses agreed to

. Schedule A, Amendt. after "large" to omit "in the United Kingdom" (*Mr. Hunt*); Amendt. withdrawn; Schedule agreed to

new cl. (Licences may be granted in different form) (*Sir George Grey*); agreed to

. Bill reported *April* 18

. Bill, as amended, considered *April* 29, 1961

new cl. (Application of Acts to licence) (*Mr. Whitbread*) read 1°; after debate, Motion withdrawn

cl. 4 Amendts. (*Mr. Hunt*) agreed to; *cl.* as amended, agreed to

. Read 3° * *May* 2

175] *l.* Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *May* 6

. Read 2ª, after long debate, *May* 31, 882

. House in Committee, after short debate, *June* 7, 1339

. *cl.* 2 (Length of sentences of penal servitude); Amendt. moved at the end of clause to add—"And if two previous convictions of felony, including summary convictions under the Criminal Justice Act, shall be proved against a prisoner found guilty of an offence now punishable by penal servitude, he shall be liable to penal servitude for seven years, and this shall be the least sentence that can be passed upon him" (*Earl Grey*), 1341; after short debate, Amendt. agreed to; *cl.* agreed to

. *cl.* 4 (Forfeiture of licence), 1342; Moved, To leave out from ("therein") to ("or") in line 38 (*Lord Houghton*); after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" Con. 49, Not-Con. 41; M. 8—List of Con. and Not-Con. 1349; Amendt. by inserting "being a male" in line 36; *cl.* as amended agreed to

. Amendments reported *June* 17, 1934

. *cl.* 4 (Forfeiture of licence), 1937; Amendt. moved, after ("subsequently") to leave out ("once in each month") and insert ("if required to do so by the conditions of his licence") (*The Earl of Lichfield*) *June* 17; Question, "That the words, &c.;" Con. 36, Not-Con. 44; M. 8; resolved in the affirmative—List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 1938

. Read 3ª * *June* 21

c. Lords Amendments considered *June* 30

. On Amendment to leave out "once in each month," and insert, "if required to do so by the conditions of his licence," read 2° *June* 30; Motion, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment" (*Mr. Hunt*); after short debate, Question put; A. 129, N. 84; M. 45

176] Commons Reasons considered *July* 14, 1440; after short debate, Question, Whether to insist? Cont. 25, Not-Cont. 62; M 37; resolved in the negative; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 1446

. Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 47]

[*cont.*

Penal Servitude Acts Amendment Bill—cont.

Parl. Papers—*Lords*

Commons . .	Bill 23
As amended in Comm. . .	Bill 71
Bill	No. 66
As amended in Comm. . .	No. 118
As amended on Report . .	No. 136
Commons Amendts. . . .	No. 169
Commons Reasons	No. 170

Penal Servitude Acts Amendment Bill

Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 10, [173] 1758; Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 15, [174] 1077; Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 23, [176] 160

Penal Servitude Acts Consolidation Bill

(*Mr. Adderley, Mr. A. Mills, Major C. Bruce*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 25 [Bill 36]

Bill withdrawn * *April* 25

PENNANT, Hon. Col. E. G. Douglas, *Carnarvonshire*

Valuation of Lands, &c. (Scotland) Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 1430

PETO, Sir S. M., *Finsbury*

Chain Cables and Anchors, Comm. *cl.* 8, [174] 514; *cl.* 9, 515

Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. [176] 1872

Government Manufacturing Establishments, Res. [176] 1963, 1964

London, &c. Docks Amalgamation, 2R. [175] 1388, 1389

Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 26, [173] 1808

Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [173] 1142;—Admiralty Office, 1302, 1303, 1305;—Naval Establishments at Home, 1314;—Wages of Artificers at Home, 1971;—Naval Stores, [174] 430, 439;—Steam Machinery, 442

Navy—Ships of War—Armour Plating, Commission moved for, [176] 1769

New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 1693

Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [173] 293

Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2131, 2148; Amendt. 2149, 2152

Supply—Houses of Parliament, [175] 430;—Royal Academy of Music, [176] 1600

Vaccination Registration, [173] 1908

Petty Offences Law Amendment Bill

(*Mr. Whalley, Mr. M'Mahon*)

176] *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *May* 27 [Bill 121]

Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 14, 1433; Amendt. To leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Solicitor General*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn

. Bill withdrawn

Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation Bill (*Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Hutt*)

175] *c.* Considered in Committee ; Bill ordered *May* 4, 16
Read 1° *May* 4 ; read 2° * *May* 9 [Bill 91]
Bill referred to Select Committee * as to Carlingford, &c. *May* 23
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) *June* 20 [Bill 149]
Considered as amended * *June* 21
Read 3° * *June* 22
Lords Amendments [Bill 241]
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 23
Read 2ª *June* 28, and committed to a Select Committee
Report of Select Committee *July* 23 (No. 151)
Committee * *July* 25 ; Report * *July* 26
Read 3ª * *July* 27
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 93]

Pilotage Order Confirmation Bill (*Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Hutt*)

c. Presented ; read 1° * *June* 2 [Bill 131]
Read 2° * *June* 13
Committee * ; Report *June* 20
Considered as amended * *June* 21
Read 3° * *June* 22
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 23
Read 2ª * *June* 28 (No. 150)
Committee * *July* 4 ; Report * *July* 5
Read 3ª * *July* 7
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 58]

Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Hutt*)

c. Resolution in Committee *
Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 30 [Bill 184]
Read 2° * *July* 5
Bill committed to a Select Committee *July* 7
As amended by Select Committee *July* 7 [Bill 226]
Considered in Committee * ; Report *July* 19
Considered in Committee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *July* 21
Read 3° * *July* 22
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *July* 22 (No. 235)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 23, [176] 1999 ; after short debate, Amendt. moved to leave out ("now") and insert ("this day three months") ; on Question, That ("now"), &c. ; resolved in the affirmative
Read 2ª, and committed to a Select Committee
Committee :—The Lord Steward (Chairman), The Earl of Devon, The Earl of Romney, The Earl of Ducie, The Lord Silchester
Report of Select Committee *July* 27, "That it is not expedient to proceed further with the Bill"

Plymouth Sound, Accident from Artillery Practice in

Question, Sir Massey Lopes ; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 2, [175] 1063

Poisoned Flesh, &c. Prohibition Act (1863) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Berkeley, Mr. W. Martin, Lord Fermoy*)

c. Ordered ; read 1° * *July* 5 [Bill 192]
Read 2° * *July* 7
Committee * ; Report *July* 11 [Bill 199]

Poisoned Grain, &c. Bill—cont.

Order for Committee read *July* 13
176] Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair ;" Amendt. To leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day three months, &c." (*Lord E. Hill-Trevor*), 1435
Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Question put ; A. 60, N. 38 ; M. 22 ; Main Question put, and agreed to
Bill considered in Committee ; Committee R.P.
Committee (*on re-comm.*) * ; Report *July* 14
Bill, as amended, considered *July* 15, 1611
Moved, "That the clause excluding Ireland from the operation of the Bill be omitted" (*Lord Naas*) ; after short debate, clause omitted ; Bill to be read 3°, on Monday next
Committee (*on re-comm.*) * ; Report *July* 18
Considered as amended * *July* 18
Read 3° * *July* 18
l. Read 1ª (*Lord Redesdale*) *July* 19 (No. 219)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 21, 1787 ; after short debate, Amendt. To leave out ("now") and insert ("this day three months") (*Lord Wodehouse*) ; Question, That ("now") &c. ; Cont. 31, Not-Cont. 18 ; M. 13 ; resolved in the affirmative ; Bill read 2ª
List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 1789
House in Committee ; Bill reported *July* 22, 1897
cl. 2 (Penalty for placing poisoned flesh in fields, &c.) ; Moved, To leave out from clause 2, line 14 ("any poison or") (*Lord Wodehouse*) ; Question, "That the words, &c. ;" Cont. 15, Not-Cont. 17 ; M. 2
Motion agreed to ; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 1897
Page 1, clause 2, line 14, after ("meat") moved to insert ("or other animal matter") (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) ; Question, "Whether to insert ?" Cont. 14, Not-Cont. 18 ; M. 4
Motion negatived ; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 1898
Amendt. ("To exempt Ireland") (*Earl of Airlie*) ; after short debate, negatived
Read 3ª * *July* 23 (No. 243)
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 115]

Poland

Despatch of Prince Gortschakoff, September, 1863, Question, Mr. Hennessy ; Answer, Viscount Palmerston ; debate thereon *Feb* 12,
173] 537 ; Question, Mr. Hennessy ; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Feb* 25, 1101
l. Resolutions—Moved, "That, in the Opinion of this House, the Correspondence of Her Majesty's Government with the Cabinet of Saint Petersburg on the Polish Question has not as yet reached a satisfactory Conclusion :
"That, in the Opinion of this House, the Czar having failed to comply with the Conditions upon which, according to the Treaty of Vienna, he acquired his Sovereignty in Poland, it is no longer binding on Her Majesty's Government to acknowledge it"
175] (*Lord Campbell*) *May* 9, 177 ; after short debate, Resolutions withdrawn
c. Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 26, To leave out from "That" and add "the negotiations of Her Majesty's Government re-

Poland—cont.
specting Poland have not terminated in a
175] satisfactory manner" (*Mr. Hennessy*), 636;
after long debate, Question, "That the words, &c." put, and agreed to; Question, Mr. Hennessy; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *May* 31, 915
Parl Papers—
Correspondence . . . . [3243]
„ with French Govt. [3358]
Polish Refugees in Austria, Question, Mr. Yorke; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *April* 18, [174] 1200

Police
Police Force and Mr. Arnold, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 5, [176] 824
Police Rate (Edinburgh)—Clergy Stipends, Question, Mr. Caird; Answer, The Lord Advocate *May* 12, [175] 361
Police, Pay and Clothing of the, Question, Mr. Howes; Answer, Mr. Peel *July* 25, [176] 2017
Public Meetings in the Parks, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 12, [175] 366; Observations, Mr. Whalley; Reply, Sir George Grey *May* 27, 769; Instructions to Police (*Parl. P.* No. 272)

Pollard-Urquhart, Mr. W., *Westmeath Co.*
Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. [176] 83
Chief Rents (Ireland), Comm. [175] 13; *cl.* 1, 15
Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1605
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1388
Ireland—State of, Res. [173] 1853;—Quartermaster Acres — North Tipperary Militia, 1930
Malt, Duty on, Res. [176] 275
Malt for Cattle, 2R. [173] 598; Comm. 1037
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Consid. *add. cl.* [174] 1965
Poor Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment, 2R. [176] 459
Servants Hiring (Scotland), Comm. [175] 1822
Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 1003
Taxation, Comm. moved for, [175] 273
Weights and Measures (Metric System), Comm. *cl.* 2, [175] 9

Poor Law
Casual Poor—The Southern Districts, Question, Mr. Kekewich; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Mar* 15, [174] 15
Consolidation of Poor Law, Question, Mr. Hibbert; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Mar* 1, [173] 1333
Cases of Starvation in the Metropolis, Question, Lord Robert Cecil; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 10, [173] 1758; Question, Lord Robert Cecil; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Mar* 11, 1821
Law of Settlement, Observations, Mr. Warner *Feb* 19, [173] 818; Question, Mr. Alcock; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Feb* 29, 1249
Parochial Assessment Committees, Question, Mr. Sutton Western; Answer, Mr. C. P.
[*cont.*

Poor Law—cont.
Villiers *April* 21, [174] 1421; Observations, Mr. Hubbard; Reply, Mr. C. P. Villiers, *July* 15, [176] 1583
Rate in Aid Act, Petition from Bakewell Union against renewal (*Lord Denman*) *Feb* 13, [173] 492
Union Assessment Act, Question, Mr. Holland; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Feb* 11, [173] 461
Union Relief to the Wives of Soldiers, &c., Question, Mr. Addington; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Mar* 11, [173] 1822

Poor Law Guardians Elections Bill
(*Mr. Barnes, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Hadfield*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 15 [Bill 153]
Withdrawn * *July* 13

Poor Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Hennessy, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart*)
174] *c.* Ordered, after short debate; read 1° *Mar* 15, 99 [Bill 51]
176] Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 29, 449
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Lord Naas*), 454
Question proposed, "That 'now' &c.;" after debate, Question put, A. 24, N. 201; M. 177; Words added; Main Question, as amended, agreed to; Bill put off for three months

Poor Relief (Metropolis) Bill
(*Mr. Villiers, Mr. Gilpin*)
176] After debate, Leave given *July* 19, 1771
c. Presented; read 1° *July* 19 [Bill 224]
Read 2° * *July* 20
Order for Committee read; Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. C. P. Villiers*) *July* 25, 2039; Amendt. To leave out from "That" and add "this House will, upon this day month, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie*), instead thereof, 2043; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Main Question put, and agreed to
Bill considered in Committee, 2056, and reported
Bill, as amended, considered *July* 26, 2101; after short debate, Amendts. made
Read 3° *July* 26
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Wodehouse*) *July* 16 (No. 253)
Order of the day for the second reading read
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*Lord Wodehouse*) *July* 27, 2127; after short debate, Amendt. moved to leave out ("now") and insert ("this day three months") (*Lord Redesdale*), 2129; after further short debate, on Question, That ("now") &c.; resolved in the affirmative; Bill read 2ª
Committee *; Report *July* 28
Read 3ª * *July* 28
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 116]

Poor Relief (Metropolis) Bill—Irregularity
Complaint, Lord Claud Hamilton; Answer, Mr. Speaker *July* 21, [176] 1796

Poor Relief—Select Committee

Select Committee appointed *Feb* 19, "To inquire into the administration of the Relief of the Poor, under the Orders, Rules, and Regulations issued by the Poor Law Commissioners and the Poor Law Board, pursuant to the provisions of the Poor Law Amendment Act, and into the operation of the Laws relating to the relief of the Poor" (*Mr. Villiers*)

Committee nominated *Feb* 24 :—Mr. Villiers (Chairman), Sir John Acton, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Bouverie, Sir G. Bowyer, Mr. Caird, Lord R. Cecil, Lord Fermoy, Lord Edward Howard, Sir William Jolliffe, Mr. Locke, Mr. Lowe, Mr. Lyall, Mr. Kekewich, Mr. Neate, Colonel Pennant, Mr. Alderman Sidney, Mr. Tollemache, and Mr. Walpole

After short debate, Mr. Buller added *Feb* 29 ; Sir William Miles added *Mar* 2 ; Mr. Ayrton added *Mar* 9

Question, Mr. Goschen ; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *May* 5, [175] 19

Report of Select Committee *May* 31 (No. 349)

Report of Select Committee, Question, Mr. Warner ; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *June* 27, [176] 334

Poor Removal Bill

(*Mr. Villiers, Mr. Gilpin*)

c. Ordered ; read 1° * *July* 18 [Bill 222]

Read 2° * *July* 19

Committee * ; Report *July* 20

Considered as amended * *July* 21

Read 3° * *July* 22

l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Wodehouse*) *July* 22 (No. 239)

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 25, [176] 2002 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to ; Bill read 2ª

Committee * ; Report *July* 26

Read 3ª * *July* 27

Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 105]

Poor's Rate

Motion, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill for more equitable distribution of the Charge on Landed Property for the Relief of the Sick and Destitute, known by the name of Poor's Rate" (*Colonel Bernard*) *Feb* 17, [173] 695 ; after debate, Motion withdrawn

PORTMAN, Lord

Chimney Sweepers, Comm. *cl.* 7, [175] 1133

Collegiate Schools, Facilities for Divine Worship in, 2R. [176] 146

Fortifications—Defences of the Bristol Channel, [175] 1046

Improvement of Land, Comm. [175] 1826

Mortgage Debentures, Comm. [175] 1048 ; *cl.* 32, Amendt. 1053

Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, [175] 1347

Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, 2R. [176] 1788

Portpatrick Harbour

Question, Mr. Torrens ; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *May* 27, [175] 719

Portsea Island (Rights of Way) Bill

(*Marquess of Hartington, The Judge Advocate*)

c. Ordered ; read 1° * *July* 20 [Bill 229]

Bill withdrawn *July* 22

Portsmouth Dockyard (Acquisition of Lands) Bill

(*Lord Clarence Paget, Mr. Childers*)

c. Read 1° * *June* 15 [Bill 152]

Read 2° * and referred to Select Committee *June* 27

Select Committee nominated *July* 4 :—Mr. Childers, Mr. Corry, Sir Francis Baring, Captain Talbot, Mr. Stansfeld, Sir James Elphinstone, and Five Members to be nominated by the Committee of Selection

Report * *July* 12 and re-committed [Bill 200]

Committee * ; Report *July* 14

Read 3° * *July* 18

l. Read 1ª * *July* 19 (No. 215)

Read 2ª * *July* 23

Committee * ; Report *July* 26

Read 3ª * *July* 27

Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 103]

Portugal, British Claims on

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 15 ; Motion for Address for, Copy of the Papers relating to the claims of British subjects in respect of the Union Mercantile Company" (*Mr. Ayrton*), [176] 1593 ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Postmaster General, Office of

Moved, "That the practice of appointing a Peer and Privy Councillor exclusively to the office of Postmaster General, is one which is not directed or required by law, and does not particularly conduce to the convenience of the distribution of Ministerial appointments, or to the efficiency of the Public Service" (*Mr. Darby Griffith*) *July* 12, (House counted out)

Post Office

Estimate for Post Office Packet Service 1864-5 (*Parl. P.* No. 105)

Australian Postage, Question, Lord A. Churchill ; Answer, Mr. Peel *June* 21, [176] 36 ; Question, Lord A. Churchill ; Answer, Mr. Peel *July* 15, 1573

Galway Packet Service, Question, Mr. Baxter ; Answer, Mr. Peel *Mar* 4, [173] 1455

Mail Packet Contracts—The West India Colonies, Question, Mr. Cave ; Answer, Mr. Peel *April* 25, [174] 1548 ; Question, Mr. Cave ; Answer, Mr. Peel *April* 21, 1421

Mails, Departure of, from Southampton, Question, Mr. H. Berkeley ; Answer, Mr. Peel *April* 5, [174] 477

Mails in the Provinces, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 4, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the Post Office, with an especial view to the improvement of existing arrangements for the transmission of Mails in the Provincial Districts" (*Mr. Richard Long*), [174] 402 ; after long debate, Question, "That the words, &c." put, and agreed to

[*cont.*

Post Office—cont.
  Portpatrick Harbour — Temporary Arrangements, Question, Mr. Torrens; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *May* 27, [175] 719
  Saturday Half Holiday, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Mr. Peel *May* 2, [174] 1976
  Transmission of Letters on Sunday, Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. Peel *Mar* 3, [173] 1365

POTTER, Mr. E., *Carlisle*
  Factory Acts Extension, Comm. [175] 1946
  Ways and Means—Sugar Duties, Report, [174] 1164

POWELL, Mr. F. S., *Cambridge*
  Army Estimates—Survey, [175] 234, 236
  Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Comm. [176] 300
  Charitable Estates and Trusts Acts, Returns moved for, [173] 491
  Charity Commissioners, Comm. moved for, [175] 1865
  Church Building Acts, [174] 184
  Church Building, &c. Acts Amendment, 2R. [175] 1526
  Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. *cl.* 12, [175] 1484
  Collegiate Schools, Facilities for Divine Service in, 2R. [176] 1778
  Education, Res. [173] 1667;—(Inspectors' Reports), Res. [176] 2078
  Factory Acts Extension, Comm. *cl.* 3, [175] 1941
  Factory Inspectors, Reports of, [174] 1501
  Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1526
  Parks, Public Meetings in the, [175] 777
  Private Bills, Res. 6, [173] 676
  South Kensington, Buildings at, [174] 1287
  Supply — Repair of Furniture, [175] 416;—Royal Parks, &c. 424;—Houses of Parliament, 430;—Land, &c. Kensington Gore, 866, 867;—Zambesi Expedition, 1897;—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [176] 396

POWELL, Mr. J. J., *Gloucester*
  Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, [174] 1259
  United States—Seizure of the "Tuscaloosa," Res. [174] 1808

POWIS, Earl of
  Admiralty Lands and Works, Comm. *cl.* 14, Amendt. [175] 1350, 1351
  Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Papers moved for, [173] 164
  Metropolitan Railways, [173] 159
  Patents, Museum and Library of, [173] 706
  Poor Relief (Metropolis), 2R. [176] 2128
  Public Schools, 2R. [175] 1251; Comm. 1633
  Public Works (Manufacturing Districts), 2R. [176] 2001

Prevention of Trespasses (Scotland) Bill
  (*The Duke of Argyll*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 26 (No. 60)

PRICE, Mr. R. G., *New Radnor*
  Customs and Inland Revenue, Consid. *cl.* 12, [174] 1986

Printing Committee
  Select Committee appointed *Feb* 5: Committee—Sir John Pakington, Sir Francis Baring, Mr. Walpole, Mr. Henley, Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Sotheron Estcourt, Mr. Bonham-Carter, Mr. Divett, Mr. Gaskell, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Greene, Mr. Peel, The O'Conor Don, and Mr. Hastings Russell (*Mr. Hastings Russell*)

Prison Ministers Act
  Motion for Address for "Copies of any Papers concerning the Proceedings of the Middlesex Magistrates, with reference to the Prison Ministers Act" (*Mr. Hennessy*) *July* 29, [176] 2195; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Private Bill Costs Bill
  (*Mr. Scourfield, Mr. Massey*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 18 [Bill 221]
  Bill withdrawn* *July* 20

Private Bills (LORDS)
  Standing Order Committee on, appointed *Feb* 9: Committee:—Ld. President, D. Somerset, M. Winchester, M. Bath, M. Ailesbury, L. Steward, E. Devon, E. Airlie, E. Hardwicke, E. Carnarvon, E. Romney, E. Chichester, E. Powis, E. Verulam, E. De Grey, E. Stradbroke, E. Amherst, L. Chamberlain, V. Eversley, L. Camoys, L. Saye and Sele, L. Colville of Culross, L. Ponsonby, L. Wycombe, L. Sondes, L. Foley, L. Dinevor, L. Wodehouse, L. Sheffield, L. Colchester, L. Silchester, L. De Tabley, L. Wynford, L. Portman, L. Stanley of Alderley, L. Aveland, L. Belper, L. Ebury, L. Churston, L. Egerton, with the Chairman of Committees
  Sessional Order thereon *Feb* 15, [173] 544 (No. 8)

Private Bills Opposed (LORDS)
  The Lords following—namely, L. Colville of Culross, L. Ponsonby, L. Colchester, L. Stanley of Alderley, were appointed*, with the Chairman of Committees, a Committee to select and propose to the House the names of the Five Lords to form a Select Committee for the Consideration of each Opposed Private Bill *Feb* 25
  Ordered *April* 21, on Motion of Lord Redesdale, That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after *Thursday*, the 30*th Day of June next*

Private Bills
  Ordered, That the Standing Orders relating to Private Bills be dispensed with for the Remainder of the Session (*The Chairman of Commitees* *July* 26, [176] 2101; Motion agreed to

Private Bills—Resolutions (COMMONS)
  Resolutions (*The President of the Board of Trade*) *Feb* 16
173] First Resolution, 645
  . Amendt. (*Lord Robert Cecil*) 647; after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Main Question put, and agreed to *Feb* 16

[*cont.*

Private Bills—Resolutions—cont.
Second Resolution, 663
Amendt. (*Mr. Hadfield*); Question put, "That those words be there added," A. 42, N. 65; M. 23; Main Question put, and agreed to
Third Resolution, 664
Amendt. (*Mr. R. Hodgson*); after debate, Question put, "That the words, &c." A. 135, N. 4; M. 131
Main Question put, and agreed to, 666
Fourth Resolution agreed to, 672
Fifth Resolution, 672
"That the Speaker be requested to revise the list of charges for Parliamentary Agents; after short debate, agreed to
Sixth Resolution, 676; after short debate, agreed to
Seventh Resolution, 677
Amendt. to leave out "eleven" and insert "twelve" (*Mr. Hassard*); after short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn

Private Bills — Fees to Parliamentary Counsel
Questions, Sir William Miles, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Feb* 29, 1252; Question, Colonel Wilson Patten; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Mar* 8, 1654

Private Bills
Standing Order (No. 142) read
175] Moved, "That the said Standing Order be repealed" (*Lord Stanley*) *June* 3, 1134; after debate, Question put, and negatived
Committees on, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 10, To leave out from "That" and add "in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the duty of ascertaining the facts upon which legislation in respect to Private Bills is to proceed should be discharged by some tribunal external to this House" (*Lord Robert Cecil*), 1545; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn
See *Standing Orders*

PROBY, Rt. Hon. Lord (Comptroller of the Household), *Wicklow Co.*
Address in Answer to the Speech—Her Majesty's Answer, [173] 321
Denmark and Germany—Her Majesty's Answer to the Address, [176] 1322

Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Captain Stacpoole*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 19 [Bill 38]
Read 2° * *April* 28
Committee *; Report *May* 2
Read 3° * *May* 4 [Bill 74]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *May* 6
Read 2ª * *May* 9 (No. 68)
Committee *; Report *May* 10
Read 3ª * *May* 12
Royal Assent *May* 13 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 20]

Prosecutions, Cost of
Question, Sir Jervoise Jervoise; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 14, [174] 968

Proxy Papers, Stamp on
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 4, "That the Stamp on Proxy Papers, used for the purpose of voting in Public Companies, Associations, and Charities, being a Tax which impedes the exercise of a franchise, might conveniently be reduced to one penny" (*Mr. Darby Griffith*), [173] 1459; after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 14, [174] 971

Public Accounts (Standing Committee)
Committee on Public Accounts nominated:—Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie (Chairman), Mr. Walpole, Sir Henry Willoughby, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Howes, Mr. Peel, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Cobden, and Mr. Pollard-Urquhart *Mar* 7. Mr. Cobden disch., Lord Robert Montagu added *April* 8

Public Buildings—Payment of Rates and Taxes by Officers occupying
Question, Colonel North; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 3, [174] 2050

Public Executions
Motion for an Address for Papers (*Mr. Hibbert*) *Feb* 23, [173] 941; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Public Houses—Closing on Sundays
Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, Mr. Somes *May* 3, [174] 2055

Public Lands and Buildings (Local Rates)
Question, Colonel North; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 10, [173] 1761; Question, Mr. Alderman Salomons; Answer, Mr. Cowper *Feb* 28, 1068
Motion, "That, in the opinion of this House, all Lands and Buildings used and occupied for Public purposes should be assessed to Local Rates, and pay Rates accordingly" (*Mr. Alderman Salomons*) *April* 5, [174] 479; after long debate, Question put, A. 30, N. 52; M. 22

Public Meetings in the Parks — The Police
Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 12, [175] 366; Observations, Mr. Whalley; Reply, Sir George Grey *May* 27, 769
Instructions to Police (*Parl. P.* No. 272)

Public Offices—Saturday Half Holiday
Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *July* 18, [176] 1622

Public Petitions (Sessional Committee)
Mr. Gregson (Chairman), Mr. Bonham-Carter, Sir J. Fergusson, Mr. C. Forster, Mr. Gard, Major Gavin, Captain Gray, Sir E. Grogan, Mr. Hope-Johnstone, Mr. Lyall, Mr. Miller, Sir C. O'Loghlen, Mr. Hastings Russell, Mr. Alderman Salomons, Mr. Owen Stanley

Public and Refreshment Houses (Metropolis) Bill—*Afterwards*—
Public and Refreshment Houses Bill
(*Sir George Grey, Mr. Baring*)
174] *c.* Ordered * *May* 3, 119
Read 1° * *May* 4 [Bill 92]
175] Read 2°, after short debate, *May* 27, 777
Committee *; Report *June* 6
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report * *June* 13
Read 3° * *June* 16 [Bill 132]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *June* 17
Read 2ª *July* 1 (No. 135)
176] Bill considered in Committee *July* 5, 822
Amendts. reported *July* 11, 1312; after debate, Report agreed to
Bill read 3ª *July* 14, 1447
Amendt. *cl.* 2 (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) negatived; Bill passed
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 64]

Public Schools Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Clarendon*)
175] *l.* Presented; read 1ª *May* 30, 778 (No. 100)
Read 2ª, after long debate, *June* 6, 1236
Considered in Committee, after debate, *June* 13, 1625; Amendts. made (No. 128)
Report * *June* 14
Read 3ª, after short debate, *June* 20, 1829
c. Read 1° * *June* 23 [Bill 168]
176] Bill read 2°, after short debate, *July* 4, 818
Committee *; Report *July* 7
Considered as amended * *July* 8
Read 3° * *July* 11
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 92]

Public Schools Commission
c. Resolution, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 6, To leave out from "That" and add "the state of the higher School Education in England is not satisfactory, and calls for the early attention of Her Majesty's Government" (*Mr. Grant Duff*), [175] 105; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Motion withdrawn
l. Motion for an Address for "Copies of any Minute of the Board of Treasury or Resolution of the Committee of the Privy Council relative to the Second Report of the Public Schools Commission" (*Earl Stanhope*) *May* 27, [175] 699; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Public Works (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Peel, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 9 [Bill 101]

Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) Bill
(*Mr. Villiers, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
176] *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *July* 13 [Bill 204]
Read 2° * *July* 15
Committee * *July* 18; Report * *July* 19
Considered as amended * *July* 20
Read 3° * *July* 21
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 22 (No. 237)
Read 2ª, after short debate, *July* 25, [176] 2001
Committee *; Report *July* 26
Read 3ª * *July* 27
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 104]

Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) [*Advances*]
c. Resolution in Committee (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *July* 18, [176] 1698

PUGH, Mr. D., *Carmarthenshire*
Mails in the Provinces, Comm. moved for, [174] 406
Private Bills, Committees on, Res. [175] 1571
Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 1004
Supply—Public Education, [176] 556

Punishment of Death
Motion, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the expediency of maintaining the Punishment of Death" (*Mr. William Ewart*) *May* 3, [174] 2055; Amendt. to leave out from "The" and add "operation of the Laws relating to Capital Punishment" (*Lord Henry Lennox*), 2070; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn
Resolved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into the provisions and operation of the Laws under which the Punishment of Death is now inflicted in the United Kingdom, and the manner in which it is inflicted; and to report whether it is desirable to make any alteration therein" (*Mr. Neate*)
Answer to Address [*May* 3], reported * *May* 9

Punishment of Rape Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess of Westmeath*)
173] *l.* Presented, and, after short debate, read 1ª *Mar* 7, 1529 (No. 22)
174] Read 2ª, after short debate, *April* 12, 859
Considered in Committee *April* 14
cl. 1 (In convictions for rape, whipping may be added to other punishment), 959; Amendt. to omit ("may") and insert ("shall") (*Lord Wensleydale*); after short debate, Amendt. agreed to (with a consequent Amendt.); *cl.* agreed to
Remaining clauses agreed to
Amendt. reported *April* 19, 1281 (No. 52)
A further Amendt. made (*The Earl of Carnarvon*)
Read 3ª *April* 28
Amendt. to reinstate ("may") in lieu of ("shall") (*Lord Wodehouse*), 1757; after short debate, Question, Cont. 55, Not-Cont. 20; M. 35; resolved in the affirmative; Bill passed
List of the Cont. and Not-Cont. 1759
c. Read 1° * June 16 [Bill 157]
Read 2° * *June* 20
176] Order for Committee read; Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Sir Stafford Northcote*) *July* 6, 941; Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "this House will, upon this day three months, &c." (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*); after further dedate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 78, N. 84; M. 6; words added; Main Question, as amended, agreed to; Bill put off for three months

Queen's Plates

Motion, "That, as the annual grant of sums of money voted by this House for Queen's Plates no longer encourages the Breed of good horses, the object for which it was originally given, it should, for the future, be discontinued" (*Mr. Percy Wyndham*) *June* 28, [176] 437; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Rags, Duty on, in Foreign Countries

Question, Lord Stanley; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 19, [173] 794

Italy, Question, Mr. Black; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *April* 22, [174] 1503

Railway Bills—Traffic Agreements

Ordered, after short debate, "That the clauses be referred to the General Committee on Railway and Canal Bills; and that it be an Instruction to the Committee that they do report to the House their opinion, whether the said clauses (with such Amendments as may be proposed by the Committee) may with advantage be inserted in all Bills containing powers to Companies to 'enter into Traffic Agreements,' or to 'work Railways and Steamboats,' respectively" (*Mr. R. Hodgson*) *April* 26, [174] 1618

Railway and Canal Bills

Question, Mr. Richard Hodgson; Answer, Lord Stanley *May* 6, [175] 101

Railway and Canal Bills—General Committee on

Lord Stanley (Chairman), Mr. Adair, Mr. H. J. Baillie (Inverness), Sir Francis Goldsmid, Sir John Hanmer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Hassard, Mr. Frederick North, Mr. Rogers, Mr. Scholefield, Mr. Scourfield, Mr. Perry Watlington, Mr. Woodd

Railway Companies Borrowing Powers

Question, The Earl of Donoughmore; Answer, Earl Granville *Mar* 1, [173] 1317

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to continue the Inquiry commenced last Session, &c.;" agreed to (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) *May* 27

Committee nominated, Ld. President, D. Devonshire, Ld. Steward, E. Airlie, E. Macclesfield, E. Powis, E. Belmore, V. Hutchinson, L. Wodehouse, L. Redesdale, L. Stanley of Alderley, L. Dartrey, L. Overstone, L. Chelmsford, L. Taunton

Report of Select Committee (*Parl. P.* No. 127)

Railway Companies Powers

Select Committee appointed *Feb* 8, "To inquire and report whether it is expedient that Railway Companies shall be authorized, and if so, upon what conditions, to construct or enlarge, purchase, or take on lease or otherwise appropriate, any Dock, Pier, Harbour or Ferry, or to acquire, provide, and use any Steam Vessels for the conveyance of goods and passengers, or to apply any portion of their capital or revenue to other objects distinct from the undertaking of a Railway Company" (*Mr. Massey*), [173] 300

[*cont.*

Railway Companies Powers—cont.

Committee nominated *Mar* 3:—Lord Stanley (Chairman), Mr. Hutt, Mr. Algernon Egerton, Mr. Richard Hodgson, Mr. Clay, Sir Francis Goldsmid, Mr. Adair, Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Lygon, Mr. Kinnaird, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart, and Mr. Massey

Report of Select Committee *Mar* 18 (*Parl. P.* No. 141)

Railway Companies Powers Bill

(*Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Hutt*)

c. Ordered* *Feb* 16; read 1° * *Feb* 22 [Bill 30]

Read 2° * *May* 12

Committee *; Report *May* 19 [Bill 110]

Committee * (on re-comm.); Report *June* 6

Read 3° * *June* 8

l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 9 (No. 121)

Read 2ª; and referred to a Select Committee *July* 7

Select Committee nominated *July* 8:—D. Devonshire, D. Buckingham and Chandos, E. Devon, E. Romney, E. Grey, E. Stradbroke, V. Hutchinson, L. Camoys, L. Wodehouse, L. Redesdale, L. Stanley of Alderley, L. Belper, L. Lyveden, L. Taunton

Report of Select Comm. *July* 22 (No. 229)

Bill reported *July* 22

As amended by Select Committee (No. 230)

Committee* *July* 23; Report* *July* 25

Read 3ª * *July* 26

l. Returned from Commons, with some of the Amendments, agreed to; some agreed to with Amendments; some disagreed to, *July* 28, [176] 2156

Commons Reasons for disagreeing considered; on Question, Whether to insist? Resolved in the affirmative; Commons Amendments considered; some agreed to, the rest disagreed to

Returned from Commons with Amendments not insisted on *July* 28

Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 120]

Railway Passengers Assurance Company Bill [H.L.]

Report * *June* 15

Read 3° * *June* 20

Royal Assent *June* 23 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 125]

Railway Schemes (*Metropolis*) (Lords)

173] Question, The Earl of Powis; Answer, Earl Granville *Feb* 5, 159; Observations, The Earl of Donoughmore; Reply, Earl Granville *Feb* 22, 848

Message from the Commons *Feb* 9, 311

Commons Message considered *Feb* 11, 454

After debate, "Select Committee appointed to join with the Select Committee appointed by the Commons, as mentioned in the said Message, to consider the best Method of Dealing with the Railway Schemes proposed to be sanctioned within the Limits of the Metropolis by Bills to be introduced in the present Session, and to report their Opinion whether any, and, if any, what Schemes should not be proceeded with during the present Session" (*Earl Granville*) *Feb* 11, 454

[*cont.*

Railway Schemes (*Metropolis*)—cont.

173] Committee : — Lord President, E. Romney, V. Eversley, L. Redesdale, L. Stanley of Alderley.

Message sent to the Commons

Joint Select Committee, Message from the Commons *Feb* 12, 493

Ordered, "That the Select Committee, appointed by this House to join with the Select Committee appointed by the Commons to consider the Metropolitan Railway Schemes, have Power to agree in the Appointment of a Chairman of such Committee"

Report of the Select Committee of last Session referred to Select Committee *Feb* 15

Report from the Select Committee presented (*The Lord President*); Observations, Earl Granville *Feb* 29, 1243

Report to be printed No. 10

Report of the Select Committee considered, *Mar* 7, 1540 ; Motion thereon

Railway Schemes (*Metropolis*)—The Sessional Order of the 21st of April last dispensed with ; then Standing Order No. 179, Sec. 4, considered and dispensed with in respect to any Metropolitan Railway Bill which has been or may be brought from the House of Commons during the present Session (*The Chairman of Committees*)* *July* 12

Railway Schemes (*Metropolis*) (Commons)

173] Motion "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the best method of dealing with the Railway Schemes proposed to be sanctioned within the limits of the Metropolis by Bills to be introduced in the present Session, and to report their opinion whether any, and, if any, what schemes should not be proceeded with during the present Session" (*Mr. Milner Gibson*) *Feb* 8, 283

Motion, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Sir John Shelley*), 293 ; after long debate, Motion withdrawn ; Main Question put, and agreed to

Committee nominated :—Mr. Milner Gibson, Lord Stanley, Mr. Massey, Colonel Wilson Patten, and Mr. Herbert

Message to be sent to the Lords, "That this House hath appointed a Committee, consisting of Five Members, to join with a Committee of the Lords, 299

Standing Order, No. 172, suspended *Feb* 8, 299

Message from the Lords, "that they have appointed a Select Committee to join with a Committee of this House," brought up (*Mr. Milner Gibson*) *Feb* 12, 500

Order made thereon, "That the Committee have power to agree to the appointment of a Chairman of the joint Committee"

Report of the Select Committee *Feb* 29, No. 87

Motion, "That the following Bills be not proceeded with in the present Session—namely, Victoria Station and Thames Embankment Railway, Oxford Street and City Railway, London Main Trunk Underground Railway, Charing Cross (Northern) Railway, Charing Cross (Western) Railway, Tottenham and Hampstead Junction Railway (Extension to Charing Cross), London Union Railways, Tottenham and Farringdon Street Railway" (*Mr. Milner Gibson*) *Mar* 8, 1634

[*cont.*

Railway Schemes (*Metropolis*)—cont.

Amendt. after "London Main Trunk Underground Railway," to insert "except

175] Schemes Nos. 1 and 2" (*Mr. Ayrton*), 1640 ; Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and negatived ; Amendt. to leave out "Charing Cross (Western) Railway" (*Sir Joseph Paxton*), 1642 ; Question, "That the words, &c." put, and agreed to *Mar* 8

Amendt. to add "and so much of the Metropolitan District Railways Bill, No. 33, as refers to the proposed works situated to the eastward of Blackfriars Bridge, together with the Metropolitan District Railways Bill, No. 34" (*Mr. Crawford*) *Mar* 8, 1644 ; Question put, "That those words be there added ;" A. 76, N. 277 ; M. 201 ; Main Question put, and agreed to

Companies Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, Question, Mr. Crawford ; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Mar* 15, [174] 17

Metropolitan Railways—Working Class Trains, Petition from the Vestry of St. George's, Southwark, praying for the compulsory establishment of cheap trains upon Metropolitan Railways, presented (*The Earl of Derby*)

174] *April* 5, 446 ; short debate thereon

Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee on every Railway Bill providing for the Construction of any new Railway within the Metropolis to insert in the Bill Provisions analogous to those contained in the North London Railway Act, 24 & 25 *Vict.* c. 196, s. 45, for the purpose of securing to the Labouring Classes a cheap Transit to and from their labour by a Morning and Evening Train, with such Modifications as may appear to be required by the Circumstances of each case" (*The Earl of Derby*) *April* 22, 1488 ; after debate, Motion agreed to

Parl. Papers—

Report of Engineer, Board of Works No. 59

Report of Select Committee . . . No. 87

Report of Board of Trade . . . . [3249]

Report of Colonel Yolland . . . . [3259]

London Main Trunk Underground Railway Bill, Motion for an Instruction to Committee (*Mr. Ayrton*) *April* 15, and, after short debate, agreed to, 1075

Railway Travelling (Ireland) Bill

(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Colonel Vandeleur, Mr. Monsell, Colonel Dickson, Captain Stacpoole*)

c. Ordered* *June* 7 ; read 1° * *June* 8 [Bill 137]

Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*) *June* 20, [175] 2102 ; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Blake*), 2106 ; Question proposed, "That 'now' &c. ;" after short debate, Question put, A. 21, N. 40 ; M. 19 ; words added ; Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Second Reading put off for three months

Railways

176] *Briggs, Mr., Murder of, on the North London Railway,* Question, Mr. C. S. Butler ; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 12, 1389

[*cont.*

Railways—cont.

176] *Communication with Railway Guards*, Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *July* 12, 1388; Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *July* 14, 1468
. *Egham Railway Accident*, Question, Sir R. Bulkeley; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *July* 27, 335
. *Offences in Railway Carriages*, Question, Lord Brougham; Answer, Earl Granville *July* 14, 1439

Railways Construction Facilities Bill
(*Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Hutt*)
c. Ordered * *Feb* 16; read 1° * *Feb* 22 [Bill 29]
Read 2° * *May* 12
Committee *; Report *May* 19 [Bill 111]
Committee (on Re-Comm.) *June* 6, [175] 1336; after short debate, Committee R.P.
Considered in Committee *June* 9, 1528
Motion, "That the 9th clause be struck out" (*Mr. Whalley*); Motion, "That the Chairman do report Progress and ask leave to sit again" (*Viscount Galway*); after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Comm. R.P.
Committee *; Report *June* 20
Considered as amended * *June* 23
Read 3° * *June* 27
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 28 (No. 160)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 9, [176] 949
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this day six months") (*The Duke of Buckingham*), 949; after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; original Motion agreed to
Read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee
Committee:—D. Devonshire, D. Buckingham and Chandos, E. Devon, E. Romney, E. Grey, E. Stradbroke, V. Hutchinson, L. Camoys, L. Wodehouse, L. Redesdale, L. Stanley of Alderley, L. Belper, L. Lyveden, L. Taunton
Report of Select Comm. *July* 22 (No. 229)
Bill reported *July* 22
Committee * *July* 23; Report *July* 25
Read 3ª * *July* 26
l. Commons Reasons considered; on Question, Whether to insist? Resolved in the affirmative; Commons Amendment considered, and disagreed to *July* 28
c. Lords Amendments considered; several agreed to; several disagreed to; several amended, and agreed to *July* 28
l. Bill returned from the Commons *July* 28
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 121]

Railways (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Peel, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 9 [Bill 99]
Read 2° * *June* 2
Committee * *June* 6 R.P.
Committee *; Report *June* 24
Considered as amended * *June* 30
Read 3° * *July* 1
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Steward*) *July* 4
Read 2ª * *July* 14 (No. 178)
Committee *; Report *July* 15
Read 3ª * *July* 18
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 71]

RAMSDEN, Sir J. W., *Yorkshire, W. R.*
Bleaching and Dyeing Works Acts Amendment, 2R. [176] 1364

Rates and Taxes, Payment of, by Officers in Government Houses
Question, Colonel North; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 3, [174] 2050

RAVENSWORTH, Lord
Alkali Works Regulation, [176] 253, 255
Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Papers moved for, [173] 162
Metropolitan Turnpikes, Abolition of, [176] 479
Public Schools, Comm. [175] 1628
Rape, Punishment of, 2R. [174] 860; Comm. *cl.* 1, 959

REDESDALE, Lord (Chairman of Committees)
Brokers Bonds and Rents, 2R. [176] 410
Burial Service, Comm. moved for, [176] 1310
Charitable Assurances Enrolment, 2R. [174] 721
Chimney Sweepers, Comm. [175] 1132
Government Offices, The New, [176] 1450
Improvement of Land, Comm. [175] 1828
Land Securities Company, 2R. [174] 1279; Amendt. 1281
London City Tithes, 2R. [176] 480
Malt for Animals, 2R. [174] 7
Mortgage Debentures, 2R. [174] 1594, 1595; Comm. [175] 1048
Peers' Robing Room — Mr. Herbert, Paper moved for, [176] 2002
Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2), 2R. [176] 1999, 2000
Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, 2R. [176] 1787
Poor Relief (Metropolis), 2R. Amendt. [176] 2129
Poor Removal, 2R. [176] 2002
Prorogation, The, [176] 2150
Public and Refreshment Houses, Report, [176] 1312, 1316
Public Schools, Comm. [175] 1633
Railway Companies Powers, Commons Amendts. Amendt. [176] 2156
Railway Construction Facilities, 2R. [176] 950
Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [173] 458
Regius Professorship of Greek (Oxford), Comm. Previous Question moved, [175] 452
Royal Arcade, 2R. [173] 849, 856
Sentences of Death, 2R. [175] 256

Registration of County Voters
Select Committee appointed *Feb* 9, "To inquire into the present system of registration of County Voters for Members of Parliament in England and Wales, and whether any and what other provisions should be made for the registration of such Voters" (*Mr. Dodson*)
Committee nominated *Feb* 16
Viscount Enfield nominated *Feb* 16, [173] 681
Motion, "That Mr. Walter be one other Member of the said Committee"
Motion, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Colonel French*), A. 6, N. 48; M. 42

[*cont.*

Registration of County Voters—cont.

Committee: — Mr. Dodson (Chairman), Mr. Walter, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Algernon Egerton, Mr. H. A. Bruce, Vist. Ingestre, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Locke King, Sir Edward Colebrooke, Mr. Longfield, Mr. Collins, Mr. Locke, Mr. Evans, and Mr. Charles Wynn nominated other Members of the Committee (*Mr. Dodson*). Instruction (*Mr. Hunt*) agreed to

Report (*Parl. P.* No. 203)

Registration of County Voters (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Agar-Ellis, Colonel French*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 15 [Bill 49]
Read 2°, after short debate, *April* 6, [174] 530
Committee *; Report *April* 13
Considered as amended * *April* 15
Read 3° * *April* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Dufferin*) (No. 50)
Read 2ª * *April* 28
Committee *; Report *May* 12
Read 3ª * *May* 13
Royal Assent *June* 23 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 22]

Registration of Deeds (Ireland) Bill (*Sir Edward Grogan, Mr. George, Mr. Vance*)

c. Ordered * *June* 14
Read 1° * *June* 27 [Bill 176]
Read 2° *June* 30
Committee *; Report *July* 14
Considered as amended * *July* 15
Read 3° * *July* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Donoughmore*) *July* 19
Read 2ª * *July* 21 (No. 218)
Committee *; Report *July* 22
Read 3ª * *July* 25
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 76]

Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford, Stipend of the

Question, Mr. G. Clive; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 10, [173] 1758; Observations, The Earl of Derby; Reply, The Lord Chancellor; debate thereon *May* 23, [175] 554

Regius Professorship of Greek (Oxford) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Chancellor*)

174] l. Read 1ª *April* 8, 720 (No. 44)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *April* 28, 1760; after long debate, Motion agreed to; Bill read 2ª
175] Moved, "That the House do resolve itself into a Committee on the said Bill" (*The Lord Chancellor*), 442; Amendt. moved, to leave out "now" and insert "this day three weeks" (*The Earl of Carnarvon*) *May* 13; after long debate, on Question, Cont. 25, Not-Cont. 55; M. 30; resolved in the Negative; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 455

Rents (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Longfield, Mr. Leader, Sir C. O'Loghlen*)

c. Ordered *; *Feb* 5; read 1° * *Feb* 8 [Bill 1]
Bill withdrawn *Feb* 24, [173] 1024

Richmond, Duke of
Oyster Fishery (England and Wales), 2R. [176] 482

Ridley, Sir M. W., *Northumberland, N.*
County Bridges, 2R. [175] 352
Highways Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 692
Mails in the Provinces, Comm. moved for, [174] 413
Malt for Cattle, Comm. *add. cl.* [173] 1226
Supply—Civil Services, [174] 292; —Nelson's Column, [175] 852
Yeomanry Cavalry, Res. [173] 1382

Rivers Pollution (Scotland) Bill (*Lord Advocate, Sir G. Grey, Sir W. Dunbar*)

c. Ordered * *May* 2; read 1° * *May* 11 [Bill 106]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 2

Robertson, Mr. D., *Berwickshire*
Scotch Affairs, Administration of, Comm moved for, [175] 1193

Robertson, Mr. H., *Shrewsbury*
Navy Estimates—Naval Establishments, [174] 2028
Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Res. [173] 1647

Roebuck, Mr. J. A., *Sheffield*
Assize Town for the West Riding Circuit, Address moved, [173] 814
Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Res. [176] 101
Death, Punishment of, Comm. moved for, [174] 2109, 2111
Denmark and Germany—The Danish Succession, [173] 833; —Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, 876; —Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 887
Egypt—Suez Canal, [173] 1066
Factory Acts Extension, Comm. [175] 1941, 1946, 1947
Forfeiture of Lands and Goods, 2R. [175] 1808
Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1593; —Mr. H. B. Sheridan, [174] 210; —Privilege, Res. 307; Nomination of Comm. 1479
Great Northern Railway (No. 3), 2R. [173] 643
Home, Mr., and the Roman Government, [175] 839, 843
Intoxicating Liquors (Sale on Sundays), Leave, Amendt. 170; 2R. [175] 1408, 1412, 1413
Ionian Islands—Officials in the, [175] 803
Japan—Bombardment of Kagosima, Res. [173] 392
Jersey Court, Comm. [176] 137
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1481
Police Spy System — Report of Inspectors, [173] 1388
Rape, Punishment of, Comm. [176] 942
Sheffield, Inundation at, [173] 1909
Sierra Leone—Case of Mr. FitzJames, [176] 2103, 2104
Standing Orders Revision, Report, Adj. moved, [176] 2138, 2142; Amendt. 2143, 2146, 2148, 2151
Street Music (Metropolis), Leave, [174] 2117

[*cont.*

ROEBUCK, Mr. J. A.—*cont.*
- Tests Abolition (Oxford), Comm. [175] 1020
- Trespass (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, Adj. moved, [176] 937; *cl.* 3, 938
- United States—Neutrality in America, [173] 1916, 1926
- Ways and Means, Report, [174] 1551
- Weights and Measures (Metric System), Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 104

ROGERS, Mr. J. J., *Helston*
- Colonial Possessions, Annual Report on, [176] 155
- Highway Act, [173] 713
- Tasmania—Gold in, [174] 1625
- Unclaimed Wreck, Proceeds of, [174] 1913; [176] 155

Rome, Passports in
- Question, Mr. Corbally; Answer, Mr. Layard *July* 15, [176] 1574

ROMNEY, Earl of
- Clerks of the Peace, [173] 708
- Public and Refreshment Houses, Report, *cl.* 9, [176] 1314

ROSE, Mr. Ald. W. A., *Southampton*
- Army—Marchwood Powder Magazine, [176] 151
- Chain Cables and Anchors, 2R. [173] 688
- Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [174] 1719
- Death, Punishment of, Comm. moved for, [174] 2079
- Gaols, 2R. [175] 2059
- Government Manufacturing Establishments, Res. [176] 1942
- Greco Conspiracy, The—M. Mazzini, [173] 1260;—Mr. Stansfeld, [174] 325
- Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, 2R. [173] 588, 590
- Navy—Masters in the, Res. [175] 1214
- Supply—Probate Court Registries, [175] 846, 847;—Emigration, 1891, 1892
- Thames Conservancy, 2R. [174] 1559
- United States—Confederate Ship "Georgia," [175] 513
- War Department Clerks—Medical Assistants, [174] 478
- Weighing of Grain (Port of London), 2R. [176] 175

Royal Academy, Report of the Commissioners on—The Exhibition Building
- Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Cowper *Feb* 19, [173] 793

Royal Academy and the South Kensington Museum
- Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Cowper *May* 5, [175] 21; Question, Earl Stanhope; Reply, Lord St. Leonards *June* 24, [176] 236; Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 21, 1808; Observations on Report of Commissioners, *Parl. P.* [3332]
- See *National Gallery—Supply*
  - *Land, &c. at Kensington Gore—Supply*
  - *New National Gallery at Burlington House—Supply*

Royal Arcade Bill
- Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*Lord Redesdale*) *Feb* 22, [173] 849; Amendt. moved to leave out "now," and insert "this day six months" (*The Earl of Derby*); after debate, Question, That "now" stand part of the Motion; resolved in the negative; and Bill to be read 2ª on this day six months

Royal Forests, The
- Question, Mr. Torrens; Reply, Mr. Peel *June* 3, [175] 1199
- Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 3, To leave out from "That" and add "there be laid before this House, a Copy of any Orders or Correspondence regarding inclosures in the Royal Forests in Essex since, or in consequence of, the Report of the Select Committee of last Session" (*Mr. Torrens*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, Mr. Peel *June* 23, [176] 154; Observations, Mr. Cox, and other hon. Members; Reply, Mr. Peel *July* 1, 647
- *Chigwell Recreation Ground*, Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, Mr. Peel *May* 2, [174] 2023

Royal Horticultural Society
- Question, Sir William Gallwey; Answer, Mr. Cowper *July* 7, [176] 952

RUSSELL, Earl (Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs)
- Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 41, 43, 70
- Anderson, Rev. F., Papers moved for, [175] 1229, 1230
- Brazilian Slave Trade, [176] 413
- China—Death of Lieutenant Tinling, [173] 451
- Collegiate Schools, Facilities for Divine Worship in, 2R. [176] 147
- Confederate States—British Consuls in the, [174] 457
- Conspiracy against the Emperor of the French, [173] 1242
- Cuba Slave Trade, [176] 1614
- Denmark and Germany—Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 308, 309, 558, 1062;—Invasion of Jutland, 1159, 1161;—War contributions in, [175] 440, 441, 610;—The Correspondence, [173] 1616, 1619, 1621;—Austrian Fleet in the Baltic, 1628, 1631;—Affairs of, [174] 293, 533;—Bombardment of Sonderborg, 532, 1276; Res. 754, 758, 772, 774, 776, 785;—The Conference, 1417, 1419; [175] 176, 177; [176] 140;—The Armistice, [175] 1439, 1921, 1928;—Ministerial Statement, [176] 302, 317;—Alleged Prussian Atrocities, [176] 821, 1076;—Vote of Censure, Res. 1166, 1169, 1170;—Massacre of Swedes at Duppel, 1366, 1367
- Foreign Affairs, [176] 2093
- Holy Alliance, alleged Revival of the, [176] 684, 685, 1887
- Japan, Res. [176] 591
- Metropolitan Railways, [174] 448
- Poland, Res. [175] 183
- Russia—The Circassians, [175] 1048

[*cont.*

Russell, Earl—*cont.*
United States—Correspondence with the Federal Government, [173] 310, 311, 436, 438;—Explanation, 544, 548, 549, 1056, 1059, 1061;—British and American Claims, Returns moved for, 624, 627, 629, 634;—Federal Recruiting in Ireland, Papers moved for, 1324; [174] 297, 299, 449, 533;—The "Kearsarge," Papers moved for, 297, 299, 449, 533;—Law of Prize, 1606;—Steam Rams in the Mersey, Papers moved for, 1892, 1897, 1913;—Kidnapping Foreign Subjects for Military Service, [175] 353;—Enlistment of Irish Immigrants, Papers moved for, 1448, 1449, 1454;—Case of Mr. Levey, [176] 4, 5
White, Captain Melville, Case of, [173] 302, 1063

Russell, Mr. A. J. E., *Tavistock*
Weighing of Grain (Port of London), 2R. [176] 166

Russell, Mr. F. C. Hastings, *Bedfordshire*
County Franchise, Leave, [173] 941

Russo-American Telegraph, The
Question, Mr. Watkin; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 30, [175] 802

Rutland, Duke of
Royal Academy, The, [176] 249

St. Asaph, Bishop of
Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Papers moved for, [173] 167

St. David's, Bishop of
Regius Professorship of Greek (Oxford), Comm. [175] 453

St. Germans, Earl of (Lord Steward of the Household)
Park Lane, Crowded State of, [175] 1234
Royal Arcade, 2R. [173] 853
Vestry Cess Abolition (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1900; Comm. *cl.* 4, [174] 9

St. James's Park, Road round
Observations, Sir William Fraser; Reply, Mr. Cowper *Mar* 11, [173] 1894

St. Leonards, Lord
Attorneys and Solicitors Remuneration, 2R. [176] 12
County Courts Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 567
Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, 2R. [173] 1243
Judgments, &c. Law Amendment, 3R. [176] 2083
Land, Improvement of, Comm. [175] 1826, 1828
Royal Academy, The, [176] 244
Union Assessment Committee Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 1339

St. Mary's Burial Ground, Sydenham
Question, Sir George Grey; Answer, Mr. Newdegate *Mar* 11, [173] 1827
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 8, "To leave out 'That' and add 'a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the Allegations contained in the Petition of Mr. Alfred Smee, which was presented upon the 19th day of February last, relative to the Saint Mary's, Sydenham, Burial Ground; and further into the existence, increase, and nature of the Conventual and Monastic Communities, Societies, or Institutions in England, Wales, and Scotland'" (*Mr. Newdegate*), [174] 633; after long debate, Question put, "That the words &c." A. 113, N. 80; M. 33; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 661

Sale of Gas (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Dalglish, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Crum-Ewing*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 30 [Bill 125]
Read 2° * *June* 8
Committee *; Report *June* 17
Considered as amended * *June* 20
Read 3° * *June* 21
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Airlie*) *June* 23 (No. 152)
Read 2ª * *July* 19
Committee *; Report *July* 21
Read 3ª * *July* 22
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 96]

Salisbury Cathedral
Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 17, [174] 177

Salisbury, Marquess of
Denmark and Germany—Vote of Censure, Res. [176] 1169
Penal Servitude, Returns moved for, [173] 919
Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. Amendt. [176] 1784

Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Baring, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 27 [Bill 243]

Salmon Fisheries (England) Act, 1861
Question, Mr. Dutton; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 9, [173] 323; Question, Mr. Percy Wyndham; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring *April* 29, [174] 1915

Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment Bill
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 30
Read 2ª * *July* 5 (No. 167)
Committee *; Report *July* 7
Read 3ª * *July* 8
c. Read 1° * *July* 14 [Bill 210]
Read 2° * *July* 15
Committee *; Report *July* 18
Considered as amended * *July* 25
Read 3° * *July* 26
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 118]

Salomons, Mr. Ald. D., *Greenwich*
Cattle Diseases Prevention, 2R. [173] 1752
City of London Bye-Laws, [174] 966

[*cont.*

Salomons, Mr. Alderman D.—*cont.*
Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1595
Government Buildings, [173] 1068
Great Eastern Northern Junction Railway, 2R. [173] 711
Jews in Morocco, [173] 1454
Metropolitan Traffic, Leave, [175] 980
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [173] 1803
Navy Estimates—Scientific Departments, [173] 1309, 1310;—Naval Establishments at Home, 1314, 1315;—Medicines and Medical Stores, [174] 442
Parochial Assessment Committees, [174] 1422
Partnership Law Amendment, 2R. [174] 1567; Comm. 2126; *cl.* 3, 2128; [175] 241
Public Lands and Buildings (Local Rates), Res. [174] 479, 509
Stamp Duties—Orders on Bankers, [176] 160
Street Music (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 477
Supply—Public Buildings, [175] 414;—Repair of Furniture, 416;—Royal Parks, &c. 419;—Rates for Government Property, 864
Thames Conservancy, Comm. *cl.* 70, Amendt. [176] 415; Lords Amendts. 2154
Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans), Comm. Res. [176] 663

Sat First in Parliament
Feb 4.—The Lord Chesham
James Molyneux Lord Charlemont, after the Death of his Uncle
The Lord Sandys
The Marquess of Normanby
Feb 16.—The Lord Broderick, after the Death of his Brother
Mar 1.—The Earl Strange, after the Death of his Father
Mar 4.—The Marquess of Lansdowne, after the Death of his Father
Apr 21.—The Viscount Sidmouth, after the Death of his Father
May 6.—The Lord Wentworth
June 13.—The Viscount Hereford, after the Death of his Father
June 17.—The Lord Oriel, after the Death of his Father
June 24.—The Marquess Townshend, after the Death of his Father
June 27.—The Duke of Cleveland, after the Death of his Brother
July 7.—The Marquess of Hastings, after the Death of his Father
July 25.—The Viscount Gordon, after the Death of his Father

Scholefield, Mr. W., *Birmingham*
Partnership Law Amendment, 2R. [174] 1559, 1568; Comm. *cl.* 3, [175] 241; *cl.* 4, 242; Adj. moved, 243

Schools of Art — Select Committee — see *Art, Schools of*

Scientific Institutions (*Dublin*)
Motion, That a Select Committee be appointed, "to inquire into the condition of the Scientific Institutions of Dublin which are assisted by Government aid" (*Mr. Gregory*) *April* 11; Motion, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Whiteside*) negatived; Original Question agreed to
[*cont.*

Scientific Institutions (*Dublin*)—cont.
Committee nominated * *April* 18:—Mr. Gregory, Lord Henry Lennox, Sir R. Peel, Mr. Luke White, Mr. Lygon, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Cogan, The O'Conor Don, Mr. O'Reilly, Mr. Dillwyn, Sir Edward Grogan, Mr. George, Mr. Leader, Mr. Lefroy and Mr. Waldron
Report *July* 15 (*Parl. P.* No. 495)

Sclater-Booth, Mr. G., *Hampshire, N.*
Beer Houses (Ireland), 2R. [175] 599; Comm. *cl.* 3, 694
Collection of Taxes, 3R. [175] 2092
Jersey—Laws of, [173] 1069;—Royal Court at, [174] 1772; Comm. [176] 1434
Malt for Cattle, Leave, [173] 228
Night Schools, Inspection of, [173] 1824
Public Lands and Buildings (Local Rates), Res. [174] 486
Rape, Punishment of, Comm. [176] 947
Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2139
Supply—Rates for Government Property, [175] 864;—Lands, &c. Kensington Gore, 867;—New National Gallery at Burlington House, 1321, 1335;—Printing and Stationery, 1679;—Postage of Public Departments, 1681;—Royal Academy of Music, [176] 1608

Scotch Affairs, Administration of
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 3, To leave out from "That" and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire how far the number of the Members of the Administration, charged with the conduct of the affairs of Scotland, and having Seats in Parliament, is commensurate with the requirements of that part of the United Kingdom" (*Sir James Fergusson*), [175] 1174; after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Scott, Lord H. J., *Selkirkshire*
Borough Franchise, 2R. [175] 346
Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [176] 1429

Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal Bill [H.L.]
(*The Duke of Buccleuch*)
l. Presented; read 1^a* *May* 10 (No. 79)
175] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a," 617; Amendt. moved, to leave out "now" and insert "this day three months" (*Bishop of Durham*); after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Original Motion agreed to
Bill read 2^a, and referred to a Select Committee *May* 26
Committee nominated *May* 30:—L. Abp. Canterbury, Ld. Chancellor, L. Abp. York, L. Abp. Armagh, Ld. President, D. Richmond, D. Devonshire, D. Marlborough, E. Derby, E. Doncaster, E. Shaftesbury, E. Airlie, E. Carnarvon, E. Wicklow, E. Powis, E. Nelson, L. Bp. London, L. Bp. Durham, L. Bp. Oxford, L. Lyttelton, L. Redesdale, L. Rossie, L. Overstone, L. Cranworth
Report of Select Committee * *June* 10 (No. 123)
Bill reported * *June* 10 (No. 124)
Committee * *June* 13; Report * *June* 14
Read 3^a* *June* 16
[*cont.*

Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal Bill—cont.

c. Read 1°* *June* 17 [Bill 161]

176] Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir William Heathcote*) *July* 13, 1408

. Amendt. To leave out from "That" and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire how far any privileges which may be conferred upon the Clergy of the Episcopal Church in Scotland would interfere with the Treaty of Union between England and Scotland, and into the expediency of removing at the same time from the Ministers of the Established Church of Scotland the disabilities imposed on them by the Act 13 & 14 *Charles* II. c. 4" (*Mr. Kinnaird*), 1418; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

. Bill considered in Committee *July* 15, 1610

Bill reported

. Bill, as amended, considered *July* 18, 1699

Amendt. to add "or in Ireland, in any Court of Common Law, in the name of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners" (*Sir W. Heathcote*); after short debate, Amendt. agreed to

. Motion, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *July* 21, 1874

Motion, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Kinnaird*), A. 18, N. 40; M. 22

Original Question again proposed

Motion, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Warner*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Original Question again proposed

. Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day month" (*Mr. Whalley*) 1876; Question put, "That 'now,' &c." A. 34, N. 10; M. 24; Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 3°

Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict*. c. 94]

Scourfield, Mr. J. H., *Haverfordwest*

Denmark and Germany—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1245

Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. Schedule, [176] 1874

Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, 2R. [173] 573

Intoxicating Liquors, 2R. [175] 1413

Metropolitan District Railways, 3R. [176] 1621

Private Bills, Res. 1, [173] 661;—Committees on, Res. [175] 1561

Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [173] 293

Standing Orders (Parliamentary Deposits), Comm. moved for, [174] 1618

Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for, [176] 1465; Report, Amendt. 2152, 2153

Turnpike Trusts, Comm. moved for, [173] 1699

Scully, Mr. V., *Cork Co.*

Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1376, 1592; 2R. [175] 1117

Civil Bill Courts (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 37, Amendt. [174] 1556

Emigration from Ireland, [175] 99

Garibaldi, General, Departure of, [174] 1423, 1425

Home, Mr., and the Roman Government, [175] 843

[*cont.*

Scully, Mr. V.—*cont.*

Intoxicating Liquors, 2R. [175] 1421

Ireland—The Constabulary, [173] 1816, 1817;—Daunt's Rock, 1817, 1818;—Outrages in, 1902

Judgments, &c. Law Amendment, 2R. [174] 101

Land, Transfer of (Ireland), [175] 2027

Law Life Assurance Company, [175] 769

Poland, Res. [175] 657

Registration of Titles in Ireland, Address moved, [175] 736, 746

Supply—Civil Service Estimates, [175] 409;—Repair of Furniture, 417;—Royal Parks, &c. 420, 421;—Landed Estates Record Offices, 1677;—Printing and Stationery, 1678;—Postage of Public Departments, 1681

Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [174] 143; Comm. [175] 1022, 1024, 1033

Seely, Mr. C., *Lincoln*

Navy Estimates—Admiralty Office, [173] 1307;—Wages of Artificers at Home, 1967

Selection, Committee of

Committee nominated *Feb* 11:—Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Bonham-Carter, Lord Hotham, Mr. Mowbray, and the Chairman of the Select Committee on Standing Orders

Select Vestries

l. Bill, *pro formâ*, read 1a* *Feb* 4

Selwyn, Mr. C. J., *Cambridge University*

New Law Courts, [174] 1420; [176] 370

New Zealand—War in, Papers moved for, [174] 1656

Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [173] 294

Standing Orders (Parliamentary Deposits), Comm. moved for, [174] 1620

Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [174] 116, 137; Comm. [176] 466

Uniformity Act, Leave, [175] 1384

Sentences of Death Bill

(*The Earl of Ellenborough*)

l. Read 1a, after debate, *April* 22, [174] 1438

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2a" [175] 247 (No. 58)

Bill withdrawn, after debate, *May* 10

Servants Hiring (Scotland) Bill

(*Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Carnegie, Sir Robert Anstruther*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 12 [Bill 108]

Read 2°* *June* 1

175] Committee; Motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 15, 1819

Amendt. To leave out from "That" and add "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr.*

. *Black*), 1821; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Bill considered in

. Committee, 1823

[*cont.*

Servants Hiring (*Scotland*) *Bill*—cont.

175] *c.* Preamble, Amendt. after "months," to insert certain other words (*Sir James Fergusson*); Question put, "That those words, &c.;" A. 116, N. 7; M. 109
Bill reported
Considered as amended * *June* 17
Read 3° * *June* 20
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Privy Seal*) *June* 21
Read 2ª * *June* 27 (No. 146)
Motion, "That the House resolve itself into Committee" withdrawn *June* 30

Settled Estates Act Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*Lord Cranworth*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Mar* 18 (No. 35)
Read 2ª, after short debate, *April* 7, [174] 534
Committee * *April* 8; Report * *April* 14
Read 3ª * *April* 15
c. Read 1° * *June* 9 [Bill 142]
Read 2° * *June* 13
Committee *; Report *June* 23
Considered as amended * *June* 27
Read 3° * *June* 29
l. Commons Amendts. considered *July* 8
Royal Assent *July* 14 [27 & 28 *Vict. c.* 45]
Parl. Papers—*Lords* . . . . No. 35
As amended in Committee . No. 43
As Amended on Report . . No. 47
As Amended by Commons . No. 163

Sewage (*Metropolis*), *&c.*
Select Committee appointed, after debate, "To inquire into any plans for dealing with the Sewage of the Metropolis and other large Towns, with a view to its utilization for agricultural purposes" (*Lord R. Montagu*) *April* 26, [174] 1698
Committee nominated *April* 29:—Lord Robert Montagu (Chairman), Mr. Cowper, Mr. Walpole, Mr. Bright, Mr. Adderley, Sir William Russell, Sir Frederic Smith, Lord Fermoy, Sir Joseph Paxton, Mr. Caird, Mr. Tite, Mr. Leader, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Sclater-Booth, and Dr. Brady. *May* 11, Mr. North and Mr. Ferrand added
Report *July* 14 (*Parl. P.* No. 487)

Sewage of the Metropolis
Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. Cowper *May* 3, [174] 2051

Sewage, &c. (*Metropolis*) *Committee*
Question, Mr. Henley; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 6, [175] 102

SEYMOUR, Mr. A., *Totness*
Russia—Despatches from St. Petersburg, [176] 1389

SEYMOUR, Mr. H. D., *Poole*
Abyssinia—Treatment of the British Consul, [175] 1145
Ashantee—War in, [175] 1840; Res. 1975
British and Foreign State Papers, [176] 1791, 1792
Canon of Westminster, The New, [176] 2158
China—Railways in, [175] 1836
Church Building, &c. Acts Amendment, 2R. [175] 1522

[*cont.*

SEYMOUR, Mr. H. D.—*cont.*
Circassians (Turkey), Papers moved for, [176] 2081
Denmark and Germany—The Conference, [175] 1263
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [176] 1809, 1824, 1825, 1856
Ecclesiastical Commission, [174] 1198
Ecclesiastical Courts, [173] 1784
Ecclesiastical Registry, [175] 1291, 1296
India—The Budget, [174] 179;—Indian Officers, Res. 896;—Finance, [175] 1146
Indian Medical Service, 3R. [176] 2039
Mails in the Provinces, Comm. moved for, [174] 405
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [173] 1803, 1804
National Gallery, [175] 1639
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, [174] 1265
Salisbury Cathedral, [174] 177
Supply—Land, &c. Kensington Gore, [175] 867, 869;—New National Gallery at Burlington House, 1327;—Consular Establishments, Amendt. 1904, 1910, 1911; Adj. moved, 1911;—Civil Establishments, West Coast of Africa, [176] 1674, 1679, 1681
Victoria Tower, Improvements near the, [174] 183

SEYMOUR, Mr. W. D., *Southampton*
Channel Islands, The, [175] 150
Chimney Sweepers, [174] 1940
Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, 2R. [173] 575
Jersey, Laws of, [176] 277

SHAFTESBURY, Earl of
Chimney Sweepers, Comm. [175] 1123; *cl.* 7, 1133; *cl.* 12, 1134; Report, *add. cl.* 1439
Collegiate Schools, Facilities for Divine Worship in, 2R. Amendt. [176] 145, 149; Comm. *add. cl.* 821
Crawley, Colonel, Court Martial on — Deputy Judge Advocate, [173] 1171
Denmark and Germany—Austrian Fleet in the Baltic, [173] 1627;—Bombardment of Sonderborg, [174] 531;—The Armistice, [175] 1438;—Alleged Prussian Atrocities, [176] 820;—Massacre of Swedes at Duppel, 1366
Factory Acts Extension, Comm. [176] 1448, 1449
Metropolitan Railways—Working Class Trains, Res. [174] 1491
Needlewomen of London—Report of the Commission, [175] 1835
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Commons Amendts. [176] 1440
Poor Relief (Metropolis), 2R. [176] 2130
Public Schools, 3R. [175] 1830
Vaccination, [175] 779
White, Captain Melville, Case of, [173] 302

Sheffield, Inundation at
Question, Mr. Roebuck; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 14, [173] 1909
Report of Messrs. Rawlinson and Beardmore *Parl P.* . . . . . (No. 290, 290-I)
See *Bradford Reservoirs*

Shelley, Sir J. V., *Westminster*
Army—Appointment of Lt.-Gen. Gough to the 2nd Dragoons, [173] 823
Army Estimates—Volunteers, [175] 49
Beckenham, Lewes and Brighton Railway, 2R. [173] 635, 639
Bridge Street, Westminster, [173] 1185
Business of the House, [176] 2107
Casual Poor (Metropolis), [176] 1800, 1801
Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1377
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 2, [174] 1859
Epping Forest, Papers moved for, [175] 1208
Great Eastern Northern Junction Railway, 2R. [173] 712
Highways Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 36, [176] 1375, 1376
Licensed Houses in the Metropolis, [174] 874,
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway, 2R. [173] 645
Miscellaneous Civil Service Estimates, Res. [175] 663
Park Lane, State of, [176] 334, 2015
Partnership Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, [175] 241 ; *cl.* 4, 243
Poor Relief (Metropolis), Comm. [176] 2051
Queen's Plates, Res. [176] 441
Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, Adj. moved, [173] 291, 299 ; Res. 1643
Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for, [176] 1453 ; Report, 2007, 2009, 2013, 2014, 2134, 2138, 2142, 2144, 2145 ; Amendt. 2146, 2148, 2151
Street Music (Metropolis), Leave, [174] 2117 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 470, 477
Supply—National Gallery, [176] 1525, 1528
Union Assessment Committee Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 84
Weighing of Grain (Port of London), 2R. Adj. moved, [175] 1338 ; [176] 171, 175
Westminster Bridge Traffic, [176] 494, 495 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1698

Sheridan, Mr. H. B., *Dudley*
Fire Insurances, [174] 11
Government Annuities, [173] 717, 796 ; Comm. 1520, 1549, 1581 ; Explanation, 1658, 1759 ; [174] 193, 194, 197, 198, 202 ;—Privilege, Res. 314, 316
Volunteer Service, [176] 2189
Ways and Means — Fire Insurance Duty, Amendt. [174] 1439 ; Res. 1459

Sheridan, Mr. H. B. — see *Government Annuities Bill*

Sheriffs Substitute (Scotland) Salaries
(*Mr. Massey, The Lord Advocate, Sir W. Dunbar*)
c. Resolution in Committee * *June* 17
Resolution reported ; Bill ordered * *June* 20
Read 1° * *June* 21 [Bill 164]
Read 2° * *June* 27
Committee *July* 11 R.P.*
Committee * ; Report *July* 14
Considered as amended * *July* 15
Read 3° * *July* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Privy Seal*) *July* 19 (No. 216)
Read 2ª * *July* 25
Committee * ; Report *July* 26
Read 3ª * *July* 27
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 106]

Siam and Tringanu, Affairs of
Question, Sir John Hay ; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 5, [175] 17

Sidney, Mr. Ald. T., *Stafford*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 2, [174] 1859
Executions, Public, Papers moved for, [173] 950
Weighing of Grain (Port of London), 2R. [176] 168

Silver Coin, Supply of
Question, Mr. Baines ; Answer, Mr. Peel *May* 30, [175] 802

Sir John Lawrence's Salary Bill
(*Mr. Massey, Sir Charles Wood, Mr. Baring*)
173] *c.* Considered in Committee ; Resolution *Feb* 8, 222
Resolution reported * *Feb* 9 ; Bill ordered
Read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 10]
Read 2° * *Feb* 11
Committee * ; Report *Feb* 12
Read 3° * and passed *Mar* 3
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Privy Seal*) *Mar* 4 (No. 20)
Read 2ª, after short debate, *Mar* 7, 1539
Committee * ; Report *Mar* 8
Read 3ª * *Mar* 10
Royal Assent *Mar* 18 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 2]

Slave Trade, The
Question, Mr. Cave ; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Feb* 26, [173] 1191 ; Question, Lord Alfred Churchill ; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 14, 1902
Slave Trade (*White Nile*)
Motion for Address for " Copies of all Correspondence between Her Majesty's Government and Mr. Petherick, H.B.M. Consul at Khartouna, relating to Slavery and the Slave Traffic that exists on the White Nile, from the year 1860 to the present time ; also other Correspondence, &c." (*Mr. Wyld*) *May* 31, [175] 981 ; Motion withdrawn
" *Castilla*," " *Lola*," *and* " *Laura*," *The*, Question, Mr. Cave ; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 20, [175] 2026
Slave Trade in the Pacific—Petition from New South Wales, presented by Lord Brougham —Petition to lay on the table *July* 19, [176] 1700
Brazilian Slave Trade, Observation, Lord Brougham ; Reply, Earl Russell *June* 28, [176] 411 ; Question, Mr. Hardcastle ; debate thereon *July* 12, 1377
Cuba Slave Trade—General Dulce—Explanation, Lord Brougham *July* 21, [176] 1781
Slave Trade—Petition, Lord Brougham *July* 18, [176] 1613

Sligo, Marquess of
Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 7

Smith, Gen. Sir J. M. F., *Chatham*
Army Estimates — General Staff, &c. [174] 818, 829 ;—Commissariat, 830 ;—Clothing, 833 ; — Manufacturing Departments, [175] 75 ;—Warlike Stores, 79

[*cont.*

SMITH, General Sir J. M. F.—*cont.*
- Army—Withdrawal of the Guards from Canada, [175] 633 ; — Regimental Quartermasters, Address moved, [176] 92
- Chain Cables and Anchors—Messrs. Brown, Lennox and Co. [173] 1458
- Church and Schools at Brompton, [173] 1277, 1280
- Denmark and Germany—Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 875
- Dockyards Commission, [173] 907 ; The Report, Res. [173] 1077, 1081
- Harbours of Refuge, Res. [174] 1695
- Head, Sir F. B., Services of, Res. [176] 1337
- Navy—Armament of the, [173] 1783 ;—Ships of War — Armour Plating, Commission moved for, [176] 1749, 1758, 1771
- Navy Estimates—Wages, [173] 1285 ; — Admiralty Office, 1303 ;—Wages of Artificers abroad, 1789 ;—Wages of Artificers at Home, 1961 ;—Naval Stores, [174] 426 ;—Naval Establishments, 2029, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034
- Navy—The "Research" and the "Enterprise," 591, 801, 802 ; [176] 1795
- New Zealand—War in, [176] 1195
- Sewage (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [174] 1698
- Supply—Civil Establishments on the West Coast of Africa, [176] 1679

SMITH, Mr. Augustus, *Truro*
- Army Estimates—Commissariat, [174] 831 ;—Clothing, 835 ; — Warlike Stores, 79 ; — Works, Buildings, &c. [175] 82
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. *cl.* 20, [176] 1866
- County Franchise, 2R. Previous Question moved, [174] 922
- FitzRoy's, Admiral, Weather predictions, [173] 1818
- Miscellaneous Civil Service Estimates, Res. [175] 663
- Navy Estimates—Wages, [173] 1284 ;—Scientific Departments, 1308, 1310, 1311
- Patent Office, The, [174] 1955
- School of Naval Architecture, [174] 1460 ;—Sir W. S. Harris, Papers moved for, [175] 194, 196, 1593 ; Res. [176] 498, 505
- Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [176] 1421
- South Kensington, New Museums at, [174] 1078
- Supply—The Scheldt Toll, [173] 1791 ; — Civil Service Estimates, [174] 292 ; [175] 399 ;—Public Buildings, 414, 415 ;—Repair of Furniture, Amendt. 415, 416, 417, 418 ;—New Foreign Office, 553, 554 ; Amendt. 845, 846 ;—Probate Court Registries, 846 ; — Architectural Designs for Public Buildings, 848, 849 ; — Lighthouses Abroad, Amendt. 861 ;—Land, &c. Kensington Gore, Amendt. 866, 868 ;—New National Gallery at Burlington House, 1317 ;—Privy Council Office, 1333 ; — Privy Council for Trade, 1601 ; Amendt. 1603;—County Roads, South Wales, 1675 ; — Landed Estates Record Offices, 1676 ;—Printing and Stationery, 1678 ; — Bermuda, 1882 ; — Governors, &c. West Indies, &c. 1885, 1887 ;—Consular Establishments, [175] 1900 ; — Embassies and Missions Abroad, [176] 394, 395 ;—Department of Science and Art, Amendt. 560 ;—University of London, 1352 ;—British Museum, 1362 ;—National Gallery, 1523, 1526, 1531 ;—Magnetic and Meteorological Observations, 1598 ;—Royal Academy of Music, 1605

SMITH, Mr. J. A., *Chichester*
- Army—Experiments with Rifled Ordnance, [176] 1624
- Charity Commissioners, Comm. moved for, [175] 1880
- Government Annuities, 3R. [175] 2040
- London, &c. Docks Amalgamation, 2R. [175] 1389
- Supply — Public Works Loan Commission, &c. [175] 1674

SMITH, Mr. J. B., *Stockport*
- Business of the House, [174] 1776
- China—Affairs of, [175] 635
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Consid. [174] 1980 ; Schedule A, Amendt. [174] 1986
- East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [176] 1817, 1829
- India—The Budget, [174] 178, 179 ;—Finance, [175] 1146 ;—Gold Currency for, Res. 1573, 1591
- New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1507
- Ways and Means—Sugar Duties, Report, [174] 1172
- Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [173] 1738

SMITH, Mr. Montague E., *Truro*
- Charity Commissioners, Comm. moved for, [175] 1871
- Courts of Justice, The New, [173] 496
- Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, 2R. [173] 577 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, 841
- Law Courts, The, [176] 363
- Lisburn Election, [174] 471
- Supply—Sir Rowland Hill, [175] 1599
- United States—Seizure of the "Tuscaloosa," Res. [174] 1820, 1825, 1827

SMOLLETT, Mr. P. B., *Dumbartonshire*
- Crawley, Colonel, Case of, Papers moved for, [174] 81, 82
- India—The Hill Tribes, [173] 462 ;—Claims of Azeem Jah, Comm. moved for, [175] 1641, 1656, 1657, 1658, 1659, 1660 ;—Covenanted Civil Service, [174] 186
- Ionian Islands—Papers moved for, [174] 352, 364 ;—State of the, [175] 634
- Lunacy (Scotland), Comm. [176] 417, 422
- Scotch Affairs, Administration of, Comm. moved for, [175] 1188
- Writs Registration (Scotland), 2R. [175] 877

SMYTH, Colonel J. G., *York City*
- Assize Town for the West Riding Circuit, Address moved, [173] 815 ; [176] 613, 1598

Solicitor General, The (Sir R. P. Collier), *Plymouth*
- Appeal in Criminal Cases Act Amendment, 2R. [176] 1774
- Costs Security, 2R. [175] 1814
- Inns of Court, Papers moved for, [176] 646
- Limited Penalties, 3R. [175] 696
- Lisburn Election, [174] 465
- Navy—Claims of Mr. J. Clare, Comm. moved for, [174] 1466
- Petty Offences Law Amendment, 2R. Amendt. [176] 1433
- Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2145
- United States — Vessels "El Tousson" and "El Monassia," Papers moved for, [173] 978, 1007; — Capture of British Ships, Papers moved for, [173] 532;—Confederate Cruisers, Papers moved for, 1490; Seizure of the "Tuscaloosa," Res. [174] 1787

Somerset, Duke of (First Lord of the Admiralty)
- Admiralty Lands and Works, Comm. *cl.* 14, [175] 1350, 1351
- Army—Artillery—Mackay's Gun, [174] 1180, 1181, 1182
- China—Death of Lieutenant Tinling, [173] 444, 449, 454
- Curtis's Steering Screw, [173] 1623
- Denmark and Germany—The Austrian Fleet, [173] 1901;—Identical Note of Austria and Prussia, [174] 3
- Greenwich Hospital, [175] 1538, 1541
- Japan, Res. [176] 604, 605
- Kertch and Yenikale Prize Money, [173] 1535, 1538, 1539
- Naval Discipline, 2R. [176] 1700
- Navy—Marine Artillery, [173] 314;—Retirement of Naval Captains, [174] 1494, 1498, 1499; — Naval Gunnery, [175] 1824; — Armour Plated Vessels, The "Kearsarge" and the "Alabama," [176] 685
- Ships of War—Petition of Mr. J. Chalmers, [174] 962

Somerset, Col. P. G. H., *Monmouthshire*
- Navy Estimates—Naval Establishments, [174] 2048

Somes, Mr. J., *Kingston-upon-Hull*
- Harbours of Refuge, Res. [174] 1697
- Intoxicating Liquors (Sale on Sundays), Leave, [175] 168
- Public Houses, Closing of, on Sundays, [174] 2055

South Kensington—New Museums at
- Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Cowper *April* 15, [174] 1078
- *Buildings at*, Question, Mr. F. S. Powell; Answer, Mr. Cowper *April* 19, 1287; Instructions of Board of Works (*Parl. P.* No. 254)

Spain and Peru—The Chincha Islands
- Question, Mr. Weguelin; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 31, [175] 911; Question, Mr. Caird; Answer, Mr. Layard *July* 15, [176] 1575; Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. Layard *July* 22, 1902
- Papers respecting the Seizure of [3368, 3409]

Speaker, The (Right Hon. J. E. Denison), *Nottinghamshire, N.*
- Amendment—On Motion, "That the House at its rising, &c.," Mr. Cobden moved certain Resolutions—After debate, the hon. Gentleman rose to reply, and being informed by Mr. Speaker, that having already spoken, he could not speak again, said he would put himself in order by moving an Amendment. Mr. Speaker said the hon. Member has moved an Amendment and cannot move another.—*Government Manufacturing Establishments*, [176] 1976
- Bills relating to Public Money and Charges on the Subject—On Order of the Day for the Second Reading of the *Church Rates Commutation Bill* (*Mr. Newdegate*), Mr. Hadfield objected, that inasmuch as the 15th clause proposed that the charge, which now fell upon occupiers, should be transferred to the owners of real property, whereby such owners would be subjected to a new tax to which they have not hitherto been liable, the Bill should have originated in Committee of the whole House. Mr. Speaker said, that that rule had been held not to apply to Bills authorizing the levy of rates for local purposes by local authorities; and having cited numerous precedents, held that there had been nothing irregular in the introduction of the present Bill, [174] 1701
- Bill—Bills of Indemnity—On Motion that the *Under Secretaries Indemnity Bill* be now read a second time, Mr. Hennessy objected that the Bill should have originated in Committee of the Whole House. Mr. Speaker said that the method adopted with reference to the Bill was perfectly correct, [175] 83
- Bill—"Hybrid" Bills—Mr. Speaker states why, in his opinion, the *Weighing of Grain* (*Port of London*) *Bill*, has been properly introduced as a Public Bill, [176] 171
- Bill—A Private Bill repealing certain provisions of a Public Act will not be stopped on a point of Order.—*Metropolitan Districts Railway Bill*, [176] 1619
- Bill — Opposed Public Bill — *Indian Medical Service Bill* ordered to be brought in by *Sir Charles Wood and The Marquess of Hartington.*—Viscount Palmerston having moved the third reading, Mr. Hennessy objected that it was irregular that an opposed Bill should be moved by any one except the Minister in charge of it. Mr. Speaker said, that the right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench were responsible for such Bill, [176] 1234
- Committee—A Committee has not the power to put an end to a Bill referred to it—*Court of Chancery* (*Ireland*) *Bill* considered in Committee—Moved, "That the Chairman do leave the chair"—On division, agreed to *June* 21 [No Report].—On the following day The Attorney General for Ireland moved, "That this House will, upon Thursday next, resolve itself into a Committee, &c."—Objected to, on the ground that the decision of the Committee was, in practice, conclusive against the further progress of the Bill in the present Session. Mr. Speaker said, a Bill is referred to a Committee in order that it may be considered and amended; but the

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

Committee have no power to put an end to the Bill; that power the House retains to itself:—And Mr. Speaker delivered his opinion at length, [176] 99

Debate—A Member may not speak a second time on the same Motion—On Motion for Committee of Supply, Mr. Scully moved an Amendment, which was withdrawn—Afterwards Mr. Longfield made some observations on the subject of the *Law Life Assurance Company*—Mr. Scully rose to address the House. Mr. Speaker said that the hon. Member for Mallow (Mr. Longfield) having moved no Amendment, the Question before the House was the same as that on which the hon. Member for Cork had already spoken, [175] 769.—*Government Manufacturing Establishments*, [176] 1796

Debate—The House, under special circumstances, will allow a Member to address it a second time on the same Motion, [173] 1549; [174] 695

Debate—Right of Reply—*Customs and Inland Revenue Bill*, as amended, considered—Mr. J. B. Smith moved to insert in Schedule (A) the words "until the first day of August, 1865"—After debate, Mr. J. B. Smith rose to reply—When Mr. Speaker said that the hon. Member's proposition having been introduced as an Amendment, he was not entitled to a reply, [174] 2022

Debate—Reference to a past debate out of order, [176] 34, 1328

Debate—Reference to a previous debate—A Member may not repeat the words spoken in debate on a previous evening. Though it be a personal explanation it is exceedingly inconvenient to refer at great length to a previous debate, [173] 1912

Debate—Reference to a speech delivered in this House in the course of the present Session, out of order, [175] 1747

Debate—Reference to documents not upon the table—"The despatches should be laid on the table before the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Layard) can quote from them."—*Denmark and Germany (Mr. Disraeli's Resolution)*, [176] 962

Debate—Reference to particular items in Estimates which were about to be discussed, not in order, [173] 903, 904

A Member, on Motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair, may bring forward a subject of which he has given notice, arising out of the Votes in the Appropriation Bill, without waiting for the particular section of the Bill to which the subject refers, [176] 1859

Debate—Discussion of the subject matter of a Motion fixed for a future day, not in order.—*Casual Poor (Metropolis) Bill*, [176] 1803

Debate—Discussion of the merits of a Bill which stood for discussion to-morrow, not in order, [176] 1797

Debate—A Question already before the House must be disposed of before an hon. Member can proceed with his Notice, [173] 1077

Debate—Resolution (*Denmark and Germany*) proposed (Mr. Bernal Osborne)—An Amendment moved thereon—After debate, Amendment, by leave, withdrawn—Original Question again proposed. Mr. Speaker said, that the Amendment had been withdrawn by the consent of the House; but as the House did not consent to the withdrawal of the Original Motion, the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) would have an opportunity of moving the Previous Question—Whereupon Previous Question put, and negatived, [174] 1376

Debate—Latitude in argument—A Member was not in order in discussing the question of costs (which had already been incidentally discussed in that debate, and which there would be other opportunities of discussing) on a Resolution relating to *ad valorem* fees. —*Private Bills—Resolution*, [173] 671

The House having decided that a Committee should be appointed, it was desirable, under ordinary circumstances, that the discussion should be confined to the names of the Members of whom it should be composed; but it was impossible to prescribe the limits to which the arguments of the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Whiteside) might extend in his endeavour to procure the substitution of one name for another.—*Scientific Institutions, Dublin*, [174] 1274

Debate—Latitude in argument—*Malt for Cattle Bill*—Order for Committee read—Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair" —Mr. Bass observed upon the whole subject, and having referred to the malt duty was proceeding to compare the relative taxation on spirits and wines—Mr. Packe rose to order: the hon. Member was travelling out of the Question, which related solely to the making of malt for cattle. Mr. Speaker said, that the hon. Member was quite in order—Upon the Motion the whole subject might be discussed, [173] 1026

Debate—Latitude permitted to a Minister in answering a Question.—*Departure of General Garibaldi*, [174] 1423

Debate—Limitation of explanation—An hon. Member can only explain an observation of his own which has been misunderstood—he cannot reply to the remarks of any one else.—*The Charity Commissioners*, [175] 1876—*Government Annuities Bill*, [174] 210

Or go beyond explanation.—*St. Mary's Burial Ground, Sydenham*, [174] 661

Debate—Limitation of personal explanation in respect of a previous debate—Reference at such great length (as the noble Lord the Secretary of the Admiralty was then making) is exceedingly inconvenient.—*Navy Estimates*, [173] 1912-13

Debate—Personal explanation when no Question before the House—Mr. Lowe having offered an explanation of his resignation of his office, and a lengthened conversation having arisen thereon, Mr. Speaker interposed.—*Education—Reports of the Inspectors*, [174] 1216

Debate—Unparliamentary Expressions—Mr. Gathorne Hardy having referred to a "calumnious statement" of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Layard rising to order, Mr. Speaker said, there did not appear to be anything calling for his interference; and referred to the warm and exciting nature of

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

the debate.—*Denmark and Germany* (*Mr. Disraeli's Resolution*), [176] 1003, 1005

Division—Mr. Speaker's Casting Vote—*Tests Abolition* (*Oxford*) *Bill* — Main Question, "That the Bill be now read a third time" put; the House divided, and the numbers being equal, Mr. Speaker declared himself with the "Ayes" and stated his reason, [176] 678

Division—The Question on Mr. Newdegate's Amendment on Mr. Disraeli's Motion respecting *Denmark and Germany*, having been put, the House being very full, and a great preponderance of voices appearing to be for the "Ayes," so that the lobby could not contain them, Mr. Speaker proposed an arrangement to avoid the inconvenience—But Mr. Newdegate did not press for a division, [176] 1299

Motion—According to the rules of the House, no Question or Amendment may be proposed which is the same in substance as any Question which, during the same Session, has been resolved in the affirmative or negative, [176] 497

Motion—*Private Bills, Resolution*—Resolution 7, and Amendment thereon withdrawn—The hon. Member for Devizes proposed to move a Resolution. Mr. Speaker said, that there being no Motion before the House, the hon. Member could not move a Resolution of which he had given no notice, [173] 680

Motion—The Appropriation Bill—A Member will be in order in bringing forward, on Motion that Mr. Speaker leave the chair, a subject of which he has given notice, arising out of the Votes included in the Bill, without waiting for the particular section of the Bill to which the subject refers.—*Consolidated Fund* (*Appropriation Bill*) — Committee, [176] 1859

Order—Committee of Supply—Mr. Speaker having put the Question, "That I leave the chair," and having declared "The Ayes have it," left the chair—Complaint arising that the House had been taken by surprise, and Mr. Speaker having resumed the chair, Sir Harry Verney said, "Sir, I rise to move the adjournment of the House." Mr. Speaker said, the hon. Member can address the House on a Question of Order without moving the adjournment—Mr. Speaker states the circumstances, [174] 1958, 1960

Privilege—A matter of Privilege which claims this precedence (over the Orders of the Day) should be some subject which has recently arisen and which clearly involves the Privileges of this House and calls for its immediate interposition—*Mr. Stansfeld and the Greco Conspiracy*, [174] 190

Privilege—A Question of Privilege having been raised, that must be decided before an hon. Member can proceed to address the House

Privilege—Dispute arising as to allegations of fact, between Mr. H. B. Sheridan and Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the matter being brought under the notice of the House by Sir John Hay as a Question of Privilege—Mr. Speaker suggested that it would not be a convenient course to extend the area of Privilege without due consideration; and expressed his opinion that this matter did not distinctly concern the Privileges of the House; and he recommended as a more convenient course, if the House deemed this a matter which it would be proper at once to entertain, rather to postpone the other Orders of the Day until after the Motion of the hon. Member for Wakefield had been disposed of.—*Government Annuities Bill* (*Mr. H. B. Sheridan*), [174] 306, 307

Question — Latitude of observation in putting a Question—It is a rule of the House that an hon. Member putting a Question must confine himself strictly to the facts necessary to explain it, [175] 100

Question—Latitude in answering, [173] 1816

Question—Latitude permitted to a Minister in answering a Question.—*Departure of General Garibaldi*, [174] 1423

Questions to Private Members—The rule of the House with respect to asking Questions of a private Member is, that any Question may be put relating to any Bill, Motion, or other public matter connected with the business of the House in which such Member may be concerned, [174] 1914

Select Committee—Notice must be given of an Instruction to a Select Committee on a Bill. —*Factory Acts Extension*, [175] 1940

Select Committee—A Select Committee on the Bankruptcy Act having been appointed, to consist of fifteen Members; and it being proposed to add Mr. Roebuck, and to substitute Mr. Vance for Mr. Hassard—Mr. Speaker held that notice of the proposed alterations must be given, [174] 501, 1569

Mr. Speaker—His Power—Power having been given by Act of Parliament to Mr. Speaker to regulate certain charges (in respect of Private Bills), it is not competent for the House to order that "counsel's fees" should be inserted in the Resolution, the powers given by the Act not extending to any control over the fees of counsel conducting business before Committees.—*Private Bills*—*Resolution* 5, [173] 676

His Power over Members—It having been suggested that the Chairman of the Court of Referees on Private Bills should be a Member of the House, and that Mr. Speaker should appoint him—Mr. Speaker reminded the House that he had no power to compel an hon. Member to undertake the duty, and that the possibility of putting such a provision into effect would depend upon the willingness of any Member to fill the office.— —*Revision of Standing Orders*, [176] 2144

Supply—"The House having already resolved 'that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question,' it is not competent for the hon. Member to move any further Amendment to the Motion, That I do leave the chair," [173] 1416; [175] 664; [176] 649

Supply—Reference to particular items in Estimates which are about to be discussed, not in order, [173] 903, 904

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

Supply—An Amendment to the Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair," having been moved and carried; and afterwards it was moved, "That this House do immediately resolve itself into the Committee of Supply," and agreed to—On Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair," Mr. Digby Seymour rose to bring forward a matter of which he had given notice. Mr. Speaker said, "It had been for some years the practice of the House, under such circumstances, for the Minister to move that the House should immediately resolve itself into a Committee of Supply, and that the Speaker should leave the chair. Such a Motion had been made, and the business of the evening might then proceed without interruption," [174] 1940

Supply—Rule as to putting Resolutions on Report of Supply.—The rule of the House is this—On the Report of Supply, the Question is, "That this Resolution be read a first time." Then, "That it be read a second time."—When the Question is put, "That the Resolution be read a second time," it is open to any hon. Member to offer any observations he may think necessary, [174] 1551

Vote of a Member personally interested in the Motion.—The rule of the House is that no Member can vote on a Question in which he is peculiarly interested; and, also, there are occasions when it is becoming for a Member to leave the House before the division, although there is no positive charge against him. The Vote of the previous evening however was, whether or not certain matters did not require the serious consideration of the House; and it could not be said, on any interpretation of the rules of the House, that the hon. Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld) ought not to have voted on that Question.—*M. Mazzini—The Greco Conspiracy,* [174] 340

Speke, Captain, Services of

Questions, Sir William Miles, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Mar* 4, [173] 1453

Spirit Duties, The

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 30, To leave out from "That" and add "in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the existing Duties on Spirits should be reduced" (*Mr. Whiteside*), [175] 810; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

STACPOOLE, Captain W., *Ennis*

Convicts (Ireland), [175] 588
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1396

Stamp Duties—Orders on Bankers

Question, Mr. Alderman Salomons; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 23, [176] 160

Stamp Duties Act (1864) Amendment Bill

(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 19 [Bill 225]
Read 2° * *July* 20
Committee *; Report *July* 21
Read 3° * *July* 22
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 22
Read 2ª * *July* 23 (No. 241)
Committee *; Report *July* 25
Read 3ª * *July* 26
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 56]

Standing Orders

Samuel Smith, esq., and Charles Frere, esq., appointed Examiners for this Session *Feb* 4

Select Committee nominated *Feb* 11:—Colonel Wilson Patten (Chairman), Mr. Walpole, Mr. Henley, Mr. Wrightson, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Bramston, Mr. Bonham-Carter, Mr. Lefroy, Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Puller, and Mr. Edward Egerton. Mr. Paget added *Feb* 24

Standing Orders (*Parliamentary Deposits*)

Select Committee appointed, after short debate, "To inquire into the operation of the Standing Orders of this House, and of the Act 9 & 10 *Vict.* c. 20, which regulate the depositing of money, or of public securities, with the Courts of Chancery in England and Ireland, and the Court of Exchequer in Scotland, in respect of works and undertakings requiring the authority of Parliament by Private Bills" (*Mr. Scourfield*) *April* 26, [174] 1618

Committee nominated *April* 29:—Mr. Scourfield (Chairman), Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Massey, Lord Hotham, Colonel Wilson Patten, Mr. Sotheron Estcourt, Mr. Edward Egerton, Colonel French, Mr. Adair, Mr. Heygate, Mr. Selwyn, Mr. Kirkman Hodgson, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Westhead, and Mr. Tite

Report *June* 22 (*Parl. P.* No. 423)

Standing Orders Revision

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to revise the Standing Orders" (*Colonel Wilson Patten*) *July* 14, [176] 1453; after debate, Motion agreed to

Committee:—Mr. Massey, Lord Stanley, Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie, and Mr. Milner Gibson

Motion, "That Mr. Sotheron Estcourt be one other Member," 1466; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Ingham, Mr. Edward Egerton, Mr. Scourfield, Mr. Hassard, Mr. Adair, Mr. Lowe, Colonel French, and Colonel Wilson Patten

Moved, That it be an Instruction to the Committee to consider whether "It is expedient that Referees should be constituted under the authority of this House for the more speedy and economical decision of certain questions of fact commonly arising in the proceedings upon Private Bills" (*Colonel Wilson Patten*); Motion agreed to

Report from Select Committee read; Standing Orders, as revised by the Committee, read *July* 25, [176] 2005

[*cont.*

Standing Orders Revision—cont.
Standing Orders, as amended by the Select Committee, severally considered
Several new Standing Orders moved, and agreed to
Standing Orders relating to Private Bills repealed
Ordered, That the several Orders, as reported by the Committee and amended by this House, be the Standing Orders of this House relating to Private Bills, and be printed. No. 545]

Stanhope, Earl
Burial Service, Comm. moved for, [176] 1312
Church Services (Apocrypha), 2R. [175] 1930
Public Schools, 1R. [175] 778; 2R. 1258, 1260
Public Schools Commission, Papers moved for, [175] 699
Royal Academy, The, [176] 236, 245

Stanhope, Mr. J. Banks, *Lincolnshire, N.*
Malt for Cattle, Comm. [173] 1033
Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 988

Stanley, Right Hon. Lord, *King's Lynn*
Denmark and Germany — Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 808
Elgin and Kincardine, Countess of, Res. [175] 1461
Foreign Office and Board of Trade, Comm. moved for, [174] 1102
Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1589, 1591; [174] 249;—Mr. H. B. Sheridan—Privilege, Res. 308
Great Eastern Northern Junction Railway, 2R. [173] 711
India—Indian Officers, Res. [174] 896;—Territory of Dhar, 1499; [175] 1958; — Burning the Dead, [174] 1500;—Claims of Indian Officers, [175] 258
Lawrence's, Sir J., Salary, Comm. [173] 224
Lisburn Election, Adj. moved, [174] 472, 476
Metropolitan District Railways, 3R. [176] 1619
Navy—The "Gladiator," [176] 161
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1509, 1517
Patent Law Commission, [174] 1773
Private Bills—Standing Order, Amendt. [175] 1134;—Committees on, Res. 1557
Rags, Export Duty on, [173] 794
Railway and Canal Bills, [175] 102
Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Comm. moved for, [173] 286; Res. 1642
Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for, [176] 1461

Stanley of Alderley, Lord (Postmaster General)
Alkali Works Regulation, [176] 254, 255
Brokers Bonds and Rents, 2R. [176] 410
Chain Cables and Anchors, 2R. [175] 1535; Comm. 1826
Hill, Sir R., Resignation of, [173] 1626
Jamaica—Affairs of, Papers moved for, Amendt. [175] 1122
Malt for Animals, 2R. [174] 3, 4

[*cont.*

Stanley of Alderley, Lord—*cont.*
Metropolitan Railways—Working Class Trains, Res. [174] 1490
Oyster Fishery (England and Wales), 2R. [176] 482
Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2), 2R. [176] 1999, 2000, 2001
Public and Refreshment Houses, Report, *cl.* 9, [176] 1314, 1315
Railway Companies Powers, Commons Amendt. [176] 2156
Railway Construction Facilities, 2R. [176] 949, 950
Railway Schemes (Metropolis), [173] 311

Stanley, Hon. W. O., *Beaumaris*
Holyhead Harbour, [174] 968;—Lighthouse at, 1501

Stansfeld, Mr. J. († Lord of the Admiralty), *Halifax*
†Greco Conspiracy, The, and Mr. Stansfeld—Res. [174] 259, 265, 271, 283, 342
Mazzini M. — The Greco Conspiracy, [173] 1255, 1257, 1258, 1259
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [173] 1131, 1156, 1157; — Wages, 1299, 1302; — Admiralty Office, 1303;—Wages of Artificers at Home, 1942, 1979
Resignation of, [174] 396

Stansfeld, Mr.—M. Mazzini—The Greco Conspiracy
M. Mazzini—The Alien Act, Question, The Marquess of Westmeath; Answer, Earl Russell *Feb* 29, [173] 1242; Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, Mr. Stansfeld *Feb* 29, 1255; Question, Sir Lawrence Palk; Answer, Mr. Layard; debate thereon *Mar* 14, 1931; Question, Sir Henry Stracey *Mar* 17, [174] 189
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 17, To leave out from "That" and add "the statement of the Procureur General on the trial of Greco, implicating a Member of this House and of Her Majesty's Government in the plot for the assassination of our Ally the Emperor of the French, deserves the serious consideration of this House" (*Sir Henry Stracey*), [174] 250; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate Question put, A. 171, N. 161; M. 10; Division List—Ayes and Noes, 284; Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Viscount Palmerston; long debate thereon *Mar* 18, 322

Stansfeld, Mr., Resignation of
Personal Explanation, Mr. Stansfeld *April* 4, [174] 396

State Papers, British and Foreign
Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Mr Layard *July* 21, [176] 1791

Steam Rams in the Mersey
Question, Sir Lawrence Palk; Answer, The Attorney General *April* 8, [174] 690; Question, Lord Robert Cecil; Answer, The Attorney General *April* 18, 1202

[*cont.*

Steam Rams in the Mersey—cont.

Address for Correspondence, Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Copy of Correspondence between Her Majesty's Government and Messrs. Laird with respect to Steam Rams" (*The Earl of Derby*) *April* 29, 1862; after long debate, Motion withdrawn

Question, Mr. Hodgkinson; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 30, [175] 804; Question, Mr. Hodgkinson; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *May* 31, 912; Question, Mr. J. Tollemache; Answer, The Attorney General *June* 1, 1001

Stewart, Sir M. R. Shaw, *Renfrewshire*

Cattle Diseases Prevention, [173] 1455; 2R. 1753

Servants Hiring (Scotland), Comm. [175] 1822

Stirling, Mr. W., *Perthshire*

Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [176] 1429

Stracey, Sir H. J., *Great Yarmouth*

Malt for Cattle, 2R. [173] 596

Navy Estimates — Naval Establishments at Home, [173] 1315

Stansfeld, Mr., and the Greco Conspiracy, Res. [174] 189, 190, 250

Stratford de Redcliffe, Viscount

Denmark and Germany—The Correspondence, [173] 1619; — Joint Action of European Powers, 1899, [174] 294; — The Conference, 1418

Elgin, Earl of, and Lord Canning, [175] 1701

Foreign Affairs, [176] 2097

Holy Alliance, Alleged Revival of the, [176] 684; Notice, 819, 1879

New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1995

Public Schools, 3R. [175] 1829

Russia—The Circassians, [175] 1047

Stratheden and Campbell, Lord

Anderson, Rev. F., Papers moved for, [175] 1225, 1230

Army—Military Commissioners in North America, [173] 856

Denmark and Germany—Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 550; Res. [174] 722, 785; —* Correspondence moved for relating to Treaties, [176] 1979, 1986

Poland—Condition of, [174] 1862; Res. [175] 177, 187

Public Schools, 3R. [175] 1831

Street Music (Metropolis) Bill

(*Mr. Bass, Captain Stacpoole, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck*)

174] *c.* Ordered * *May* 3, 2116

Read 1° * *May* 4 [Bill 90]

175] Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Bass*), 1529; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Hankey*), 1530; Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Motion, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Butt*), A. 19, N. 56; M. 37; [*cont.*

Street Music (Metropolis) Bill—cont.

Question, "That 'now,' &c." agreed to; Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2° *June* 9

175] *c.* Bill considered in Committee *June* 29, [176] 467

After long discussion Committee R.P.

176] Bill considered in Committee *July* 1, 680

Bill reported [Bill 186]

Considered as amended * *July* 5

Motion, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *July* 7, 1073; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Sir William Jolliffe*); after short debate, Question put, "That 'now' &c." A. 49, N. 18; M. 31; Main Question agreed to; Bill read 3°

l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Malmesbury*) *July* 8 (No. 196)

Read 2ª, after short debate, *July* 12, 1367

Committee *; Report *July* 15

Read 3ª * *July* 18

Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 55]

Stuart, Colonel W., *Bedford*

Beer Houses (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [175] 694

Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Comm. [176] 299

Collection of Taxes, Leave, [173] 241

Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [173] 1804

New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1521

Supply — Public Buildings, [175] 415; — Harbours of Refuge, 854; — Lunatic Asylum, Isle of Man, Amendt. 861; — Printing and Stationery, 1680; — Department of Science and Art, [176] 560

Sugar Duties and Malt Duty

Amendt. on Committee of Ways and Means *April* 14, To leave out from "That," and add "the consideration of the Duties upon Sugar be postponed until the House shall have the opportunity of considering the expediency of the reduction of the Duty upon Malt" (*Colonel Barttelot*), [174] 972; Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out, &c." A. 347, N. 99; M. 248; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 105

See *Ways and Means—Customs and Inland Revenue Bill*

Sugar Duties and Malt Tax—Precedence of Motions

Observations, Colonel Barttelot; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 13, [174] 958

Summary Procedure (Scotland) Bill

(*Lord Advocate, Sir G. Grey, Sir W. Dunbar*)

c. Ordered * *Feb* 22; read 1° * *Feb* 23

Read 2° * *Mar* 11 [Bill 32]

Committee *; Report *April* 21

Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 9

Considered as amended * *May* 12 [Bill 76]

Read 3° * *May* 19

l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chancellor*) *May* 23

Read 2ª * *June* 2 (No. 89)

Committee * *June* 21; Report *June* 30 (No. 148)

Read 3ª * *July* 11 (No. 165)

Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 53]

Superannuation (Union Officers) Bill
(*Mr. Villiers, Mr. Gilpin*)
c. Ordered * *June* 7 ; read 1° * *June* 8 [Bill 133]
Read 2° * *June* 13
Committee * ; Report *June* 17
Considered as amended * *June* 20
Read 3° * *June* 22
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Wodehouse*) *June* 23
Read 2ª * *June* 27 (No. 154)
Committee * ; Report *July* 4
Read 3ª *July* 5
Royal Assent *July* 14 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 42]

Superior Courts of Common Law (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Sir R. Peel*)
c. Read 1°, after long debate, *April* 31, [174] 1967 [Bill 86]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 13

SUPPLY, 1864
Lords Commissioners' Speech consid. *Feb* 8 ; Motion, "That a Supply be granted to Her Majesty" (*Mr. Peel*) agreed to ;—to be considered in a Committee of the Whole House
Lords Commissioners' Speech referred, and Motion considered *Feb* 9
Resolved, "That a Supply be granted to Her Majesty"
Resolution reported, and agreed to *Nem. Con.* *Feb* 11
Considered in Committee *Feb* 12—r.p.*
Considered in Committee *Feb* 19—r.p.*
173] Order for Committee read ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Feb* 22 ; Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the consideration of the Navy Estimates be postponed till this day three weeks" (*Mr. Osborne*) ; after long debate, Question put "That the words, &c." A. 220, N. 47 ; M. 173, 873
· Division List, 887
Supply considered in Committee—Committee r.p.*
· Considered in Committee ; Navy Estimates *Feb* 25—Statement of Lord Clarence Paget on proposing the First Resolution, 1103
Considered in Committee *Feb* 26 ; Committee r.p.*
· Considered in Committee ; Navy Estimates *Feb* 29, 1280
· Considered in Committee ; Army Estimates *Mar* 3 ; Statement of The Marquess of Hartington on moving the First Resolution, 1416
Considered in Committee ; Army Estimates *Mar* 4—r.p.*
· Considered in Committee ; Navy Estimates ; Scheldt Toll ; Supplemental Army Estimate *Mar* 10, 1785
Considered in Committee *Mar* 11—r.p.*
Considered in Committee ; Navy Estimates ; Resolution (Vote 8) re-committed *Mar* 14
174] Considered in Committee ; Civil Service Estimates *Mar* 17, 289
£1,866,000, on Account of certain Civil Services
After short debate, Vote agreed to
Resolution reported *Mar* 18
Considered in Committee *Mar* 18—r.p.*
[*cont.*

Supply—cont.
174] Considered in Committee ; Navy Estimates *April* 4—Resolutions reported *April* 5, and, after short debate, agreed to, 501
Considered in Committee *April* 8—r.p.*
· Considered in Committee ; Army Estimates *April* 11, 809
Considered in Committee *April* 15—r.p.*
Considered in Committee *April* 21—r.p.*
Considered in Committee *April* 28—r.p.*
Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *April* 29
An Amendment proposed, and, on Question agreed to
Moved, "That this House do immediately resolve itself in the Committee of Supply" agreed to,
Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair ;" after debate interposed, Mr. Speaker put the Question, "That I leave the chair," and having declared it carried left the chair
Supply considered in Committee
· *Privilege*, Mr. Osborn ; Debate thereon ; Motion to report Progress, 1957 ; Motion agreed to ; Committee report Progress
· *Privilege*, Further debate thereon *April* 29, 1958
· Considered in Committee ; Navy Estimates *May* 2, 2025
175] Considered in Committee ; Army Estimates *May* 5, 29
Considered in Committee *May* 6—r.p.*
· Considered in Committee ; Army Estimates *May* 9, 201
· Considered in Committee ; Civil Service Estimates *May* 12, 410
· Supply—Order for Committee read ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *May* 13, 514
House counted out
· Considered in Committee ; Civil Service Estimates *May* 20, 552
· Considered in Committee ; Navy Estimates *May* 26, 667
Considered in Committee *May* 27—r.p.*
· Considered in Committee ; Civil Service Estimates *May* 30, 884
Considered in Committee *June* 3—r.p.*
· Considered in Committee ; Civil Service Estimates *June* 6, 1297
· Considered in Committee—Sir Rowland Hill—Civil Service Estimates *June* 10, 1595
· Considered in Committee ; Civil Service Estimates *June* 13, 1669
· Considered in Committee ; Civil Service Estimates *June* 16, 1882
Considered in Committee *June* 17—r.p.*
Considered in Committee *June* 24—r.p.*
176] Considered in Committee ; Civil Service Estimates *June* 27, 392
· Considered in Committee ; Civil Service Estimates *June* 30, 516
· Considered in Committee ; Civil Service Estimates *July* 1, 656
· Considered in Committee *July* 8—r.p.*
· Considered in Committee ; Civil Service Estimates *July* 11, 1340
· Considered in Committee ; Civil Service Estimates *July* 14, 1522
· Considered in Committee ; Civil Service Estimates *July* 15, 1598
· Considered in Committee ; Civil Service Estimates *July* 18, 1652
[*cont.*

Supply—cont. Total of Vote.

SUPPLEMENTAL ARMY ESTIMATES.

£409,000, Supplemental Estimate for Army Services beyond ordinary Grants for 1863-4 *Mar* 10 [173] 1795
After debate, Vote agreed to ... £ 409,000
Resolution reported *Mar* 11

THE SCHELDT TOLL—SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE.

£175,650, Moiety of Charge for the Redemption of the Scheldt Toll *Mar* 10 ... [173] 1789
After debate, Vote agreed to
Resolution reported *Mar* 11

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1864-5.

COMMITTEE *Feb* 25.

Statement of Lord Clarence Paget, Secretary of the Admiralty, on moving the First Vote [173] 1103
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That 71,950 Men and Boys be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services, for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1865, including 18,000 Royal Marines" (*Lord Clarence Paget*)
After long debate, Motion, "That the Chairman report Progress" (*Mr. Lindsay*)
Question put, A. 31, N. 28; M. 3; Committee report Progress

COMMITTEE *Feb* 29—REPORT *Mar* 1.

Original Question again proposed, "That 71,950 Men and Boys, &c."
Question put, and agreed to [173] 1280
(1.) £2,874,647, Wages [173] 1280
After debate, Vote agreed to ... 2,874,647
(2.) 1,304,119, Victuals and Clothing 1,304,119
(3.) Motion, £168,605, Salaries of the Officers and the Contingent Expenses of the Admiralty Office, &c. 1865 [173] 1302
Motion, "That a sum, not exceeding £163,405, be granted, &c." (*Mr. Lindsay*)
After debate, Question put, A. 10, N. 109; M. 99
Original Question put, and agreed to 168,605
(4.) £300,718, Coast Guard Service, &c. ... ... [173] 1307
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 300,718
(5.) Motion, "71,276, Salaries of the Officers and the Contingent Expenses of the several Scientific Departments of the Navy, 1865" [173] 1307
Motion, "That the Item of £2,300, for School of Naval Architecture, and maintenance of Students in the same, be omitted from the proposed Vote" (*Mr. Augustus Smith*)
After debate, Question put; A. 15, N. 100; M. 85
Original Question put, and agreed to 71,276
(6.) £192,574, Naval Establishments at Home ... [173] 1314
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 192,574

Supply—cont. Total of Vote.

(7.) £37,666, Naval Establishments Abroad; Vote agreed to ... £ 37,666
Vote 7; Explanation, Lord Clarence Paget *Mar* 14 ... [173] 1911

COMMITTEE *Mar* 10—REPORT *Mar* 11.

(8.) £1,275,316, Wages to Artificers and others at Home [173] 1785
Vote agreed to
Debate arising on unexpected putting of the Question
Motion, "That the Chairman do report Progress" (*Sir James Elphinstone*)
After debate, Motion withdrawn
First Resolution re-committed;—Explanation, Lord Clarence Paget *Mar* 14 ... [173] 1911

COMMITTEE *Mar* 14—REPORT *Mar* 15.

Re-committed Resolution (reported *Mar* 11) read
(8.) £1,275,316, Wages to Artificers, Labourers, and others employed in Her Majesty's Naval Establishments at Home *Mar* 14 [173] 1942
Motion, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,030,337, &c." (*Mr. Lindsay*) [173] 1958
After long debate, Motion withdrawn
Original Question again proposed
Motion, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,112,878, &c." (*Mr. Lindsay*) [173] 1978
Question put, A. 29, N. 110; M. 81
Original Question put, and agreed to 1,275,316
(9.) £69,205, Wages to Artificers, &c. Naval Establishments Abroad, agreed to 69,205

COMMITTEE *April* 4—REPORT *April* 5.

(10*a*.) £1,164,100, Naval Stores [174] 418
After long debate, Vote agreed to ... 1,164,100
(10*b*.) £662,212, Steam Machinery [174] 441
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 662,212
(12.) £64,350, Medicines and Medical Stores ... ...[174] 442
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 64,350
(13.) £102,320, Naval Miscellaneous Services ... ...[174] 442
After debate, Vote agreed to ... 102,320
(14.) £697,790, Half Pay, Reserved Half Pay, and Retirement Officers of Navy and Royal Marines [174] 444
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 697,790
(15.) £490,201, Military Pensions and Allowances 490,201
(16.) £193,983, Civil Pensions and Allowances ... [174] 444
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 193,983
(17.) £314,230, Freight of Ships, &c. ... ... [174] 444
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 314,230
Resolutions reported *April* 5; and agreed to, after short debate, [174] 501

Supply—cont. — Total of Vote.

Committee *May* 2—Report *May* 3.

(11.) £449,298, for New Works, Improvements, and Repairs in the Naval Establishments [174] 2025
Motion, "That the Item of £1,549 [for additional accommodation for spinning machinery at Chatham] be omitted" (*Mr. Wykeham Martin*)
After short debate, Motion withdrawn
Original Question again proposed
Motion, "That the Item of £15,900, for deepening the North West Basin [of Malta Harbour] and constructing a First-class Dock, be reduced by the sum of £5,000" (*Lord Clarence Paget*) [174] 2034
After long debate, Question agreed to
Motion, "That the Item so reduced be omitted from the proposed Vote" (*Captain Talbot*)
After short debate, the Committee divided; A. 93, N. 111; M. 18
Original Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
£449,298, New Works, Improvements, and Repairs, agreed to ... £ 449,298

Supplementary Navy Estimates.

Committee *May* 26—Report *May* 27.

Statement of Lord C. Paget *May* 26 [175] 667
(1.) Motion, "£55,266, for increasing the Full Pay of the Executive Officers, Paymasters and Assistant Paymasters, Naval Instructors, &c. and Petty Officers of the Royal Navy"
After long debate, Motion, "That Chairman report Progress" (*Mr. Lindsay*) put, and negatived
Original Question agreed to ... 55,266
(2.) Motion, "£5,775, Retirement of Officers of the Royal Navy, and reducing the number of Officers on the Active List of the Navy" 691
After debate, Motion, "That Chairman report progress" (*Mr. C. Berkeley*) put, and negatived
Original Question agreed to ... 5,775

Committee *July* 14—Report *July* 15.

£220,000, Iron-clad Ships *El Tousson* and *El Monassia* ... [176] 1681
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 220,000

Total for the Naval Service ... 10,113,380
For the Service of other Departments 314,230
Supplementary Estimates ... 61,041
Purchase of Iron-Clads ... 220,000

Grand Total £10,708,651

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1864-5.

I.—Regular Forces.

Committee *Mar* 3—Report *Mar* 4.

Statement of The Marquess of Hartington, Under Secretary of State for War, on moving the First Resolution [*cont.*

Supply—cont. — Total of Vote.

of the Army Estimates, [173] 1416; "146,766 Land Forces"
After long debate, Resolution agreed to *Mar* 3

Committee *April* 11—Report *April* 13.

(1.) £5,708,983, General Staff and Regimental Pay, Allowances and Charges ... [174] 809
After long debate, Vote agreed to £ 5,708,983
(2.) £1,319,047, Commissariat Establishment, Services, and Movement of Troops ... [174] 829
After debate, Motion, "That the Chairman do report Progress" (*Mr. Hunt*), negatived
Original Question put, and agreed to 1,319,047
(3.) £596,694, Clothing; Vote agreed to ... ... [174] 832 596,694
(4.) £611,165, Barracks [174] 836
After short debate, Vote agreed to... 611,165
(5.) £45,433, Divine Service ... 45,433
(6.) £40,549, Martial Law [174] 836
After debate, Vote agreed to ... 40,549

Committee *May* 5—Report *May* 6.

(7.) £262,216, Army Medical Establishments, Services and Supplies [175] 29
After long debate, Vote agreed to... 262,216

II.—Auxiliary Forces.

(8.) £783,783, Disembodied Militia, [175] 40
After short debate, Vote agreed to... 783,783
(9.) £47,886, Yeomanry
Vote agreed to 47,886
(10.) £39,200, Yeomanry Cavalry, [175] 42
After debate, the Committee divided; A. 119, N. 29; M. 90
Vote agreed to 39,200
(11.) £328,260, Volunteers, [175] 46
After debate, Vote agreed to ... 328,260
(12.) £49,580, Enrolled Pensioners and Army Reserve ... [175] 51
After short debate, Vote agreed to... 49,580

III.—Stores.

(13.) £973,031, Manufacturing Departments ... [175] 54
Whereupon, after long debate, Amendment, "That a sum, not exceeding £967,031, &c." (*Sir Henry Willoughby*) ... [175] 63
After further debate, Motion withdrawn
Original Question again proposed
Whereupon Amendt. "That a sum, not exceeding £810,199, &c." (*Lord Elcho*)... ... [175] 74
After debate, the Committee divided; A. 35, N. 80; M. 45
Original Question put, and agreed to... 973,031
(14.) £572,519, Warlike Stores [175] 79
After short debate, Vote agreed to... 572,519 [*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
IV.—WORKS AND BUILDINGS.	
(15.) Motion, "£750,870, Works, Buildings and Repairs at Home and Abroad" [175] 80	
Whereupon Amendt. "That a sum, not exceeding £675,870, &c." (*Mr. Charles Berkeley*) ... [175] 81	
After debate, Committee report Progress *May* 5	
COMMITTEE *May* 9—REPORT *May* 11.	
(15.) Original Question again proposed, "£750,870, Works, Buildings, and Repairs at Home and Abroad," [175] 201	
Amendt. again proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £675,870, &c." (*Mr. Charles Berkeley*) [175] 201	
After long debate, Amendt. withdrawn	£
Original Question agreed to ...	750,870
V.—OTHER SERVICES.	
(16.) £173,883, Military Education [175] 215	
Royal Hibernian Military School at Dublin; Observations (*Mr. Maguire*)	
After debate, Vote agreed to ...	173,883
(17.) £88,345, Surveys [175] 232	
After debate, Vote agreed to ...	88,345
(18.) £123,103, Miscellaneous Services	
Vote agreed to	123,103
(19.) £223,834, Administration of the Army ... [175] 237	
After debate, Amendt. "That Item of £973, Forage to the Field Marshal, Commanding-in-Chief, be reduced by £473" (*Mr. Williams*), put, and negatived	
Original Question agreed to ...	223,834
VI.—NON-EFFECTIVE SERVICES.	
(20.) £26,020, Rewards for Military Service; Vote agreed to	26,020
(21.) £75,400, Pay of General Officers	
Vote agreed to	75,400
(22.) £449,471, Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers; Vote agreed to ...	449,471
(23.) £162,986, Widows' Pensions and Compassionate Allowances	
Vote agreed to	162,986
(24.) £29,663, Pensions and Allowances to Wounded Officers [175] 240	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	29,663
(25.) £33,260, In-Pensioners of Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals	
Vote agreed to	33,260
(26.) £1,161,812, Out-Pensioners of Chelsea Hospital, &c.; Vote agreed to	1,161,812
(27.) £136,332, Superannuation Allowances, &c.; Vote agreed to ...	136,332
(28.) £31,213, Non-effective Services, Disembodied Militia; Vote agreed to	31,213
Total, Effective Services ...	12,737,931
Total, Non-Effective Services ...	2,106,157
Grand Total, Army Services ...	£14,844,088

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1864-5.

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

The Votes marked † "to complete sums" for the several Services named.

	Total of Vote.
COMMITTEE *May* 12—REPORT *May* 19.	
(1.) £40,258, Royal Palaces † [175] 410	
Whereupon Amendt. "That a sum not exceeding £40,208," &c. (*Mr. Peacocke*) ... [175] 411	
After short debate, Amendt. withdrawn	£
Original Motion agreed to ...	52,258
(2.) £77,531, Public Buildings † [175] 412	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	107,531
(3.) £12,300, Furniture in Public Departments † ... [175] 415	
Whereupon Amendt. "That a sum, not exceeding £9,300," &c. (*Mr. A. Smith*)	
After debate, Amendt. withdrawn	
Original Question again proposed,	
Whereupon Amendt. "That the Item of £4,300, for Furniture, &c. for Department of Science and Art, be omitted" (*Mr. A. Smith*) put, and negatived	
Original Question put, and agreed to	17,300
(4.) £72,944, Royal Parks and Pleasure Grounds † [175] 418	
After debate, Vote agreed to ...	97,994
(5.) £22,144, New Houses of Parliament † ... [175] 425	
After long debate, Vote agreed to ...	32,144
COMMITTEE *May* 20—REPORT	
(6.) £517, Embassy Houses, &c. at Paris and Madrid † [175] 552	1,517
(7.) £3,201, Embassy Houses, &c. at Constantinople	3,201
(8.) £55,000, New Foreign Office Buildings†	
Committee counted out	
COMMITTEE *May* 30—REPORT *June* 2.	
(8.) £55,000, New Foreign Office Buildings ... ... [175] 844	
Whereupon Amendt. "That Item £4,899 8*s*. 9*d*., for Preliminary Expenses of Designs for a Foreign Office, which were not adopted, be omitted" (*Mr. A. Smith*)	
After debate, Motion withdrawn	
Original Question agreed to ...	75,000
(9.) £6,750, Industrial Museum, Edinburgh	6,750
(10.) £3,355, Aberdeen University ...	3,355
(11.) £6,574, Probate Court Registries [175] 846	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	6,574
(12.) £574, General Register House Edinburgh †	1,574
(13.) £19,000, Public Record Repository †	26,000
(14.) £15,000, New Westminster Bridge Approaches † ... [175] 847	
After short debate, Vote agreed to	20,000
(15.) £7,930, New Westminster Bridge†	10,930

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. Total of Vote.

(16.) £3,260, Architectural Designs, &c. for Public Buildings [175] 848
After short debate, the Committee divided; A. 84, N. 21; M. 63 £
Vote agreed to 3,260
(17.) £4,000, Nelson's Column [175] 851
After debate, Vote agreed to ... 4,000
(18.) £96,000, Harbours of Refuge [175] 854
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 96,000
(19.) £47,875, Holyhead, Portpatrick, and Spurn Point † [175] 856
Whereupon Amendt. "That the Item of £8,727, for Portpatrick Harbour, be omitted" (*Mr. Torrens*)
After short debate, Amendt. negatived
Original Question agreed to ... 57,875
(20.) £72,452, Public Buildings in Ireland † ... [175] 858
Whereupon Amendt. "That Item of £950, for additions, &c. to Model Agricultural Schools be reduced by £600" (*Lord Naas*)
After short debate, Amendt. negatived
Original Question agreed to ... 97,452
(21.) £13,000, New Record Buildings (Dublin) † 18,000
(22.) £1,100, National Gallery (Dublin) 1,100
(23.) £13,703, for Lighthouses Abroad [175] 860
Whereupon Amendt. "That Item £2,000, for the Little Basses Rocks Light Ship at Ceylon, be omitted" (*Mr. A. Smith*)
After short debate, Question negatived
Original Question agreed to ... 13,703
(—)£4,000, Lunatic Asylum, Isle of Man ... ... [175] 861
After short debate, the Committee divided, A. 73, N. 95; M. 22
(25.) £17,000, Sheriff Court-Houses (Scotland) ... [175] 863
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 17,000
(26.) £20,000, Rates for Government Property ... [175] 863
After short debate, Vote agreed to 27,000
(27.) £53,000, Land &c. at Kensington Gore ... [175] 866
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 53,000

Total of Class I. £853,518

CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.

The Votes marked † "to complete sums" for the several Services named.

COMMITTEE *June* 6—REPORT *June* 8.

(—)£10,000, New National Gallery at Burlington House [175] 1297
After long debate, Committee divided, A. 122, N. 174; M. 52
(1.) £51,127, Two Houses of Parliament, Offices † ... ... £ 69,127
(2.) £39,147, Treasury † 53,147
(3.) £19,883, Home Office † ... 26,883
(4.) £53,015, Foreign Office † [175] 1332
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 72,015

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. Total of Vote. £

(5.) £23,421, Colonial Office † ... 31,421
(6.) £17,306, Privy Council Office † [175] 1333
After short debate, Vote agreed to 24,306

COMMITTEE *June* 10—REPORT *June* 13.

(7.) £48,543, Board of Trade † [175] 1601
Motion, "That the Item of £450, for Salary of Librarian to the Board of Trade, be omitted from proposed Vote" (*Mr. Augustus Smith*) negatived ... [175] 1603
Original Question agreed to ... 65,543
Motion, "That Chairman report Progress" (*Mr. Cox*), negatived
(8.) £1,908, Privy Seal Office †
Motion, "That Chairman report Progress" (*Mr. Cox*), 1604
The Committee divided, A. 7, N. 59; M. 52
Vote agreed to 2,908
(9.) £5,744, Civil Service Commission †... 8,744
(10.) £14,491, Paymaster General's Office † ... [175] 1604
Motion, "That Chairman report Progress" (*Mr. Hennessy*)
After short debate, Motion withdrawn
Original Question agreed to ... 19,491

COMMITTEE *June* 13—REPORT *June* 14.

(11.) £2,928, Controller General of Exchequer † 4,928
(12.) £22,903, Office of Works and Public Buildings † 31,903
(13.) £20,225, Office of Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues † .. 28,225
(14.) £14,651, Office of Public Records, &c. † 20,651
(15.) £213,810, Poor Law Commissions † 233,810
(16.) £41,867, Mint, including Coinage† 55,867
(17.) £26,647, Inspectors of Factories, Fisheries, &c. †.. 35,647
(18.) £4,235, Exchequer and other Offices in Scotland† 6,235
(19.) £4,434, Household of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland † 6,434
(20.) £11,695, Offices of Chief Secretary for Ireland † 16,695
(21.) £2,782, Office of Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums, Ireland † ... 3,782
(22.) £17,431, Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Public Works in Ireland † ... ...[175] 1669
Whereupon Motion, "That the Item of £500, for Salary of Inspecting Commissioners of Fisheries, be omitted from proposed Vote" (*Mr. Butt*) [175] 1671
Motion, "That Chairman report Progress" (*Mr. Hennessy*), [175] 1672
After short debate Motion withdrawn
Question again proposed, "That the Item of £500, for Salary of Inspecting Commissioners of Fisheries, be omitted from proposed Vote" (*Mr. Butt*) ... ... [175] 1673

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

	Total of Vote.
After short debate, Motion withdrawn	£
Original Question agreed to ...	23,431
(23.) £26,512, Commissioners of Audit†	35,512
(24.) £14,125, Copyhold, Inclosure, and Tithe Commission † ... [175] 1674	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	19,125
(25.) £9,290, Imprest Expenses under Inclosure and Drainage Acts † ...	13,290
(26.) £50,955, General Register Office †	67,955
(27.) £11,440, National Debt Office†...	15,440
(28.) £2,795, Public Works Loan Commission, and West India Islands Relief Commission † [175] 1674	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	3,795
(29.) £5,172, Lunacy Commission † ...	7,172
(30.) £1,223, General Superintendent of County Roads, South Wales [175] 1675	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	1,223
(31.) £1,453, Registrars of Friendly Societies †	2,453
(32.) £14,823, Charity Commission † [175] 1676	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	18,823
(33.) £4,442, Local Government Act Office †	6,442
(34.) £1,244, Landed Estates Record Offices † ... [175] 1676	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	2,244
(35.) £446, Quarantine Expenses † ...	1,446
(36.) £24,000, Secret Service † ...	32,000
(37.) £254,165, Printing and Stationery † ... [175] 1678	
After debate, Vote agreed to ...	344,165
(38.) £101,300, Postage of Public Departments † [175] 1680	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	136,300
Total of Class II.	£1,548,578

CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

ENGLAND.

The Votes marked † "to complete sums" for the several Services named.

COMMITTEE *June* 13—REPORT *June* 14.

(1.) £25,115, Law Charges, England †	34,115
(2.) £144,923, Prosecutions at Assizes and Quarter Sessions †	194,923
(3.) £184,050, Police Counties and Boroughs, Great Britain † [175] 1682	
Amendt. "That the deductions now made were contrary to the provisions and intentions of the Act of Parliament 19 & 20 *Vict.* c. 69, which never contemplated that payments made by the Police to the Superannuation Fund and fines should be taken account of in calculating the amount to be paid by the Treasury" (*Sir W. Miles*) *June* 13	
After short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Vote agreed to	244,050
(4.) £1,188, Crown Office, Queen's Bench †	3,188
(5.) £8,700, High Court of Admiralty and Admiralty Court, Dublin† ...	11,700
(6.) £2,358, Expenses of late Insolvent Debtors' Court †	4,358

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

	Total of Vote.
	£
(7.) £62,580, Courts of Probate and Divorce and Matrimonial Causes †...	83,580
(8.) £112,000, County Courts † [175] 1685	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	152,000
(9.) £2,900, Office of Land Registry †	4,900
(10.) £14,633, Police Courts (Metropolis) †	20,633
(11.) £106,894, Metropolitan Police†...	146,894
(12.) £17,850, Revising Barristers, England and Wales	17,850
(13.) £786, Compensation under Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act ..	786
(14.) £13,143, Compensations under Bankruptcy Act, 1861†	18,143

SCOTLAND.

(15.) £2,577, Salaries of Lord Advocate and Solicitor General, Scotland †	3,577
(16.) £13,174, Court of Session, Scotland †...	18,174
(17.) £7,811, Court of Justiciary, Scotland †	10,811
(18.) £2,800, Prosecutions under Lord Advocate †	4,800
(19.) £680, Salaries, &c., Exchequer, Scotland, Legal Branch † ...	1,680
(20.) £26,231, Expenses connected with Sheriff Court, Scotland † ...	35,231
(21.) £14,105, Salaries of Procurators Fiscal, Scotland † [175] 1686	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	20,105
(22.) £10,250, Salaries of Sheriff's Clerks, Scotland † [175] 1687	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	14,250
(23.) £3,000, Expenses in matters of Tithes, &c. Scotland	3,000
(24.) £11,778, General Register House, Edinburgh †	16,778
(25.) £1,295, Commissary Clerk Office	1,295
(26.) £1,472, Accountant in Bankruptcy	1,472

IRELAND.

(27.) £45,134, Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions, Ireland † ..	61,134
(28.) £3,717, Court of Chancery, Ireland † ... ... [175] 1688	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	5,717
(29.) £7,462, Courts of Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer, Ireland †	10,462
(30.) £6,000, Process Servers, Ireland †	9,000
(31.) £3,932, Registrars to Judges, &c. Ireland †	5,932
(32.) £1,200, Compensations to Seneschals, &c. of Manor Courts in Ireland †	2,200
(33.) £1,360, Office for Registration of Judgments, Ireland † [175] 1688	
After short debate, Vote agreed to	2,360
(34.) £100, Fees to Commissioners of High Court of Delegates, Ireland ...	100
(35.) £4,403, Court of Bankruptcy and Insolvency, &c. Ireland † ...	6,403
(36.) £7,650, Court of Probate, Ireland†	10,650
(37.) £7,819, Landed Estates Court, Ireland †	11,819
(38.) £1,150, Consolidated Office of Writs, Dublin	1,150

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. Total of Vote.

(39.) £420, Revising Barristers, Dublin £420
(40.) £36,000, Police Justices, &c. Dublin † 49,000
(41.) £536,535, Constabulary Force, Ireland † 736,535
(42.) £1,714, Four Courts, Marshalsea Prison, Dublin † 2,714

PRISON AND CONVICT SERVICES AT HOME AND ABROAD.

(43.) £13,980, Inspection, &c. of Prisons, Reformatories, and Industrial Schools † 18,980
(44.) £300,627, Government Prisons and Convict Establishments at Home † [175] 1689
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 390,627
(45.) £218,286, Maintenance of Prisoners in County Gaols, &c. † ... 288,286
(46.) £16,380, Transportation of Convicts † 26,380
(47.) £101,783, Convict Establishments, Colonies † [175] 1690
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 151,783
Resolutions reported *June* 14 and agreed to; except Res. 7, 9, 12, 75, postponed
Postponed Resolutions considered *June* 16 [175] 1912
Seventh Resolution read 2°
Amendt. to leave out "26,647," and insert "25,202" (*Mr. Butt*)
Question, "That '£26,647,' stand part of the Resolution"
Amendt. withdrawn; Resolution agreed to
Ninth Resolution agreed to
Twelth Resolution further postponed
Seventy-fifth Resolution agreed to
Postponed Resolution (No. 12) read 2° and agreed to *June* 17

Total of Class III. £2,859,945

CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.

The Votes marked † "to complete sums" for the several Services named.

COMMITTEE *June* 30—REPORT *July* 1

(1.) £525,404, Public Education, Great Britain† ... [176] 516
After long debate, Vote agreed to ... 705,404
(2.) £97,582, Department of Science and Art † [176] 557
Motion, "That a sum, not exceeding £82,582, &c." (*Mr. A. Smith*) 560
After short debate, A. 73, N. 131; M. 58
Original Question put and agreed to 135,582

COMMITTEE *July* 11—REPORT *July* 12.

(3.) £236,770, Public Education, Ireland † ... [176] 1340
After long debate, Vote agreed to ... 316,770
(4.) £805, Commissioners of Education Ireland (Office Expenses) ... 805
(5.) £3,206, University of London † [176] 1352
After short debate, Vote agreed to 5,206

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. Total of Vote. £

(6.) £13,704, Universities, &c. in Scotland † 19,704
(7.) £2,462, Queen's University in Ireland 2,462
(8.) £3,400, Queen's Colleges in Ireland † ... [176] 1353
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 5,400
(9.) £500, Royal Irish Academy ... 500
(10.) £600, National Gallery of Ireland [176] 1355
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 600
(11.) £1,500, Belfast Theological Professors, &c. † 2,500
(12.) £69,127, to complete the sum for the British Museum [176] 1356
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 92,127

COMMITTEE *July* 14—REPORT *July* 15.

(13.) £8,876, National Gallery † [176] 1523
After debate, Vote agreed to ... 13,876
(14.) £1,500, British Historical Portrait Gallery . [176] 1532
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 1,500

COMMITTEE *July* 15—REPORT *July* 19.

(15.) £5,184, Scientific Works and Experiments † ... [176] 1598
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 7,184
(16.) £500, Royal Geographical Society 500
(17.) £1,000, Royal Society ... 1,000
(18.) £500, Royal Academy of Music [176] 1600
After debate, A. 52, N. 42; M. 10
Vote agreed to 500

Total of Class IV. £1,311,620

CLASS V.—COLONIAL, CONSULAR, AND OTHER FOREIGN SERVICES.

The Votes marked † "to complete sums" for the several Services named.

COMMITTEE *June* 16—REPORT *June* 17.

NORTH AMERICA.

(1.) £3,200, Civil Establishments, Bermudas † [175] 1882
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 4,200
(2.) £3,213, Ecclesiastical Establishments, British North American Provinces; Vote agreed to † ... 4,213
(3.) £1,000, Indian Department, Canada [175] 1882
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... 1,000

WEST INDIES, &c.

(4.) £21,278, Salaries of Governors, Lieutenant Governors, and others, in West Indies, and certain other Colonies † .. ... [175] 1885
Whereupon Amendt. "That the Item of £450, for Presiding Magistrate of Anguilla, be omitted from proposed Vote" (*Mr. Hennessy*), [175] 1886
Committee divided; A. 34, N. 45; M. 11
Original Question agreed to ... 24,278
(5.) £6,200, Justices, West Indies; Vote agreed to † 7,200

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
AFRICA.	
(—) £14,355, Civil Establishments on Western Coast of Africa † [175] 1888	
Whereupon Amendt. "That Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again" (*Sir John Trelawny*) [175] 1889	
After short debate, Motion and Original Question withdrawn	
(7.) £2,924, St. Helena †; Vote agreed to	£ 4,924
(8.) £700, Orange River Territory (Cape of Good Hope); Vote agreed to	700
MISCELLANEOUS.	
(9.) £960, Heligoland [175] 1890	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	960
(10.) £3,608, Falkland Islands † ...	5,608
(11.) £3,825, Labuan †	5,825
(12.) £300, Pitcairn Islanders, Norfolk Island ... [175] 1890	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	300
(13.) £7,720, Emigration † [175] 1891	
After debate, Vote agreed to ...	10,720

(14.) £32,550, Treasury Chest † [175] 1896	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	37,550
(15.) £12,500, Zambesi Expedition [175] 1896	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	12,500
(16.) £2,000, Niger Expedition [175] 1897	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	2,000
(17.) £55,000, Captured Negroes, Bounties on Slaves, &c. † [175] 1897	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	70,000
(18.) £7,650, Commissions for Suppression of Slave Trade † [175] 1898	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	10,650
(19.) £124,503, Consular Establishments Abroad † [175] 1900	
Whereupon Amendt. "That the Item of £400, for Salary of Consul at Rome, be omitted from proposed Vote" (*Mr. Henry Seymour*) [175] 1904	
After debate, Amendment negatived	
Original Question again proposed	
Whereupon Amendt. "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again" (*Mr. Henry Seymour*) ... [175] 1911	
After short debate, the Committee divided; A. 40, N. 111; M. 71	
Original Question again proposed	
Whereupon Amendt. "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Darby Griffith*) [175] 1911	
After short debate, Amendt. negatived	
Original Question put, and agreed to	166,503

COMMITTEE *June* 27—REPORT *June* 29.

(20.) £94,222, Services in China, Japan, and Siam †	99,222
(21.) £27,000, Extraordinary Disbursements of Embassies and Missions Abroad † ... [176] 392	

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
Motion, "That a sum, not exceeding £17,000, &c." (*Mr. Dodson*) [176] 393	
After short debate, A. 37, N. 113; M. 76	£
Original Question put, and agreed to	37,000
(22.) £20,000, Special Missions, Outfits, &c. † ... [176] 396	
Motion, "That the Item of £52 4*s.* 4*d.*, for Seamen's Clothing supplied to Commodore Wilmot from the *Rattlesnake* in January, 1863, for presentation to the Chiefs, &c., at the Court of the King of Dahomey, be omitted from the proposed Vote" (*Mr. Butt*) 397	
After short debate, Motion withdrawn	
Original Question put, and agreed to	30,000
(23.) £3,649, Third Secretaries to Embassies, &c. †	4,649

COMMITTEE *July* 14—REPORT *July* 15.

(6.) £14,355, Civil Establishments on Western Coast of Africa † [176] 1658	
Motion, "That £12,105 be granted, &c." (*Sir John Hay*); after long debate, Motion withdrawn; Original Question agreed to	18,355
Total of Class V. ...	£558,357

CLASS VI.—SUPERANNUATION AND RETIRED ALLOWANCES, AND GRATUITIES FOR CHARITABLE AND OTHER PURPOSES.

The Votes marked † "to complete sums" for the several Services named.

COMMITTEE *June* 27—REPORT *June* 28.

(1.) £123,280, Superannuation and Retired Allowances †	183,280
(2.) £728, Toulonese and Corsican Emigrants, &c., and American Loyalists	728
(3.) 325, Refuge for the Destitute ...	325
(4.) £1,959, Polish Refugees and Distressed Spaniards †	2,959
(5.) £50,700, Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions †	54,700
(6.) £25,400, Relief of Distressed British Seamen †	34,400
(7.) £2,607, Miscellaneous Charges, formerly on Civil List †	3,607
(8,) £1,272, Public Infirmaries, Ireland †...	2,272
(9.) £1,600, Westmoreland Lock Hospital †	2,600
(10.) £700, Rotunda Lying-in Hospital	700
(11) £200, Coombe Lying-in Hospital	200
(12.) 5,600, House of Industry Hospitals †	7,600
(13.) £1,500, Cork Street Fever Hospital †...	2,500
(14.) £600, Meath Hospital ...	600
(15.) £100, St. Mark's Ophthalmic Hospital	100
(16.) £300, Dr. Steven's Hospital † ...	1,300
(17.) £245, Board of Superintendence of Dublin Hospitals	245

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
(18.) £5,693, Concordatum Fund, and other Charities and Allowances, Ireland †...	£ 8,693
(19.) £29,670, Non-conforming and other Ministers in Ireland † [176] 399	
Motion, "That a sum, not exceeding £670, &c." (*Mr. Hadfield*), 399	
After short debate, A. 21, N. 127; M. 106	
Original Question put, and agreed to	40,670
Total of Class VI.	£347,479

Class VII.—Miscellaneous, Special, and Temporary Objects.

The Votes marked † "to complete sums" for the several Services named.

Committee *July* 1—Report *July* 4

(1.) £3,750, Ecclesiastical Commissioners ... [176] 656	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	3,750
(2.) £11,224, Temporary Commissions † ... [176] 657	
After short debate, Vote agreed to	15,224
(3.) £22,689, Patent Law Expenses †	30,689
(4.) £11,152, Fishery Board, Scotland†	15,152
(5.) £2,000, Trustees of Manufactures, Scotland	2,000
(6.) £37,948, Dues under Treaties of Reciprocity †	53,948
(7.) £2,220, Inspectors of Corn Returns †	3,220
(8.) £500, Boundary Survey, Ireland	500

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
(9.) £680, Malta and Alexandria Telegraph, &c. ... [176] 657	£
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	680
(10.) £12,457, Miscellaneous Expenses from Civil Contingencies † [176] 658	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	13,457

Committee *June* 10—Report *June* 13.

(11.) Award to Sir Rowland Hill [175] 1595	
After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	20,000
Total of Class VII.	£158,620

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, 1864-5.

Committee *July* 15—Report *July* 18.

Vote I. Customs (Salaries and Expenses) ... [176] 1608	771,473
Vote II. Inland Revenue (Salaries and Expenses)	1,313,467
Vote III. Post Office	2,114,616
Vote IV. Superannuations [176] 1609	492,536
Total of Revenue Departments...	£4,692,092

POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE.

Committee *July* 18—Report *July* 19.

£860,276, Post Office Packet Service [176] 1652	860,276

EXCHEQUER BONDS.

Committee *July* 14—Report *July* 15.

£1,600,000, Exchequer Bonds ...	1,600,000

SUMMARY.

Sums Voted in Supply, Session 1864.

1863-4.

(Supplemental Votes.)

Army		£409,000
Redemption of Scheldt Toll (1st moiety)		175,650
Army		14,844,088
Navy		10,708,651
Civil Services—viz.		
I. Public Works and Buildings	£853,518	
II. Salaries, &c. Public Departments ...	1,548,578	
III. Law and Justice	2,859,945	
IV. Education, Science, and Art ...	1,311,620	
V. Colonial and Consular Services ...	558,357	
VI. Superannuation, &c.	347,479	
VII. Miscellaneous...	158,620	
		7,638,117
Revenue Departments ...		4,692,092
Post Office Packet Service		860,276
Exchequer Bonds		1,600,000
Total, Votes in Supply ...		£40,927,874

SUMMARY.

Ways and Means.

1863-4.	£	s.	d.
Amount granted per Act 27 *Vict.* c. 5, dated 18 March 1864, for the service of the year to 31 March 1864 ...	584,650	0	0
1864-5.			
Amount granted on Account, per Act 27 *Vict.* c. 6, dated 18 March 1864	4,500,000	0	0
Further Amount granted on Account, per Act 27 *Vict.* c. 11, dated 28 April 1864 ...	15,000,000	0	0
Surplus Ways and Means of former years, per Appropriation Bill, Section 9 ...	3,501,410	4	2
Balance per Appropriation Bill, Section 1	17,341,813	15	10
Total, Grants of Ways and Means, per Appropriation Bill, Section 10 ...	£40,927,874	0	0

SURTEES, Mr. H. E., *Hertfordshire*
- Paper Manufacture, Comm. moved for, [176] 1739
- Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 983
- Watching of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1720

SYDNEY, Viscount, (Lord Chamberlain)
- Address in Answer to the Speech—Her Majesty's Reply, [173] 301

SYKES, Col. W. H., *Aberdeen City*
- Administration of Trusts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 9, [176] 425
- Army Estimates — Land Forces, [173] 1436 1440, 1444 ;—Medical Establishment, [175] 34, 35, 40 ;—Volunteers, 47 ;—Enrolled Pensioners, 52 ;—Manufacturing Departments, 73 ; —Warlike Stores, 79 ;—Works, Buildings, &c. 205, 214 ; — Military Education, 230 ;—Administration of the Army, 238
- China — Captain Osborn's Expedition, [173] 860 ;—Anglo-Chinese Fleet, 1182, 1183 ;—Captain Gordon and the Footai of Shanghai, [174] 1199 ;—Hong Kong Ordinances, [175] 191 ;—Policy of European Powers, 459, 460 ; —Affairs of, 534, 535, 541 ; Res. 965 ;—British Subjects in, 588
- Denmark and Germany—Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 886
- East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [176] 1810, 1817, 1839
- Education, Res. [173] 1682 ; — Endowed Schools, Res. [175] 1083
- Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 616
- Flogging at Sunderland, Case of, [176] 2190
- Fortifications and Works, Comm. [176] 1533
- Game Law Prosecutions, [176] 1324
- Government Annuities, Comm. [174] 799
- Hudson's Bay Territory, Papers moved for, [176] 628
- India—Gold Currency, [173] 1364, 1365 ; Res. [175] 1582 ; — Indian Officers, Res. [174] 882, 893 ; [175] 1264, 1273, 1274 ; [176] 614, 2158 ;—Army Medical Officers, [174] 1770 ;—Banda and Kirwee Booty, Address moved, [175] 736 ; — Claims of Azeem Jah, Comm. moved for, 1665 ; — Army Brevet Rank, [176] 1572
- Indian Medical Service, Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 1703 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1900 ; 3R. 2039
- Japan—The 20th Regiment, [174] 620
- Lawrence's, Sir J., Salary, Comm. [173] 224
- Mails in the Provinces, Comm. moved for, [174] 409
- Naval Forces, Res. [173] 1099
- Navy Estimates — Wages, [173] 1282, 1285, 1287, 1288, 1297 ;—Admiralty Office, 1307 ; —Wages of Artificers at Home, 1970 ; Naval Stores, [174] 426, 428 ; — Naval Miscellaneous Services, 442 ;—Freight of Ships, 444
- New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1507 ; Comm. 1688 ; *cl.* 1, 1694
- Private Bills, Res. 7, [173] 680
- Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [176] 1429
- Servants Hiring (Scotland), Comm. [175] 1822
- Supply—Civil Service Estimates, [175] 406 ;—Department of Science and Art, [176] 563 ; —Public Education (Ireland), 1350 [*cont.*

SYKES, Colonel W. H.—*cont.*
- United States—Capture of British Ships, Papers moved for, [173] 518 ;—Soochow, 1463 ; —Seizure of the "Saxon," [174] 477
- Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [173] 1738
- Writs Registration (Scotland), 2R. [175] 1493

TALBOT, Hon. Capt. W. C., *Waterford Co.*
- Ashantee—War in, [175] 1841
- Malta—Dock at, [173] 497 ; Res. 889, 895, 896 ; [176] 158
- Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [173] 1155 ; [174] 1473 ;—Naval Establishments, [174] 2040, 2048 ; Amendt. 2049 ;—Pay of Officers, [175] 688, 691

Tasmania, Gold in
- Question, Mr. Rogers ; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 26, [174] 1625
- Report of Mr. Gould (*Parl. P.* No. 331)

TAUNTON, Lord
- Brokers Bonds and Rents, 2R. [176] 609
- London City Tithes, 2R. [176] 480
- Mortgage Debentures, 2R. [174] 1595
- New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1906
- Peers' Robing Room — Mr. Herbert R. A.—Paper moved for, [176] 2003
- Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, 2R. [175] 890
- Regius Professorship of Greek (Oxford), Comm. [175] 445
- Royal Academy, The, [174] 245

Taxation
- Motion, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the operation and incidence of our present fiscal system, and to consider and report if any and what measures could be devised to secure a more equitable adjustment of the burden of Imperial taxation" (*Mr. White*) *May* 10, [175] 261 ; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Taxation and Expenditure
- Observations, Sir Henry Willoughby ; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 11, [173] 473

TAYLOR, Mr. P. A., *Leicester*
- Emigration (America), Papers moved for, [176] 2179
- Garibaldi, General—Meeting at Primrose Hill, Papers moved for, [174] 1699
- Stansfeld, Mr., and the Greco Conspiracy, Res. [174] 266
- Turkey—Prince Couza and the Porte, [176] 2189
- United States—Confederate Cruisers, Papers moved for, [173] 1488

Telegraphic Despatches
- Question, Mr. Darby Griffith ; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 29, [173] 1254 ; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith ; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 1, 1337 ; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith ; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 8, 1652

Tests Abolition (Oxford) Bill

(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Goschen*)

c. Tests Abolition (Oxford) considered* in Committee; Bill ordered *Feb* 12
Read 1°* *Feb* 12 [Bill 18]

174] Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Dodson*) *Mar* 16, 102; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir W. Heathcote*), 113; after long debate, Question put, "That 'now' &c.;" A. 211, N. 189; M. 22; Bill read 2°; Division List—Ayes and Noes, 158
Order for Committee read *June* 1

175] Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," 1002; Amendt. To leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day three months, &c." (*Mr. Trefusis*), 1008; Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 236, N. 226; M. 10; after long debate, Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill considered in Committee; Committee R.P.*

176] Bill considered in Committee *June* 29, 467; and reported, without Amendment
Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°," *July* 1, 666; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Sir William Heathcote*); Question put, "That the word 'now,' &c.;" A. 150, N. 140; M. 10; List of the Ayes and Noes, 668; after short debate, Main Question put; A. 170, N. 170; Mr. Speaker declares himself with the Ayes; Division List, 675; Question put, "That this Bill do pass;" A. 171, N. 173; M. 2; Division List, 678

Thames Conservancy Bill

(*Mr. Hutt, Mr. Peel*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 11 [Bill 60]
Read 2°, after short debate, and committed to a Select Committee *April* 25
Committee nominated *April* 29:—Mr. Hutt (Chairman), Mr. Cave, Mr. Headlam, Mr. Alderman Rose, Mr. Joseph Ewart, Mr. Locke, Mr. Longfield, Sir W. Russell, Mr. R. B. Sheridan, Lieut. Col. Sturt, Mr. Torrens, Mr. E. M. Fenwick. *May* 19, Mr. Joseph Ewart disch., Mr. Ayrton added
Report of Select Committee *June* 8 (Bill 60, Nos. 373, 135)
Bill considered in Committee *June* 28, 415
Bill reported
Considered as amended* *June* 29
Read 3°* *June* 30

l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *July* 1 (No. 173)
Read 2ª* *July* 11, and referred to a Select Committee
Select Committee appointed and nominated* as follows: The Viscount Hutchinson (Chairman), The Lord Abercromby, The Lord Mostyn, The Lord De Mauley, The Lord Methuen *July* 21
Report of Select Committee *July* 22 (No. 226)
Committee* *July* 23; Report* *July* 25
Read 3ª* *July* 26 (No. 240)

c. Lords Amendts. considered and agreed to *July* 27, [176] 2153
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 113]

Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans) Bill

Resolutions in Committee *July* 1 (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*), [176] 660
Resolution reported; Bill ordered *July* 4
(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)
Read 1°* *July* 5 [Bill 191]
Read 2°* *July* 8
Committee*; Report *July* 11
Read 3°* *July* 14

l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *July* 15
Read 2ª* *July* 18 (No. 206)
Committee*; Report *July* 19
Read 3ª* *July* 21
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 61]

Theatres (Precautions against Fire)
Question, Mr. W. Ewart; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 12, [173] 494; Question, Sir William Fraser; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 12, 534
Papers respecting (*Parl. P.* No. 64)

Thomas, Case of Mr.
Question, Sir John Pakington, 1770; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Mar* 10, [173] 1774

Thompson, Mr. H. S., *Whitby*
Agricultural Statistics, Res. [175] 1373
Cattle Diseases Prevention, Re-Comm. *cl.* 6, [176] 1568
Highways Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 692; Comm. Preamble, [176] 1372
Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers), 3R. Amendt. [176] 1365

Tite, Mr. W., *Bath*
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway, 2R. Amendt. [173] 1633
Metropolitan District Railways, 3R. [176] 1622
Park Lane, South Entrance to, [175] 364; [176] 334
Railway Schemes (Metropolis), Res. [173] 1646

Titles (Ireland) Bill

(*Mr. Monsell, Mr. Herbert, Sir C. O'Loghlen*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 20 [Bill 230]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 25

Titles (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill

(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Sir R. Peel*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 27 [Bill 244]

Tobacco Juice for Sheep-Dressing
Question, Lord John Browne; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 3, [174] 629

Tollemache, Mr. J., *Cheshire, S.*
Confederate Steam Rams, [175] 1001

Took the Oath
Feb 4—The Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol
The Lord Archbishop of Armagh
Henry White, esq., having been created Baron Annaly
Richard Monckton Milnes, esq., having been created Baron Houghton
Feb 5—The Lord Inchiquin
Mar 14—The Lord Dunsany
April 12—The Lord Bishop of Ossory
May 6—The Lord Wentworth
May 10—The Lord Bishop of Cork
June 21—The Lord Bishop of Ely

TORRENS, Mr. R., *Carrickfergus*
Civil Bill Courts (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [174] 1556; Consid. *cl.* 25, Proviso, 1966, 1967
Civil Service and Miscellaneous Estimates, Res. [173] 1356
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [176] 1835, 1855, 1856
Epping Forest, Papers moved for, [175] 1199
India—Officers in the Army, [175] 1271;—Finance Accounts, [176] 2191, 2192
Open Spaces (Metropolis), Res. [176] 437
Portpatrick Harbour, [175] 719
Standing Orders Revision, Report, Amendt. [176] 2153
Supply—Holyhead and Portpatrick Harbours, &c. Amendt. [175] 856;—Suppression of Slave Trade, 1899;—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [176] 396

Townley, The Convict
Motion (*The Earl of Carnarvon*) postponed *Feb* 5, [173] 169; Question, Lord Henry Lennox; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 8, 218; Question, Sir FitzRoy Kelly; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 9, 328; Question, Mr. Morritt; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 26, 1185 (*Parl. P.* No. 37)
See *Penal Servitude Acts Amendment Bill*
Insane Prisoners Act Amendment Bill

TRACY, Hon. C. R. D. HANBURY, *Montgomery*
Navy—Gunnery Instructors, [173] 1756;—Armstrong Guns at Kagosima, [174] 1624; Iron Plate Committee, [175] 366;—Chaplain Generalship of the Navy, [176] 1468

Trade with Foreign Nations
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 15, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the arrangement between the Foreign Office and the Board of Trade in reference to Trade with Foreign Nations" (*Mr. W. E. Forster*), [174] 1083; after long debate, Question, "That the words, &c." put, and negatived; words added; Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
Committee nominated *April* 26:—Mr. William Edward Forster (Chairman), Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Henley, Mr. Cobden, Mr. Layard, Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald, Sir Stafford Northcote, [*cont.*

Trade with Foreign Nations—cont.
Sir Minto Farquhar, Mr. Charles Turner, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Somerset Beaumont, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Kinnaird, Mr. Butler-Johnstone, and Mr. Pender
Report *July* 15 (*Parl. P.* No. 493)

Treasure Trove
Motion for an Address (*Sir Jervoise Jervoise*) *May* 10, [175] 285; House counted out
Return of Treasure claimed, 1863-4 (*Parl. P.* No. 297)

Treasury Regulations—Payments "without Account"
Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. Peel *Mar* 17, [174] 186

TREFUSIS, Hon. C. H. R., *Devonshire, N.*
Tests Abolition (Oxford), Comm. Amendt. [175] 1002

TREHERNE, Mr. M., *Coventry*
County Franchise, 2R. [174] 947
Coventry, Trade of, [176] 505, 510

TRELAWNY, Sir J. S., *Tavistock*
Army Estimates — Medical Establishment, [175] 35
Army—Sanitary Measures (Camps, &c.), Comm. moved for, [175] 1914
Indian Medical Service, Consid. *add. cl.* [176] 1902
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1505; Comm. Amendt. 1681; *cl.* 1, 1694
New Zealand—War in, Papers moved for, [174] 1652
Rape, Punishment of, Comm. [176] 947
School of Naval Architecture—Sir W. S. Harris, Papers moved for, [175] 196; Res. [176] 501
Street Music (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 472
Supply—West Coast of Africa, Adj. moved, [175] 1889, 1890; Report, [176] 1702

Trespass (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. William Ormsby Gore, Captain Archdall*)
173] *c.* Ordered * *Feb* 9; read 1°* *Feb* 12 [Bill 13]
Bill read 2°, after short debate, *Mar* 9, 1705
174] Order for Committee read:—Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *April* 13, 954: Amendt. To leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Bagwell*); after short debate, Question put, "That the words, &c." A. 158, N. 45; M. 113; Bill considered in Committee—R.P. *April* 13
. Bill considered in Committee—R.P.* *April* 26, 1752
176] Bill considered in Committee *July* 6, 931
Bill reported [Bill 195]
Considered as amended * *July* 11
Read 3° * *July* 13
l. Read 1ª* (*Marquess of Clanricarde*) *July* 14
Read 2ª * *July* 15 (No. 202)
Committee *; Report *July* 21
Read 3ª* *July* 22
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 67]

Trevor, Lord A. E. **Hill-**, *Downshire*
Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, Comm. Amendt. [176] 1435

Trollope, Right Hon. Sir J., *Lincolnshire, S.*
Bewicke, Mr., Case of, Comm. moved for, [174] 1935
Collection of Taxes, 3R. Amendt. [175] 2088, 2101
Forests, Royal, in Essex, [176] 653
Supply—Rates for Government Property, [175] 865

Truro, Lord
Hill, Sir Rowland, Resignation of, [173] 1626

Turkey—Prince Couza and the Porte
Questions, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Baillie Cochrane, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Layard *July* 22, [176] 1904; Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *July* 29, 2189

Turner, Mr. C., *Lancashire, S.*
Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. *cl.* 2, [175] 1481
Customs Officers, Complaints of, [176] 1705
Government Annuities, Comm. [173] 1526

Turner, Mr. J. A., *Manchester*
Factory Acts Extension, Comm. [175] 1947
Insolvent Debtors, Comm. [176] 1432
Supply—Sir Rowland Hill, [175] 1598

Turnpike Acts Continuance Bill
(*Mr. Baring, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered * *July* 4; read 1° * *July* 5 [Bill 194]
Read 2° * *July* 7
Committee *; Report *July* 14
Considered as amended * *July* 15
Read 3° * *July* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *July* 19
Read 2ª * *July* 21 (No. 214)
Committee *; Report *July* 22
Read 3ª * *July* 25
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 75]

Turnpike Gates
Question, Mr. Sutton-Western; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring *July* 7, [176] 951; Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Sir William Jolliffe *July* 15, 1570

Turnpike Roads Bill
(*The Earl of Romney*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Mar* 7 (No. 24)
Read 2ª * *Mar* 11

Turnpike Trusts
Select Committee appointed *Mar* 8, "To inquire into the expediency and practicability of abolishing Turnpike Trusts," [173] 1699
Select Committee nominated *April* 5:—Mr. Clive (Chairman), Mr. Bruce, Colonel Hussey Packe, Mr. Alcock, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Mildmay, Mr. Wrightson, Lord Henley, Mr. Dodson, Colonel Pennant, Colonel Barttelot, Colonel Smyth, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Colonel Stuart (Bedford), Sir James Fergusson, Sir William Jolliffe, Colonel Gilpin, Mr. Walter, Colonel French, Mr. William Legh, and Mr. Western. Mr. T. G. Baring added *April* 29
Instruction—That they do limit their inquiry to the Turnpike Trusts of England and Wales
Report *June* 14
Parl. Paper, No. 383
Index to ditto, 383-I

Turnpike Trusts Arrangements Bill
(*Mr. Baring, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 7 [Bill 196]
Read 2° * *July* 11
Committee *; Report *July* 14
Read 3° * *July* 15
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *July* 18
Read 2ª * *July* 21 (No. 211)
Committee *; Report *July* 22
Read 3ª * *July* 25
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 79]

Unclaimed Wreck
Question, Mr. Rogers; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *April* 29, [174] 1913; Question, Mr. Rogers; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 23, [176] 155; Sums received (*Parl. P.* No. 462)

Under Secretaries Indemnity Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Viscount Palmerston, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 29 [Bill 85]
Bill read 2°, after short debate, *May* 5, [175] 82
Committee *; Report *May* 6
Read 3° * *May* 9
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *May* 10
Read 2ª * *May* 12 (No. 77)
Committee *; Report *May* 13
Read 3ª * *May* 23
Royal Assent *June* 23 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 21]

Under Secretaries of State
174] Question, Mr. Disraeli; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *April* 15, 1081
. *New Writ for Merthyr Tydvil*, Question, Colonel French; Answer, Mr. Attorney General *April* 19, 1287

Under Secretaries of State—Privilege
174] Observations, Mr. Disraeli *April* 18, 1218
. Notice having been taken by a Member of this House, that more than four Under Secretaries of State having been sitting and voting in this House at the same time during the present Session, 1231
. Motion, "That the provisions of the Act 21 & 22 *Vict.* c. 106, s. 4, have been violated, and that the Seat of the fifth Under Secretary of State has been and is thereby vacated" (*Mr. Disraeli*) *April* 18; after long debate, Amendt. to leave out from the words "violated, and that" and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire whether

[*cont.*

Under Secretaries of State—Privilege—cont.

174] the Under Secretary of State who was last appointed to that office thereby vacated his Seat" (*Sir George Grey*), 1248; after further debate, Question, "That the words, &c." put, and negatived; words added; Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Committee nominated *April* 21:—Sir George Grey, Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Walpole, Mr. Attorney General, Sir Hugh Cairns, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Sir William Heathcote, Mr. Massey, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Bright, Mr. Serjeant Kinglake, Mr. Hunt, and Mr. Dodson (*Sir George Grey*)

First Report *April* 21 (*Parl. P.* No. 226)

Second Report *April* 27

The Committee report:—That the Seat of the Under Secretary of State last appointed is not vacated *April* 27

See *Merthyr Tydvil Writ*
Vacating of Seats Bill

Under Secretaries, Seats of

Question, Mr. Walpole; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 2, [174] 1980

Uniformity Act Amendment Bill

(*Mr. E. P. Bouverie, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart*)

c. Resolution in Committee; Bill ordered *June* 7
Read 1° *June* 8 [Bill 134]

176] Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. E. P. Bouverie*) *July* 13, 1391; Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Walpole*), 1399; Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 101, N. 157; M. 56; words added; Main Question, as amended, agreed to; Bill put off for three months

Union Assessment Committee Act Amendment Bill

(*Mr. Villiers, Mr. Gilpin*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 23 [Bill 83]

175] Bill read 2°, after short debate, *May* 5, 83

Considered in Committee *May* 19, 518

cl. 1 (Notice of appeal to be given to the assessment committee); Amendt. (*Mr. Dodson*), after short debate, withdrawn; Amendt. (*Sir W. Jolliffe*), 518; after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; *cl.* agreed to

cl. 3 (Provision for costs of committee on appeals); Amended and agreed to

new cl. (Provision for new plans, maps, and books of reference) (*Mr. John Peel*); after short debate, *cl.* withdrawn

new cl. (*Mr. Wentworth Beaumont*); after short debate, withdrawn

Bill reported
Considered as amended * and re-comm. *May* 26
Committee * (on re-comm.); Report *May* 27
Read 3° * *May* 27

l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Wodehouse*) *May* 30 (No. 102)
Read 2ª, after short debate, *June* 7, 1338
Committee * *June* 14; Report *June* 17
Read 3ª * *June* 21 (No. 131)
Royal Assent *July* 14 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 39]

Union Relief Aid Acts Continuance Bill

(*Mr. C. P. Villiers, Mr. Gilpin*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 15 [Bill 50]
Read 2° * *Mar* 18
Committee *; Report *April* 4
Considered as amended * *April* 5
Read 3° * *April* 6

l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *April* 7
Read 2ª * *April* 18 (No. 39)
Committee *; Report *April* 19
Read 3ª * *April* 21
Royal Assent *April* 28 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 10]

UNITED STATES

LORDS—

British and American Claims, Address for "Return of Claims" [and other Papers] (*The Earl of Carnarvon*) *Feb* 16, [173] 618; after long debate, Motion agreed to *Parl. P.* No. [1724-11]

British Consuls in the Confederate States, Address for Copy of any Correspondence (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *April* 5, [174] 450; after debate, Motion amended, and agreed to *Parl P.* No. [3330]

Correspondence with the Federal Government, Question, The Earl of Derby; Answer, Earl Russell *Feb* 9, [173] 310; Question, The Earl of Derby; Answer, Earl Russell *Feb* 11, 427; Question—Explanation, Earl Russell; short debate thereon *Feb* 15, 544; Observations, The Earl of Derby; debate thereon *Feb* 25, 1053; Explanation, Earl Granville *Feb* 26, 1160

Law of Prize—Correspondence respecting the "Tuscaloosa," Observations, Lord Chelmsford; debate thereon *April* 26, [174] 1595

Enlistment of Irish Emigrants, Address for Papers (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *June* 9, [175] 1439; after short debate, Motion agreed to *Parl P.* [1724-17]

Kidnapping of Foreign Subjects for Military Service, Observations, The Earl of Ellenborough; Reply, Earl Russell *May* 12, [175] 353

Federal Recruiting in Ireland, Address for "Copies of Reports" (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *Mar* 1, [173] 1317; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Foreign Enlistment Act—The "Kearsarge," Question, The Earl of Donoughmore; Answer, Earl Russell *April* 5, [174] 448; Explanation, The Earl of Derby; Reply, Earl Russell *April* 7, 533; Address for Copies of Informations, Depositions, and Indictment (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *Mar* 18, 295; after debate, Motion agreed to (*Parl. P.* No. 53)

Outrage on a British Subject by the Federal Authorities—Case of Mr. Levey, Question, The Earl of Derby; Answer, Earl Russell *June* 21, [176] 2

COMMONS—

"Alabama" and "Alexandra," The—Correspondence, Question, Mr. Peacocke; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 9, [173] 323

"Alabama, The," Capture of the "Martaban," Question, Mr. G. S. Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 19, [173] 793

[*cont.*

United States—*cont.*

American Securities — Payment of Interest, Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 10, [175] 259

Capture of a Confederate Vessel (*the "Chesapeake"*) *in a British Harbour,* Question, Mr. Haliburton, [173] 823; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 19, 829

Capture of British Ships—The "Margaret and Jessie," Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Feb* 12, To leave out from "That," and add "Copies of all Correspondence with the Governor of the Bahama Islands, with reference to the sinking of the *Margaret and Jessie* in British waters" [and other Papers] (*Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald*), [173] 501; after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Civil War, The—Intervention of European Powers, Question, Mr. W. S. Lindsay; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *July* 25, [176] 2018

Clearance of British Ships at New York, Observations, Mr. Cave; Reply, Mr. Layard *June* 27, [176] 385

Conference on American Affairs, Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Sir G. Grey *April* 28, [174] 1775

Compulsory Enlistment of British Subjects, Question, Sir Andrew Agnew; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 8, [174] 628

Cruisers of Belligerents—Instructions to Colonial Authorities, Question, Mr. Peacocke; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 3, [174] 2055

Emigration (*America*), Motion for an Address for "Copy of Papers on the subject of Emigration to the United States of America in reference to the prolongation of the war now raging in that country" (*Lord Edward Howard*) *July* 28, [176] 2161; Motion agreed to

English Ships and American Cruisers—Adjudication in Prize Courts, Question, Mr. H. Baillie; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 18, [173] 713

Federal Recruiting in Ireland, Question, Mr. Roebuck; Answer, Viscount Palmerston; Observations thereon *Mar* 14, [173] 1916

M'Hugh, Mr. James, Case of, Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 23, [176] 159

Outrage on a British Subject, Question, Lord Robert Cecil; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 22, [174] 1504

"*Pampero,*" *The,* Question, Mr. Dalglish; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 7, [173] 1544

Relations with the United States, Question, Mr. Watkin; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 23, [175] 587

San Juan, Island of, Observations, Mr. Haliburton *Feb* 26, [173] 1217; Observations, Mr. Haliburton; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 4, 1495

"*Saxon,*" *Capture of the—Murder of the Mate,* Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 3, [173] 1365; Question, Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 15, 567; Question, Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 19, 796; Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 5, [174] 477; Question, [*cont.*

United States—*cont.*

Sir James Elphinstone; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 12, [175] 368; Question, Sir James Elphinstone; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 2, 1064

"*Science,*" *the Barque—Seizure of, in a Neutral Harbour,* Question, Mr. Hassard; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 1, [173] 1334; Question, Mr. Hassard; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 12, [174] 874; Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Layard *July* 18, [176] 1622

Seizure of British Property in New York, Question, Mr. Laird; Answer, Mr. Layard *July* 15, [176] 1574

Mr. Seward's Despatch of July 11, Question, Lord Robert Cecil; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 12, [173] 498

Sioux Indians, Outrages by the, Question, Mr. Hennessy; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 3, [174] 2053

"*Tuscaloosa,*" *Seizure of the,* Questions, Mr. Peacocke, Lord Robert Cecil; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Feb* 25, [173] 1068; Question, Mr. Peacocke; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Feb* 26, 1185; Observations, Mr. Peacocke; Reply, The Attorney General *Mar* 4, 1462; Question, Mr. Peacocke; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Mar* 17, [174] 183

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 28, To leave out "That," and add "the instructions contained in the Despatch of the Duke of Newcastle to Sir P. Wodehouse, dated the 4th day of November, 1863, and which remain still unrevoked, are at variance with the principles of International Law" (*Mr. Peacocke*), 1777; after long debate, Question put, "That the words, &c." A. 219, N. 185; M. 34

"*Tuscaloosa*"—*Seizure of the—Instructions to Colonial Governors,* Question, Mr. Peacocke; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 3, [174] 2055

The Confederate States—

Confederate States—Notice of Motion, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Lindsay *May* 31, [175] 912; Notice postponed

Confederate Ships building in British Ports, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 4, To leave out from "That," and add Address for "Copy of any Correspondence between Her Majesty's Government and the Agents of the Confederate States of America, relative to the building and equipment of ships of war in this country" (*Mr. G. Shaw Lefevre*), [173] 1475; after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Confederate and Federal Cruisers, Rights of, Question, Mr. R. Long; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 7, [173] 1544

Confederate Rams in the Mersey—see title, *Steam Rams in the Mersey*

Confederate Ship "Georgia," Observations, Mr. T. Baring; Reply, The Attorney General; long debate thereon *May* 13, [175] 467

Forged Report of the Secretary of the Confederate Navy, Question, Sir James Elphinstone; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 2, [174] 1978; Explanation, The Attorney General *May* 5, [175] 24

Exportation of Tobacco from the Southern States, Question, Sir Robert Clifton; Answer Mr. Layard *Feb* 23, [173] 931

[*cont.*

UNITED STATES—*cont.*
Parl. Papers—
North America, 1864—
Correspondence respecting
No. 1 Capture of "Alabama" . . [3241]
No. 3 " "Alabama" . . [3283]
No. 2 Capture of "Saxon" . . . [3269]
No. 4 The "Gibraltar" . . . . [3284]
No. 5 Iron-clads at Birkenhead . . [3285]
No. 6 Respecting "Tuscaloosa" . [3291]
No. 7 Respecting "Kearsarge" . . [3298]
No. 12 Do. Do. . [3328]
No. 8 Recruitment in Ireland . . [3299]
No. 9 Seizure of "Chesapeake" . . [3308]
No. 10 Alleged Report of Mr. Mallory [3319]
No. 11 Claims of British Subjects . . [3327]
No. 13 Removal of British Consuls . [3330]
No. 14 With Mr. Mason . . . . . [3331]
No. 15 Relative to Mr. M'Hugh . . [3365]
No. 16 Do. Do. . . . [3384]
No. 18 Do. Do. . . . [3394]
No. 17 Enlistment of British Subjects [3385]
No. 19 Do. Do. . . . [3395]

Vacating of Seats (House of Commons) Bill (*Sir George Grey, Viscount Palmerston*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 12 [Bill 107]
Read 2° after debate *May* 23, [175] 594
Committee *; Report *May* 26
Read 3° * *May* 30
l. Read 1a * (*The Lord President*) *May* 31
Read 2a * *June* 21 (No. 105)
Committee *; Report *June* 23
Read 3a * *June* 24
Royal Assent *June* 30 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c 34]

Vaccination
Question, Lord Lyttelton; Answer, The Earl of Shaftesbury *May* 30, [175] 779; Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, Mr. Lowe *Mar* 4, [173] 1457
Vaccination Registration, Question, Sir Morton Peto; Answer, Mr. Lowe *Mar* 14, [173] 1908
Vaccination Act, Question, Sir J. Pakington; Answer, Mr. H. A. Bruce *June* 13, [175] 1640
Vaccination of Sheep, Question, Sir Jervoise Jervoise; Answer, Mr. Lowe *Feb* 23, [173] 931; Question, Sir Jervoise Jervoise; Answer, Mr. H. A. Bruce *May* 2, [174] 1977; Question, Sir Jervoise Jervoise; Answer, Mr. H. A. Bruce *May* 9, [175] 193

Valuation of Lands and Heritages (Scotland) Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Dunlop, Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Baxter*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 27 [Bill 81]
Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Dunlop*) *June* 8, [175] 1423
Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Mackie*), 1427; Question proposed, "That the word 'now' &c.;" Debate adjourned
Bill withdrawn * *June* 14

Valuation of Rateable Property (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Gregory, Sir Colman O'Loghlen*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 9 [Bill 102]
Read 2° * *May* 31
[*cont.*

Valuation of Rateable Property (*Ireland*)—cont.
Committee *; Report *June* 9 [Bill 141]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 14
Read 3° * *June* 17
l. Read 1a * (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *June* 2 (No. 147)
Read 2a * *June* 28
Committee*; Report *June* 30
Read 3a * *July* 4
Royal Assent *July* 25 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 52]

VANCE, Mr. J., *Dublin City*
Army Estimates—Military Education, [175] 222
Bankruptcy Court (Dublin), [174] 303
Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1592; 2R. [175] 1098; Comm. *cl.* 12, [176] 27; Res. 101; Amendt. 298
Conveyancers, &c. (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [173] 1228
Costs Security, 2R. [175] 1813
Government Annuities, 3R. [175] 2040
Ireland—State of, Res. [173] 1845
Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers), Consid. *add. cl.* [176] 1075
Ordnance Survey—Civil Assistants, [173] 1250
Railway Encroachments (Dublin), [173] 562
Scientific Institutions, Dublin, [174] 677
Supply — Embassies and Missions Abroad, [176] 395, 396;—Civil Establishments on the West Coast of Africa, 1680
Tenure and Improvement of Land Act (Ireland), [174] 1775
Vestry Cess Abolition (Ireland), 2R. [173] 721

Vancouver's Island
Question, Mr. Arthur Mills; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *July* 22, [176] 1903

VANDELEUR, Colonel C. M., *Clare Co.*
Watching of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1719

VANE, Lord H. G., *Hastings*
Denmark and Germany — Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 868
Private Bills, Res. 1, [173] 656;—Committees on, Res. [175] 1565
Stansfeld, Mr., and the Greco Conspiracy, Res. [174] 263
Supply—Public Education, [176] 549
Union Assessment Committee Act Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [175] 519

VANSITTART, Mr. W., *Windsor*
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [176] 1820, 1832
India — Gold Currency, [173] 1364, 1906; Covenanted Servants, [175] 168;—Officers of the Army, 1270, 1272;—Claims of Azeem Jah, Comm. moved for, 1664
Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2013

VAUX OF HARROWDEN, Lord
Agrarian Offences (Ireland), Paper moved for, [175] 359

VERNEY, Sir H., *Buckingham*
  Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 123
  Army Estimates — Volunteers, [175] 48; — Works, Buildings, &c. 80, 204; — Military Education, 231; — Surveys, 232
  Army—Instruction of Soldiers in Trades, Res. [173] 1414; [174] 624;—Married Soldiers' Quarters, Aldershot, [175] 1544;—Requisition from the War Office to the Admiralty, [176] 153;—Sanitary Regulations for Field Service, 258
  Denmark and Germany — Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 466, 467, 885;—Order of Succession in Holstein and Schleswig, [174] 334; [175] 156, 167; [176] 2188; —The Conference, [174] 631; [175] 1291;—Bombardment of Sonderborg, [174] 715;—Treaty of London, 1852, 1344
  Garibaldi, General, Departure of, [174] 1425
  Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [173] 1805
  Navy Estimates — Naval Miscellaneous Services, [174] 443
  Privilege, [174] 1957; Adj. moved, 1958
  Supply—Emigration, [175] 1891

Vessels "El Tousson" & "El Monassia"
  Address for Copies of Correspondence (*Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald*) *Feb* 23, [173] 955; after long debate, Question put; A. 153, N. 78; M. 25
  Parl. Paper—
    North America, No. 5 . . . . [3285]
  See *Supply*

Vestry Cess Abolition (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir R. Peel, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
173] *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 12 [Bill 15]
  Read 2°, after debate, *Feb* 18, 718
  Considered in Committee *Feb* 29, 1316; reported
  Considered as amended * *Mar* 1
  Re-Comm., reported, and considered as amended * *Mar* 3
  Read 3° * *Mar* 3
l. Read 1^a * (*The Lord Steward*) *Mar* 4 (No 19)
  Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a" 1900; Motion agreed to; Bill read 2^a *Mar* 14
174] Considered in Committee *Mar* 15, 9
  cl. 4 (Guardians of poor of unions, &c. to provide coffins for interment of poor persons dying in such unions); Moved, to omit *cl.* (*The Earl of Donoughmore*); after short debate, Question put, "That clause stand part of the Bill," Cont. 27, Not-Cont. 34; M. 7; Amendt. agreed to; Division List, —Cont. and Not-Cont. 10
  Report * *April* 14 (No. 48)
  Read 3^a * *April* 18
175] *c.* Lords Amendts. considered; and, after short debate, agreed to *May* 5, 84
  Royal Assent *May* 13 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 17]

Victoria — Expulsion of Ticket-of-Leave-Men
  Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *June* 14, [175] 1729

Victoria Tower, Improvements near the
  Question, Mr. T. Miller; Answer, Mr. Cowper *Mar* 17, [174] 183

VILLIERS, Right Hon. C. P. (Chief Commissioner of the Poor Law Board), *Wolverhampton*
  Casual Poor (Metropolis), [176] 1800
  Corn Rent, [174] 1200
  Parochial Assessment Committees, [174] 1422
  Poor Law, Consolidation of the, [173] 1333; Casual Poor, [174] 15; Relief, [176] 334
  Poor's Rate, Leave, [173] 702
  Poor Relief Committee, [173] 1316; [175] 20
  Poor Relief (Metropolis), Leave, [176] 1771; Comm. 2039, 2045, 2047, 2050, 2054; Consid. 2101
  Settlement, Law of, [173] 1249
  Starvation in the Metropolis, [173] 1821
  Union Assessment Act, [173] 461
  Union Assessment Committee Act Amendment 2R. [175] 83; Comm. *cl.* 1, 518; *cl.* 3, 519
  Union Assessment Committees, [176] 1588
  Union Relief to Wives of Soldiers, [173] 1822

VIVIAN, Mr. H. H., *Glamorganshire*
  Army Estimates—Volunteers, [175] 48, 51;—Manufacturing Departments, 62, 75; — Surveys, 232
  Army—The Armstrong Gun, [175] 1838
  Government Annuities, Nomination of Comm. [174] 1480
  Welsh Steam Coal, [175] 103

Volunteer Review
  Question, Major Knox; Answer, Sir George Grey, [175] 808

Wakefield Prison, Dietary in
  Question, Lord Fermoy; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 15, [174] 16

WALCOTT, Admiral J. E., *Christchurch*
  Chain Cables and Anchors, Comm. Preamble, [174] 515
  Dockyards Commission — The Report, Res. [173] 1078
  Japan—Bombardment of Kagosima, Res. [173] 359
  Navy Estimates—Wages, [173] 1283
  Supply—Nelson's Column, [175] 851

WALPOLE, Right Hon. S. H., *Cambridge University*
  Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. [176] 90
  Barnstaple Election, Report, [174] 870
  British Museum, [176] 1194
  Business of the House, [173] 1925
  Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. [176] 1859; *cl.* 20, 1866
  Customs and Inland Revenue, Consid. [174] 1983
  Denmark and Germany — Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1264
  Dockyards, Comm. moved for, [173] 1157
  Ecclesiastical Commission, Papers moved for, [173] 1021
  Lisburn Election, [174] 395, 473
  Navy and Army Expenditure (1862-3), Comm. Res. [176] 1696
  Navy Estimates—Admiralty Office, [173] 1303

[*cont.*

Walpole, Right Hon. S. H.—*cont.*
- New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 1693
- Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Leave, [173] 785
- Public Schools Commission, Res. [175] 137
- Salisbury Cathedral, [174] 177
- South Kensington, New Museums at, [174] 1079
- Supply—West Coast of Africa, [175] 1888 ;—Treasury Chest, 1896 ; — British Museum, [176] 1356, 1361, 1362
- Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [174] 155
- Under Secretaries of State — Privilege, Res. [174] 1243, 1980
- Uniformity Act Amendment, 2R. Amendt. [176] 1399
- United States — Vessels "El Tousson" and "El Monassia," Papers moved for, [173] 1012
- Vacating of Seats (House of Commons), 2R. [175] 595

Walsh, Sir J. B., *Radnorshire*
- Canada—The North American Colonies, [176] 1708
- County Franchise, 2R. [174] 949
- Death, Punishment of, Comm. moved for, [174] 2113
- Denmark and Germany — Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 862
- Greco Conspiracy, The — M. Mazzini — Mr. Stansfeld, [174] 328
- Ireland—State of, Res. [173] 1884
- Naval Force, Res. [173] 1088
- United States — Capture of British Ships, Papers moved for, [173] 531

Walter, Mr. J., *Berkshire*
- Denmark and Germany — Integrity of the Danish Monarchy, [173] 884
- Education—Reports of Inspectors of Schools, Res. [174] 902 ;—Resignation of Mr. Lowe, 1216 ; — (Inspectors' Reports), Nomination of Comm. [175] 994 ; Res. [176] 2072 ;—Endowed Schools, Res. [175] 1075
- Gaols, 2R. [175] 2082
- Highways Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 32, [176] 1374
- Malt for Cattle, Comm. [173] 1040
- Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [176] 1422
- Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for, [176] 1465
- Supply—New National Gallery at Burlington House, [175] 1327 ;—Public Education, [176] 527
- Street Music (Metropolis), Comm. *add. cl.* [176] 683
- Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [174] 153
- Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. Amendt. [173] 1735, 1738

Warehousing of British Spirits Bill
(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel, Sir William Dunbar*)
- *c.* Considered in Committee *Feb* 15 ; Resolution
- Bill ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 15 [Bill 19]
- Read 2°, after short debate, *Feb* 23, [173] 1022
- Motion for an Instruction (*Mr. Lygon*), 1613 ; Motion withdrawn [*cont.*

Warehousing of British Spirits Bill—cont.
- Considered in Committee * *Mar* 7 ; Committee R.P.
- Committee * ; Report *Mar* 17 [Bill 54]
- Re-Comm. * ; Report *April* 8
- Read 3° * *April* 11
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *April* 14
- Read 2ª * *April* 25 (No. 46)
- Committee negatived
- Read 3ª * *April* 26
- Royal Assent *April* 28 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 12]

Warner, Mr. E., *Norwich*
- Cape of Good Hope—Kaffir War, [176] 1905
- Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. [175] 1469
- County Franchise, 2R. [174] 941
- Income Tax, The, [173] 216
- New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 3R. [176] 1870
- Poor Law Relief, [176] 334
- Poor's Rate, Leave, [173] 698
- Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 3R. Adj. moved, [176] 1874
- Settlement, Law of, [173] 818
- Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2131

Watching of Towns (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir H. Bruce, Sir F. Heygate, Capt. Stacpoole*)
- *c.* Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 15 [Bill 22]
- Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir Hervey Bruce*), [173] 1706 ; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Brady*) ; after long debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn ; Bill withdrawn *Mar* 9

Waterhouse, Major S., *Pontefract*
- Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, 2R. [173] 1523

Watkin, Mr. E. W., *Stockport*
- Borough Franchise, 2R. [175] 347
- Hudson's Bay Territory, Papers moved for, [176] 621
- India—Gold Currency for, Res. [175] 1590
- Navy — Naval Stations in the Pacific, [175] 1636
- Paper Manufacture, Comm. moved for, [176] 1745
- Russo-American Telegraph, [175] 802
- Standing Orders Revision, Report, [176] 2008
- Supply — Indian Department, Canada, [175] 1882
- United States—Our Relations with, [175] 587

Watlington, Mr. W. Perry, *Essex, S.*
- Archway and Kentish Town Junction Road, 2R. [173] 1064
- Epping Forest, Papers moved for, [175] 1205

WAYS AND MEANS
- Considered in Committee *Mar* 10
- (1.) £584,650 from the Consolidated Fund
- (2.) £4,500,000 from the Consolidated Fund
- Resolutions reported *Mar* 11 ; Bills ordered
- Considered in Committee ; *The Financial Statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer April* 7, [174] 536

[*cont.*

Ways and Means—cont.

174] Resolutions which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had given notice to move in Committee of Ways and Means *April* 7, [174] 595

Considered in Committee *April* 13
Resolution, £15,000,000 from the Consolidated Fund
Resolution reported *April* 14

Order for Committee read *April* 14
Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair"
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the consideration of the Duties upon Sugar be postponed until the House shall have had the opportunity of considering the expediency of the reduction of the Duty on Malt" (*Colonel Barttelot*), [174] 972; after long debate, Question put, "That the words, &c." A. 347, N. 99; M. 248
Division List, Ayes and Noes, [174] 1053
Considered in Committee *April* 14
Resolution on Sugar Duties [April 7], again proposed, [174] 1057
Resolution (1.) withdrawn
Resolution proposed in lieu thereof, 1057
Resolutions (2.) to (12.) as amended, 1058
Resolutions reported *April* 15
Motion, "That the said Resolutions be now read a second time," 1142
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "it is not possible for the Officers of the Customs to ascertain by inspection the quantity of crystallizable saccharine matter contained in any sample of Sugar; and that a law, which seeks to effect such an object, is unjust to the producer, inasmuch as by striking with a superior Duty one pound of Sugar which by a better mode of manufacture contains more saccharine matter than another pound obtained from the same raw material, it inflicts direct discouragement on improvement, whilst at the same time it excludes large quantities of fine Sugars from the market, and thereby injures both consumers and the Revenue by limiting the supply" (*Mr. Crawford*)
After long debate, Question put, "That the words, &c." A. 133, N. 17; M. 116
Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1173
Resolutions read 2°, and agreed to

Considered in Committee *April* 15
Resolutions (Sugar used for Brewing) agreed to
Resolutions reported *April* 18

Order for Committee read *April* 21
Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*The Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *April* 21, 1431
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, such a reduction of the Fire Insurance Duty as that contemplated by the Resolution of the House passed last Session would be best effected by an uniform reduction of one shilling per cent on all descriptions of property liable to the said duty" (*Mr. H. B. Sheridan*)
After debate, Question put, "That the words &c." A. 170, N. 117; M. 53
Main Question put, and agreed to

Considered in Committee *April* 21
Resolution, Fire Insurance Duty, 1*s*. 6*d*. per Cent, 1450

[*cont.*

Ways and Means—cont.

[174 Amendt. to leave out "Goods, Wares, or Merchandise, being stock in trade, or of or upon any Machinery, Implements, Fixtures, or Utensils used for the purpose of any manufacture or trade," and insert "Houses or Buildings" (*Sir Henry Willoughby*)
After debate, Question, "That the words, &c." put, and agreed to
Main Question put, and agreed to
Resolutions reported *April* 25

Considered in Committee *July* 14, £1,600,000, Exchequer Bonds
Resolutions reported *July* 15
Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, [176] 1610
After short debate, Resolutions agreed to
Bill ordered (*Mr. Massey, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)

SUMMARY.

WAYS AND MEANS.

1863-4	£	s.	d.
Amount granted, per Act 27 *Vict.* c. 5, dated 18 March, 1864, for the service of the year to 31 March, 1864 ...	584,650	0	0
1864-5			
Amount granted on Account, per Act 27 *Vict.* c. 6, dated 18 March, 1864	4,500,000	0	0
Further Amount granted on Account, per Act 27 *Vict.* c. 11, dated 28 April, 1864	15,000,000	0	0
Surplus Ways and Means of former years, per Appropriation Bill, Section 9 ...	3,501,410	4	2
Balance per Appropriation Bill, Section 1	17,341,813	15	10
TOTAL, GRANTS OF WAYS AND MEANS, per Appropriation Bill, Section 10 ...	£40,927,874	0	0

WEGUELIN, Mr. T. M., *Wolverhampton*
Peru—Seizure of the Chincha Islands, [175] 911

Weighing of Grain (Port of London) Bill
(*Mr. Crawford, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Thomas Baring, Mr. Hubbard*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 26 [Bill 119]
175] Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Crawford*), 1337; Motion, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir John Shelley*) *June* 6, 1338
176] Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°," 163; Amendt. (*Mr. Ayrton*) *June* 23, 166; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Bill read 2°
Committee *; Report *June* 24; and Re-Comm. to Select Committee [Bill 172]
Select Committee nominated *June* 28:—Mr. Crawford (Chairman), Sir John Shelley, Mr. Alderman Rose, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Francis William Russell, Mr Bramley-Moore, Mr. Brown (Malton), Lord Alfred Churchill, Mr. E. Egerton, Mr. A. Seymour
Minutes of Evidence *July* 12 (*Parl. P.* No. 479)
See SPEAKER, Mr., "*Hybrid*" *Bills*

Weight and Measure—The Standards of
Question, Mr. Doulton; Answer, Mr. Peel *July* 25, [176] 2015

Weights and Measures
Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *April* 28, [174] 177

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill
(*Mr. W. Ewart, Mr. Adderley, Mr. Cobden, Mr. Finlay*)
173] *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 18 [Bill 24]
Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. W. Ewart*), 1721; after long debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.," A. 90, N. 52; M. 38; Main Question put, and agreed to, Bill read 2° *Mar* 9
Order for Committee read
Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. W. Ewart*), [175] 1; after debate, Motion agreed to
Considered in Committee *May* 4
cl. 1 agreed to
cl. 2 (The use of metric weights and measures allowed), 4; after debate, Committee report Progress
176] Considered in Committee *June* 22, 144
Bill reported *June* 22 [Bill 165]
Considered as amended *June* 27
Read 3° * *June* 29
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl Fortescue*) *June* 30 (No. 164)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 21, 1782; Amendt. moved, to leave out ("now") and insert ("this day six months,") (*The Marquess of Salisbury*), 1784; after short debate, Question that ("now") &c. Cont. 34, Not-Cont. 23; M. 11; resolved in the affirmative; Bill read 2ª;
List of Cont. and Not-Cont., 1786
Committee * *July* 26; Report * *July* 27
Read 3ª * *July* 28
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 117]

Welsh Steam Coal
Question, Mr. Hussey Vivian; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *May* 6, [175] 103

WENSLEYDALE, Lord
Convocation, Powers of—Essays and Reviews, [176] 1558
County Courts Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 587
Crawley, Colonel, Court Martial on—Deputy Judge Advocate, [173] 1171
Rape, Punishment of, 2R. [174] 860; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. 959; 3R. 1758

WESTBURY, Lord—*see* CHANCELLOR, The Lord

WESTERN, Mr. T. SUTTON, *Maldon*
Cape of Good Hope—Kaffir War, [176] 1806
Parochial Assessment Committees, [174] 1421
Sugar Duties and the Malt Duty, Res. [174] 1005
Turnpike Gates, [176] 951

West Hartlepool Railway Directors
Questions, The Earl of Donoughmore; Answer, The Lord Chancellor *Feb* 26, [173] 1179

West Indian Incumbered Estates Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Mr. Peel*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 15 [Bill 215]
Read 2° * *July* 18
Committee *; Report *July* 19
Read 3° * *July* 20
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *July* 21
Read 2ª * *July* 25 (No. 225)
Committee *; Report *July* 26
Read 3ª * *July* 27
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 108]

WESTMEATH, Marquess of
Agrarian Offences (Ireland), Papers moved for, [175] 356
Burial Service, Commission moved for, [176] 1311
Conspiracy against the Emperor of the French, [173] 1242
Rape, Punishment of, 1R. [173] 1529; 2R. [174] 859, 861; Comm. *cl.* 1, 960; 3R. 1758; "That the Bill do pass," 1759

Westminster Bridge Traffic Bill
(*Mr. Cowper, Mr. Baring*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 13 [Bill 205]
Read 2° * *July* 15
Committee *July* 18, [176] 1698; Report
Considered as amended * *July* 19
Read 3° * *July* 21
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Wodehouse*) *July* 22 (No. 240)
Read 2ª * *July* 23
Committee *; Report *July* 25
Read 3ª * *July* 26
Royal Assent *July* 29 [27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 88]

Westminster, New Canon of
Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring *July* 28, [176] 2158

Westminster, New Palace of—see *Parliament*

West Riding Circuit—The Assize Town
173] Question, Mr. Morritt; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 19, 795
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Feb* 19, To leave out after "That," and add an Address "That Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to nominate the Town of Wakefield as the Assize Town for the West Riding of Yorkshire" (*Sir John Hay*); after long debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.," A. 138, N. 119; M. 19; Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 14, 1906; Question, Colonel Edwards; Answer,
174] Sir George Grey *April* 15, 1080; Question, Colonel Smyth; Answer, Sir George Grey
176] *July* 1, 613; Question, Colonel Smyth; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 15, 1598
Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that the late Decision of the Privy Council, ordering the

[*cont.*

West Riding Circuit—cont.
Removal of the West Riding Assizes from York to Leeds instead of to Wakefield, be re-considered (*Lord Wharncliffe*) *June* 13, 175] 1613; after debate, their Lordships divided, Cont. 80, Not-Cont. 54; M. 26, 1624; Motion agreed to
Her Majesty's Answer to Address *June* 17
(*Parl. P.* Nos. 84, 229, 403)

Whalley, Mr. G. H., *Peterborough*
Denmark and Germany — Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 886
Gaols, 2R. [175] 2077, 2079, 2081
Income Tax, Res. [175] 1750
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), Comm. Res. [175] 1696, 1697; 2R. [176] 1509; Comm. 1689; 3R. 1867
Parks, Public Meetings in the, [175] 366, 769, 774
Petty Offences Law Amendment, 2R. [176] 1433, 1434
Police Force and Mr. Arnold, [176] 824, 1626, 1707
Private Bills, Res. 1, [173] 660; Committees on, Res. [175] 1568
Railways Construction Facilities, Re-Comm. [175] 1528
Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, Consid. [176] 1699; 3R. Amendt. 1876
Standing Orders Revision, Comm. moved for, [176] 1460
Street Music (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 682
Supply—Consular Establishments, [175] 1903, 1905;—Public Education (Ireland), [176] 1350
Uniformity Act Amendment, 2R. [176] 1407

Wharncliffe, Lord
West Riding of Yorkshire Assizes, Address moved, [175] 1613, 1623

Whitbread, Mr. S., *Bedford*
Malta—Dock at, Res. [173] 901
Navy Estimates—Naval Establishments, [174] 2031, 2045, 2047
Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Leave, [173] 755; Comm. *cl.* 4, [174] 1267; Consid. *add. cl.* 1961, 1965

White, Hon. Lieut.-Col. (Lord of the Treasury), *Kidderminster*
Watching of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [173] 1719

White, Mr. J., *Brighton*
Address in Answer to the Speech, Report, [173] 195
China—Soochow, [173] 1474;—Affairs of, Res. [175] 963
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. [176] 1859
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 602
Government Manufacturing Establishments, Res. [176] 1943
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [173] 1800
Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia), Comm. Amendt. [176] 2056, 2067
Navy Estimates—Admiralty Office, [173] 1305
[*cont.*

White, Mr. J.—*cont.*
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), Comm. *cl.* 1, [176] 1694
Supply — Sir Rowland Hill, [175] 1601;—British Museum, [176] 1360;—Superannuation, Customs, &c. 1610
*Taxation, Comm. moved for, [175] 261, 279

White, Captain Melville, Case of
Question, Colonel French; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 12, [173] 495; Question, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Answer, Earl Russell; debate thereon *Feb* 9, 302; Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, Earl Russell *Feb* 25, 1063; Question, Colonel French; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 22, [174] 1504
Address for "Copy of Award made by Senate of Hamburgh in the case of Captain Melville White" (*Colonel French*) *May* 23; after debate, agreed to, [175] 604
(*Parl. P.* No. 482)

Whitecross Street Prison
Question, Mr. Denman; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 11, [173] 1826

Whiteside, Rt. Hon. J., *Dublin University*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [173] 147; Report, 173, 188
Agricultural Population (Ireland), Res. [176] 78, 98
Army — Forage Money of Cavalry Officers, [176] 1329
Bankruptcy Act, Nomination of Comm. [174] 1569
Bewicke, Mr., Case of, Comm. moved for, [174] 1939
Borough Franchise, 2R. [175] 327
Chancery, Court of (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1376, 1377, 1378, 1584, 1591, 1593; 2R. [175] 1104; Comm. *cl.* 12, [176] 23; Adj. moved, 27; Res. 98, 101; Amendt. 293, 299
Chief Rents (Ireland), 2R. [174] 1398, 1400
Costs Security, 2R. Amendt. [175] 1812
Denmark and Germany — Prussian Exactions in Jutland, [175] 516, 522, 591, 593;—Vote of Censure, Address moved, [176] 1220
Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) 2R. [176] 301
Education, National (Ireland), Res. [175] 1793; [176] 234
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Res. [174] 604, 615
Forfeiture of Lands and Goods, 2R. [175] 1806
Government Annuities, Nomination of Comm. [174] 1480
Indictable Offences (Ireland), Returns moved for, [174] 1120, 1126, 1129, 1132
Inland Revenue (Stamp Duties), Comm. *cl.* 10, [176] 283
Ireland—Additional Police at Lisburn, [174] 969, 971
Japan—Bombardment of Kagosima, Res. [173] 412
Lisburn Election, Res. [174] 856, 858
Merthyr Tydvil Writ, [174] 1195
Naval Establishments at Cork, [173] 325
New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), 2R. [176] 1479
Parks, Public Meetings in the, [175] 776
Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [175] 2107
[*cont.*

Whiteside, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Registration of Voters (Ireland), 2R. [174] 530
- Scientific Institutions of Dublin, [174] 676; Nomination of Comm. 1273, 1274
- Spirit Duties, Res. [175] 810, 839
- Superior Courts of Common Law (Ireland), Leave, [174] 1975
- Supply—Procurators Fiscal, Scotland, [175] 1686;—Sheriffs' Clerks, Scotland, 1687;—Court of Chancery (Ireland), 1688;—Landed Estates Court (Ireland), 1689;—Consular Establishments, 1905, 1908; Report, 1913; —Civil Establishments, West Coast of Africa, [176] 1665
- Trespass (Ireland), Comm. [174] 956
- United States—Seizure of the "Tuscaloosa," Res. [174] 1799

Wickham, Mr. H. W., *Bradford*
- Factory Acts Extension, Comm. [175] 1947
- Government Annuities—The "Professional" and "European" Societies, [173] 1820

Wicklow, Earl of
- Park Lane, Crowded State of, [175] 1236

Williams, Mr. W., *Lambeth*
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, [173] 1444;—Supplemental Estimate, 1796; — General Staff, &c. [174] 817;—Commissariat, 830;—Clothing, 832, 834;— Yeomanry Cavalry, [175] 45; — Volunteers, 49; — Warlike Stores, 79;—Works, Buildings, &c. 215;—Administration of the Army, 238; Amendt. 239
- Collection of Taxes, Re-Comm. [175] 1478
- Mails in the Provinces, Comm. moved for, [174] 417
- Mazzini, M.— The Greco Conspiracy, [173] 1260
- Miscellaneous Civil Service Estimates, Res. [175] 665
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [173] 1799, 1803
- Navy Estimates—Wages, [173] 1280, 1282;—Naval Stores, [174] 419;—Pay of Officers, [175] 680
- Navy—Retirement in the Royal Marines, Res. [175] 148
- School of Naval Architecture, Papers moved for, [175] 1594
- Supply—Civil Service Estimates, [175] 409; —Royal Palaces, 410;—Public Buildings, 412; — Repair of Furniture, 418;—Royal Parks, &c. 421;—New Foreign Office, 553, 845; — Architectural Designs for Public Buildings, 848, 851;—Nelson's Column, 852; —Holyhead Harbour, &c. 857; — Public Works (Ireland), 859, 860; — Sir Rowland Hill, 1597, 1598;—Privy Council for Trade, 1601; — Public Works (Ireland), 1672;—Copyhold, &c. Commission, 1674;— Charity Commission, 1676; — Governors, &c. West Indies, &c. 1886, 1887; — West Coast of Africa, 1888;—Emigration, 1891, 1892;—Consular Establishments, 1900; — Ecclesiastical Commissioners, [176] 657;—Civil Contingencies, 658;—Civil Establishments, West Coast of Africa, 1660

Willoughby, Sir H. P., *Evesham*
- Army Estimates—General Staff, &c. [174] 817; [175] 26; — Manufacturing Departments, Amendt. 63;—Works, Buildings, &c. 202, 214
- Army—Receipt and Expenditure, [173] 712;—Supplemental Estimates, 1796
- Bewicke, Mr., Case of, Comm. moved for, [174] 1933
- Business of the House, [174] 1777
- Casual Poor (Metropolis), [176] 1802
- Collection of Taxes, Leave, [173] 241; Re-Comm. Amendt. [175] 1465
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. [176] 1859; *cl.* 20, 1865
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Consid. [174] 1980
- East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [176] 1809, 1837, 1838
- Elgin and Kincardine, Countess of, Res. [175] 1461
- Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 1872
- Government Annuities, Leave, [173] 479
- Greek Loan, Res. Report, [175] 1606
- Navy Estimates—Wages, [173] 1283;—Admiralty Office, 1305;—Wages of Artificers Abroad, 1785, 1789;—Wages of Artificers at Home, 1973
- New Zealand (Guarantee of Loan), Comm. Res. [175] 1696; 2R. [176] 1483; 3R. 1868
- School of Naval Architecture, Papers moved for, [175] 1594
- Supply—Civil Service Estimates, [175] 406;—Royal Palaces, 410;— Paymaster General, 1604; — Printing and Stationery, 1679;—University of London, [176] 1353;—Queen's Colleges (Ireland), 1355;—Customs (Salaries and Expenses), 1608; — Superannuations, Customs, &c. 1609; Report, 1702
- Taxation and Expenditure, [173] 473
- Vacating of Seats (House of Commons), 2R. [175] 594
- Ways and Means—Fire Insurance Duty, [174] 1450; Res. Amendt. 1451, 1459; Report, [176] 1610

Wine Licences
- Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 21, [176] 1794; Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 22, 1906

Wodehouse, Lord († Under Secretary of State for India)
- Denmark and Germany—Speech of M. Hall, [173] 1897; Res. [174] 777; —†Vote of Censure, Res. [176] 1152
- †India—Seat of Government, [174] 1756;—† Disposal of the Native Dead, 1757
- Insane Prisoners Act Amendment, 2R. [173] 1247
- Malt for Animals, 2R. [174] 7
- Penal Servitude, Returns moved for, [173] 924
- † Poisoned Flesh Prohibition, 2R. [176] 1787; Amendt. 1788, 1897
- † Poor Relief (Metropolis), 2R. [176] 2127
- † Public Schools, 2R. [175] 1247
- † Rape, Punishment of, Report, [174] 1282; 3R. Amendt. 1757
- † Union Assessment Committee Act Amendment, 2R. [175] 1338

Wood, Right Hon. Sir C. (Secretary of State for India), *Halifax*
  Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [174] 1724
  East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [176] 1808, 1809, 1824, 1830, 1838, 1839, 1851, 1855, 1856, 1857
  Elgin and Kincardine, Countess of, Res. [175] 1461, 1463
  India—The Hill Tribes, [173] 463 ; — Central India Prize Money, 1071 ; — Gold Currency, 1364, 1906 ; Res. [175] 1586 ;—The Budget, [174] 179, 180 ;—Covenanted Civil Service, 187 ; [175] 167 ;—Territory of Dhar, [174] 1500 ; [175] 1948 ;—Burning the Dead, [174] 1500 ;—Affairs of Siam and Tringanu, [175] 18 ;—Delhi Prize Money, 460 ; [176] 706 ;—The British Envoy to Bhootan, [175] 634 ;—Finance, 1146 ; — Pensions, 1544 ;—Claims of Azeem Jah, Comm. moved for, 1663 ;—The Native Press, 1949 ;—British Burmah, 1949 ;—Lucknow Booty, [176] 705 ; — Gaol of Calcutta, 706, 707 ;—Army Brevet Rank, 1571, 1572 ; Finance Accounts, 2192
  Indian Army—Report of Commissioners, [173] 172 ;—Claims of Officers, 1065 ; [174] 176 ; Res. 891, 896 ; [175] 189, 259, 1272, 1273, 1279 ; [176] 615, 2159 ; — Medical Service, [173] 1067 ; [174] 185, 966, 1770
  Indian Medical Service, Comm. *cl.* 2, [176] 1703 ; Amendt. 1704, 1705 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1901 ; 3R. 2036, 2039
  Lawrence's, Sir J., Salary, Comm. [173] 222
  Mutual Surrender of Criminals (Prussia), Comm. [176] 2064

Writs Registration (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Sir George Grey, Sir William Dunbar*)
c. Ordered * *April* 26 ; read 1° * *April* 29 [Bill 84]
175] Motion, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*The Lord Advocate*) *May* 30, 869 ; Amendt. "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Major Hamilton*), 879 ; after debate, Amendt. agreed to ; Debate adjourned ; Debate resumed *June* 9, 1485 ; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Sir James Fergusson*), 1493 ; Question proposed, "That the word 'now,' &c. ;" after long debate Amendt. and Motion withdrawn ; Bill withdrawn *June* 9

Writs and Returns
  Feb 4.—The Lord Inchiquin, elected a Representative Peer for Ireland

Wyld, Mr. J., *Bodmin*
  Army Estimates—Surveys, [175] 233 ;—Administration of the Army, 239
  Denmark and Germany—The Norwegian Mail Steamer "Viken," [176] 1708
  Mails in the Provinces, Comm. moved for, [174] 407
  Prison Ministers Act, Papers moved for, [176] 2199
  Slave Trade—White Nile, Papers moved for [175] 981

Wyndham, Hon. P. S., *Cumberland, W.*
  Queen's Plates, Res. [176] 437, 448
  Salmon Fisheries Act, [174] 1915

Wynn, Mr. C. W. W., *Montgomeryshire*
  Penal Servitude Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [174] 1257

Yeomanry Cavalry, The
  Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 3, To leave out from "That," and add "The discontinuance in the present year of the assembling of the Yeomanry Cavalry for the accustomed period of six days' training on permanent duty, would be detrimental to the efficiency of the Force, and contrary to the recommendation of the Committee appointed by Lord Herbert in the year 1861, and is inexpedient" (*Colonel Edwards*), [173] 1376 ; after debate, Question put, "That the words, &c. ;" A. 158, N. 157 ; M. 1

York, Archbishop of
  Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Papers moved for, [173] 160
  Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal, 2R. [175] 627

Yorke, Mr. J. R., *Tewkesbury*
  Navy Estimates, Report, [174] 501
  Polish Refugees in Austria, [174] 1200

END OF VOLUME CLXXVI., AND FOURTH AND LAST VOLUME OF SESSION 1864.

LONDON : PRINTED BY CORNELIUS BUCK, 23, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

K 26 FEB 1970